

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

14th November 2018

ADDITIONAL PAGES UPDATE

DISTRIBUTED AT THE COMMITTEE MEETING

**AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL
GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

Additional Representations on Schedule Items Pages 8 - 13

ADDITIONAL PAGES ON SCHEDULE ITEMS

Item	Ref. No	Content
01	18/02207/REM	Revised site location plan – Please see attached.
02	18/02743/FUL	<p>Additional representation -</p> <p>'I had planned to attend the Planning Committee meeting on Wednesday 14th November and to speak as an objector to this application. However, due to work commitments, I am unable to attend. Would you please bring the following summary of what I had intended to say to the attention of the committee at the meeting.</p> <p>Firstly, I reiterate what we have said consistently throughout the progress of this application - that we are not against the connection detailed in this application on principle. However, we remain to be convinced that the connection, via a substandard pipe in the private road off Albion Street, into infrastructure that is already accepting flows from two other pumping stations (from Roberts Close and Stratton Place) in addition to the existing residential connections in the street, will not overload the infrastructure and thus cause detriment to residents.</p> <p>The condition in the original planning consent specifically refers to "sufficient capacity is made available to cope with the new development and in order to avoid adverse environmental impact upon the community,"</p> <p>Over the past several years, since the development was commenced, and despite repeated requests, neither the developer nor Thames Water has produced information or evidence that demonstrates that this will be the case.</p> <p>It should be noted that the connection via Albion Street, which incidentally was implemented and the development occupied before any approval was given, will serve a 64 bed care home and some 34 apartments, plus staff, visitors etc. We calculate the total population to be around 200 including residents of the care home and apartments, staff, visitors etc. This is in excess of the population of Albion Street. Added to which, a care home will be expected to generate flows in excess of a residential average due to the semi-clinical setting and the age of the population.</p>

		<p>Thames Water has not produced any verifiable data for residents of Albion Street, the ward councillor or indeed yourselves to examine, nor have they done anything to convince us that this connection is safe for the existing infrastructure and will not cause 'adverse environmental impact on the community'. All that they have produced is bland assurances. This is simply not acceptable.</p> <p>Regarding 'adverse environmental impact', for some time now we have been suffering foul odours emitting from manholes in the street. Thames Water has been investigating for some time without a resolution; and, while the cause is not clear, it is reasonable to assume that the additional from this development will not improve the situation.</p> <p>Option 2 - a gravity-fed connection via Gloucester Road - was Thames Water's initial preferred option and was accepted by the developer's agent (see <u>email</u> from Matt Tompkins dated 13 February 2018 in which he states: "I have spoken with Max at Aura and the drainage engineer and can confirm that the applicant is content to progress with option 2." This email is available in the documents posted for application 15/05221/COMPLY). We do not understand why this preferred option was abandoned, nor has any explanation been forthcoming. If that option had been implemented then I would be speaking in support. The lack of transparency throughout the process of this and the previous compliance application has been disturbing and frustrating.</p> <p>We urge the committee either to refuse the application on the grounds that the applicants and Thames Water have not provided information to demonstrate that the connection is satisfactory; or to defer the application to allow Thames Water to produce such information for independent verification'.</p>
03	18/02935/FUL	<p>Conservation Officer - In respect of the amended plans, the Conservation Officer has commented that whilst the amendments to the design have addressed some of the concerns raised, the only remaining design issue is the dormers, which appear boxy and top-heavy. It is commented that if Members were to permit the application, a condition would be required that the dormers would be built as per the Council's published dormer-window guidance.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the principle of erecting a dwelling in this location remains a fundamental concern for the reasons set out in the agenda.</p>

04	18/03198/FUL	<p>Email and statement from the Applicant forwarded to Members of the Planning and Licensing Committee –</p> <p>'Dear Councillor</p> <p><u>Re: Application 18/03198/FUL - Proposed conversion of Dutch Barn at Nesley Farm, Tetbury</u></p> <p>This email has been sent on behalf of David Morris, the applicant, to Planning Committee members in advance of the meeting on 14th November to address concerns regarding the content of the information that has appeared in the agenda items for the above application at Nesley Farm.</p> <p>There has been no communication forthcoming from officers to the applicant or agent prior to the release of the agenda.</p> <p>There have been significant changes to the planning scenario since the previous application was refused at Committee in June, particularly with the adoption of the new Local Plan. Therefore, the previous very limited negotiations on that case are not relevant and the reasons for refusal are neither applicable nor transferrable.</p> <p>All the reasons given in the agenda for the current recommendation for refusal are arguable and can be countered but not in the three minutes allotted at the scheduled meeting. It would be very much appreciated if you could take the time to look over the attachment that is included with this email'</p>
06	18/02731/LBC	<p>Case Officer - Change of description to read, 'Demolition of existing garage'. The proposed annexe would be detached and does not require listed building consent.</p>

{The start of the attachment}

At the committee meeting in June considerable confusion arose over several aspects of the application which were not resolved satisfactorily in the mind of myself, the applicant, and some committee members. To this end I was urged to resubmit as soon as possible.

Considerable and diligent work has ensued to address all the concerns raised by members with this current application. In addition, advice was sought from a longstanding board member of the Cotswold Conservation Board. Although familiar with some members of the Board, I approached a member with whom I have no relationship other than having been introduced to each other on a site visit in a neighbouring parish over a planning issue. His encouragement to pursue the application and his suggestion to include a natural stone element in the design were the starting point for the re-application. He also was very encouraging in that the conversion would sit comfortably in the surroundings and the demolition of the lean-to would give the adjoining stone barn the prominence it deserves in the landscape from all vantage points.

The officer's submission:

Site description.

Site is under 1.5 miles from the road junction.

Lean-to extension erected in approx. 1975 is wooden and has come to the end of its useful life.

Despite the contention that the stone barn is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset it was not identified as such in the Tetbury and Tetbury Upton Neighbourhood Plan.

There is NOT a shared access or parking area for the stone barn. This was an issue that remained unresolved at the previous committee meeting and has subsequently been explained fully in the application. There are restrictive covenants on the stone barn that cover light air and non-interference. The owner has only a statutory right of access to the stone barn for maintenance. This parcel will remain in the ownership of the applicant and a right of access will be given to the new property if permission is granted.

The Current Application.

There are many differences in the proposal. Two of the elevations are faced with natural stone. There is a covered area on the south east corner of the building that is not built which will give views through the structure to open countryside from the roadside on the north and further distance the built structure from the stone barn. The garden area is considerably reduced to a maximum of the footprint of the lean-to and a narrow strip between the buildings as they are and the site boundary wall on the west. The agricultural cladding will be a maximum of 8ft above finished ground level *on two sides (SW)* which means, particularly from the south, because of the topography, little if any evidence of domestication will be visible from the road and light pollution is minimised. The reason the application offered to have condition on the outside lighting was to ensure no external lights are above this 8ft level in perpetuity.

12

Item 04
18/03/98/FUL

It is re-iterated again that all works necessary to convert the building to what would virtually be a domestic property could legitimately be carried out without planning consent but as previously stated would in the applicants view be a cynical abuse of the planning process. This does remain an option, as the officer suggests, should the application be refused.

Sustainability is a subjective view. The members will all have their own views on this and it is hoped that they will reach a fair conclusion on its use as a determinant in this instance.

However, the conclusion that the proposal would not minimise waste and pollution nor mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy and therefore not accord with either national or local policy and is used as a part of the determination in this application, I feel is hardly appropriate to an application for a single two bed dwelling.

The isolation issue is much more clear cut and I have yet to come across anyone who shares the officers opinion. At the previous meeting the question was posed by members of other houses in the vicinity, to which there was an answer of "none". However, the case sheet for this matter has Charlton Down listed as a neighbour for consultation where there eight dwellings. In essence there are therefore 10 dwellings in the vicinity of the application.

The Design, impact on Character and Appearance of the Cotswolds AONB and the setting of the adjoining stone barn are again all subjective and it is the opinion of the officer that the proposals do not accord with many policies. As previously, I am sure members will have their own views on what constitutes good practice and what does not. As mentioned above, a serving board member for the AONB, encouraged the re-application because he felt the officer's opinion to be incorrect.

The provision of a windfall property which is acceptable in both national and district plan takes this application out of the consideration that housing provisions are met and it is proposed that a conversion and development of this nature is beneficial in adding to the diversity in the rural and wider community that has always changed over time.

It has been suggested, by an objector, there are plenty of two bedroom houses in Tetbury that cater for that sector. However, this development would add to the character of the area by being smaller and therefore more affordable to a wider range of people rather than the preponderance of larger houses usually associated with the rural areas locally, most of which have been extended in size further.

The conclusion states that development would be out of character with the adjacent stone barn. This barn has its own large garden area with lawns and paving and outside lighting to the south so the officer's conclusion is hard to understand.

13

Item 04
18/03/198/FUL.