

Objector's comments in respect of application no;

18/02207/REM

FILE COPY  
NOT TO BE REMOVED

These plans are **not** what people in the village expected when outline permission was first granted last year following consultation by the previous owner in conjunction with the previous developers. I cannot emphasise this too strongly.

2. I and many others contend that the plans vary so much from what was agreed at outline stage – especially number of bedrooms in the market properties - that they should be turned down.
3. It seems that Piper Homes ignored the Parish Council's input following a public meeting at the end of July.
4. The Parish Council does not support the current application.
5. Public opinion in the village – there are numerous 'objections' on the site and there is a petition. I can find no one from the village who supports this development. Many villagers (not necessarily all) are content with 7 'affordables' and 7 'market' homes. But as I mentioned above, what they expected and what Piper Homes now propose are very different.
6. There is not enough time for a layperson such as myself to go through all the documents in the time available. I know that Martin Perks has rebutted a lot of the points I made.
7. Tim Gardner, a member of the Parish Council but it seems writing in a personal capacity, asked for deferral of consideration. This was not granted.
8. There has been insufficient time for these new proposals to be brought to the attention of the village.
9. Developers have not consulted with local people at all. Contrast that to what happened prior to Outline Permission being granted (see 1 above). I signed up to the Piper Homes site. They emailed me to say how much they looked forward to welcoming me to The Grange at Longborough, to attend their invitation only VIP sales launch. I would be one of the first to receive plans, brochure and selling prices.
10. The Council has a Corporate Strategy. One aim is to Champion Issues which are Important to Local People. Well, this is!

11. I beseech the Planning Committee to refuse this application for the reasons I have given above. If they do not feel able to refuse, at least I ask them to defer making a decision and give the village more time to respond. Preferably in consultation with the developers.

12. Thank you.

Ruth Wright

13<sup>th</sup> November 2018

Saved as 14.11.2018 speech to Planning Committee handed to officer

Applicant's comments in respect of application no;

18/02207/REM

**FILE COPY  
NOT TO BE REMOVED**

Longborough - 18/02207/REM - Piper Homes

Good morning and thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak at this committee meeting.

My name is Rupert Parkin and I am a Director of Piper Homes. Piper Homes is a family run business established over 50 years ago and we pride ourselves on building high quality family homes across the south midlands and Cotswolds.

I have been made aware that one of the primary concerns that the local residents have is in respect of the foul drainage. I am sure that the committee will understand that this point does not form part of the items to be considered at this reserved matters stage, and will be dealt with in detail as a pre-commencement condition, however we do appreciate those concerns expressed and I can formally confirm here that we will address those concerns to the satisfaction of the local authority, statutory authority and in turn building control and I am happy to provide you all with further explanation here today to give you the comfort that you require.

It is our understanding that the current problems at the Plum Tree Close pump station are being caused by the slow turnover and throughput of effluent within the wet well of the pump chamber and the effluent is becoming septic and producing particularly unpleasant odours - the equivalent of a dry pan in a domestic toilet, but on a much larger scale. The original pump was designed to accommodate more houses than there are currently at Plum Tree Close.

We and our engineers have liaised very closely with Thames Water, Bromford Housing and an independent pump company who all agree that there is sufficient capacity within the system and a higher throughput of foul effluent discharging into the chamber from a greater number of

houses would increase the turnover and throughput, therefore eliminating the foul odour by reducing the time for effluent to sit and stagnate in the wet well.

As part of our connection works our independent pump specialist would also service and check the capacity of the existing system, the pumps and monitoring systems and renew or upgrade where necessary to ensure that the system is in perfect working order. We will be responsible to our homeowners and the locals to ensure that the system is fit for purpose and that responsibility is important to us.

We want to work with the community and very much see ourselves as part of the community whilst we build and sell the houses and clearly it is in all of our interests and benefit to have a solution to the drainage that works properly. A fully detailed design with all the necessary improvement proposals will be submitted at pre-commencement condition stage for scrutinisation by the local authority, community and relevant statutory bodies.

Ward Member's comments in respect of application



Gmail  
FILE COPY

Julian Beale

no, 18/02207/REM

NOT TO BE REMOVED

PLANNING 14 NOV '18. ITEM NO 1 18/02207/REM

1 message

Julian Beale <j.

13 November 2018 at 20:48

SUMMARY OF WARD MEMBER'S COMMENTS : ---

\* Most Members will have inspected the Site and seen its juxtaposition to Plum Tree Close. I will refer to the current intended development as "Plum Tree Two".

\* The land is now in the ownership of the new Applicant, Piper Homes.

\* *please can we have better markings on maps and layouts!!*

\* Having consulted the Parish Council (on Monday evening), I have no comment to make under the headings of Scale and Appearance, Layout or Landscaping except to note that we have not received from Piper the information regarding Highways and Vehicle Movements (p15).

\* I DO have a very considerable concern under **Other Matters**

^^^ First, for clarity, references to "Plum ORCHARD Close" - (p16, 3 paras from bottom) - mean "Plum Tree Close".

^^^ The proposed managing agent for the Affordable Properties has not been identified - perhaps The Guinness Trust but certainly NOT Bromford Housing.

^^^ **Foul Drainage**

A very serious problem which has persisted in Longborough over the last three years is the pervasive smell of effluent which has emanated from the sewerage system installed to service the houses in Plum Tree Close. The noxious smell has caused distress and ill health to neighbouring residents as well as to the occupants of Plum Tree Close.

Currently, the circumstances are improved but not resolved.

The root cause may include a design deficiency but a certain, demonstrable contributor has been the management ineptitude of both Bromford Housing and Thames Water.

Against that background, please note : ---

**AA) When Outline Permission was granted for Plum Tree Two, we were told by Glanville, civil engineer, on behalf of the then owner, Mr Matthew Stokes, that output from the new development would be pumped to the Thames Water sewer at Manhole 0602, North West of the site by Pear Tree Cottage. It was to be separate from the arrangement for One as "this will assist with spreading out flows throughout the local network."**

**BB) Now, in direct contrast, we are asked to accept the proposal by Piper that effluent WILL be drained from Plum Tree Two into the Plum Tree One system and we are assured that this arrangement will IMPROVE the sewerage performance to the benefit of both developments. NO EVIDENCE HAS BEEN ADVANCED TO SUPPORT THIS CLAIM AND I BELIEVE THAT WE NEED TO BE CONVINCED THAT IT IS ACCURATE.**

**CC) As a point of further concern, it is inferred that the One Pumping Station will be in the ownership of Bromford.**

**DD) In summary, here is an attempt to persuade our Authority that all will be well when there is an established track record which proves the contrary.**

10-10-61  
10-10-61

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

TO: DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
FROM: ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

RE: [Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

[Illegible]

**I request Members to REFUSE this Application - or to DEFER it - until Officers have received fresh and expert opinion as to how Sewerage arrangements for Plum Trees One and Two can be guaranteed to produce working results to a standard befitting the 21st Century.**

**ENDS**

Agent's comments in respect of application no;  
18/02935/FUL

Thank you Chair.

**FILE COPY  
NOT TO BE REMOVED**

Members will note the conclusion within the officer's report that there is no issue with the principle of the proposed new dwelling and that officers are satisfied there is no basis for objections on highways, amenity or archaeological grounds. Accordingly, it is only the alleged harm to landscape character and the setting of the Grade II listed Briarfurlong Cottage which feature as reasons for refusal.

In this regard, you could be forgiven when reading the officers report for forming an entirely inaccurate impression of the application site. As will be clear to anyone who knows the site, the reality is that it forms part of the extensive garden area associated with The Malt House and is contained within a mature landscape framework which visually and functionally separates it from the paddocks and agricultural land which lie further to the north. There are no long-distance views available of the site from the wider AONB and any close-up views are seen within the context of built development associated with the existing cluster of dwellings. Accordingly, and contrary to what is implied within the report, the proposals will not result in the settlement fringe 'intruding into the landscape' nor will it 'erode the distinctive settlement pattern' as implied by the landscape officer.

In terms of whether or not there is a 'distinctive settlement pattern', Members may have noticed that the report fails to provide a consistent description. It is described both as a 'cluster' of dwellings characterised by large detached properties generally set within large and well-defined private gardens, and then later as having a 'scattered' development pattern! Either way, evidence submitted as part of the Design and Access Statement clearly demonstrates that there is no 'build line' and that residential properties extend some distance to the north along Cutham Lane, to include Springfield Farmhouse, Withy Close, York House, Cutham Rise and Cutham Hill House.

The officer's report is also wildly inaccurate when it states that the 'footprint of the dwelling would occupy a large proportion of the site' and that there is little room for mitigation. If Members take a further look at the site plan, they will note that the footprint actually equates to less than 10% of the site area which leaves the majority of the site undeveloped, with considerable scope for new planting!

In addition to the above, the alleged impact on the setting of Briarfurlong Cottage is also disputed. The NPPF defines setting as the surroundings in which a heritage



asset is experienced and, due to the application site's separation from the cottage by both Cutham Lane, substantive boundary vegetation and a lower ground level, there simply is no meaningful 'experience' of the listed building from the application site and, therefore, no harm to the significance of the heritage asset. As to concerns over the design of the new dwelling set out within the report, Members should note that these pre-date a meeting held between the applicant and conservation officer, following which the scheme was amended to take on board all of the officer's suggestions such that the proposed design of the new dwelling (which now excludes the garage shown on the Committee papers) should no longer be at issue.

In conclusion, there is clear evidence that the report before you cannot be used as a reliable basis on which to make a sound decision. Accordingly, the landscape and heritage reasons for refusal are both unfounded and, in the absence of any other material policy conflict, planning permission should therefore be granted.

Parish Council's comments in respect of applications no;  
18/02731/LBC and 18/02715/FUL

Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council agrees with the objections made by two nearby residents  
and is surprised that the Officer's assessment on p117 is a recommendation to permit.

FILE COPY  
NOT TO BE REMOVED

Our own objections, made on 8 August this year, to some extent repeat the objections we made to the earlier application which you refused, rightly in our view, as the scope of the so-called annexe is reduced in the current application, but its size, traffic implications, and effect on the adjacent listing building are very little changed.

In particular, the footprint of the proposed annexe is around three times larger than the existing garage, and indeed is 90% of the main dwelling itself. It is substantially larger – although set back a little more – than the annexe refused in the previous application.

Specifically, there is inadequate parking provision, as Marshmouth Lane is unable to accommodate any on-street parking as it is primarily a rural farm track used also by commercial vehicles from Birdland. To remove the garage from this holiday let site while adding two more large double bedrooms – ie quite possibly two extra cars – seems unwise, and our earlier comments make clear the need – because of the narrow access off Marshmouth Lane at a tight corner between a stream and the river – for all vehicles to both enter and leave the site in a forward direction. This seems unlikely to be achieved when examining the block plan in terms of the existing behaviour of multi-occupation holiday lets elsewhere in the Village.

The appearance of the proposed building is neither in the village vernacular (blockwork, cladding and plain tiles) nor in that of the surrounding buildings in Nethercote (given its low roof pitch), and we believe it will give no public benefit, be detrimental to the adjacent Listed Building, and will cause substantial harm to the nearby environment. We do not agree, given its size, that the annexe would “appear subservient” to the listed building.

We therefore argue that this application, like its similar predecessor, should be refused.

Cllr Robin Daniel,  
Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council

13 November 2018

Objector's comments in respect of applications no;  
18/02715/FUL and 18/02731/LBC

FILE COPY  
NOT TO BE REMOVED

Demolition of existing garage and erection of detached annexe  
AT Nethercote Bridge Cottage Marshmouth Lane Bourton-On-The-Water  
Cheltenham Gloucestershire  
APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER : 18/02731/LBC

Demolition of existing garage and erection of detached annexe  
AT Nethercote Bridge Cottage Marshmouth Lane Bourton-On-The-Water  
Cheltenham Gloucestershire  
APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER : 18/02715/FUL

Dear Councillors,

Thank you for the opportunity to address this committee in relation to these applications. Through the iterations submitted to the council, this proposal has attracted opposition from:

- Bourton Parish Council,
- The Conservation officer
- Nearby residents

Despite changes to the proposal, those objections have not been addressed.

The conservation officer distilled the Good Practice Advice as, **previous changes to a heritage asset, do not absolve anyone from an ongoing duty of care in respect of future changes.** The proposed annexe does not constitute a public benefit. What now remains is a determination: Does it harm the listed asset?

This proposal does harm to the listed asset.

- The footprint of the proposed annexe represents a near 50% increase on the existing garage footprint
- The frontage presented is dramatically increased. The proposed annexe would stand almost 1½ times higher than the existing garage and 2½ times wider.

Wider than the original unextended cottage it would equate to 75% of the width of the current cottage. **This is not a building that fades into the background.**

The inclusion of Velux windows points to an intention to exploit the loft space for future use and is evidenced by Section 8b of the planner's assessment comparing the proposed annexe to existing double garages with accommodation above. No such garages exist on the Lane. No such garages exist on the road to the rear of the property. There is no precedent. **The proportions of this proposal do not maintain the character and appearance of the site.**

Contrary to the close in section 8c on subservience, the size and the lightweight materials will appear incongruous next to a listed asset. **They are at odds with the Cotswold vernacular.**

Section 8d seeks to dismiss noise concerns. It treats the annexe as a stand alone entity, ignoring the reality that it increases the rental from one that sleeps 7, suited to familial groups, to one that sleeps at least 11, with a consequential increase in noise. The nature of the annexe will lead to increased movement between the two buildings in the late evening. With the number of beds so out-of proportion to the seating and dining provision, we also foresee increased traffic from large groups making their way into and out of the village. **The nature of the larger non-familial groups that the applicant targets in his business model leads to an appreciable impingement on the serenity of the neighbouring properties.**

Section 8e asserts that parking is unlikely to be an issue – optimistically citing use of a public car park as a solution. The reality is that it leaves unanswered the issue of how parking in the approach to Nethercote Bridge (a single lane bridge without sides) would be regulated. This is of

acute concern to those with farmland or stables further down the lane. ***Crossing an already challenging bridge becomes nigh impossible if the area around Nethercote Bridge Cottage should be parked up. Emergency services would struggle for access in this scenario.***

In the earlier application for this site, Bourton Parish Council made the observation - ***"The onus is for planning guidelines and policies to dictate the nature of the development, rather than this be done by the applicant's financial needs or business model."*** We believe this must always hold true and therefore respectfully ask you to refuse this application

Applicant's comments in respect of applications no:

18/02745/FUL and 18/02731/LBC.

FILE COPY  
NOT TO BE REMOVED

Chairman and Members. Thank you for the opportunity to speak directly to the Committee.

I would like to start by giving you a brief history of our attempts to resolve all concerns and requests presented to us by neighbours, your conservation officer and your planning officers. The first application was made on the 8th of February and it was for a two-storey annex with two dormer windows. This proposed structure was considered by your officers to be too large and of an inappropriate design and it would harm the setting of the listed Nethercote Bridge Cottage. Therefore that first application was refused, but only on grounds of impact to the listed building. Your officers did not object to the principle of the proposed use of the annexe and were generally supportive to providing holiday accommodation ancillary to the existing dwelling.

I noted the concerns raised and in fact changed my architect and strategy by appointing Prime Oak Ltd, a premium company that is highly respected for its work and designs within sensitive locations such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty or within the setting of a listed building. Their buildings are constructed from matured oak with beautiful exposed rafters, beams and timber cladding.

For this second application Prime Oak's designers created an outbuilding that again was considered too large by your officers. However my aim has always been to work with your planning team and I took the decision to almost half the proposed structure again to a footprint approximately 40 sqm. Please also bear in mind that we will be taking down the existing poor quality garage that has a footprint of around 27 sqm and which does not provide sufficient useable internal space.

The latest revised proposal before you now is acceptable to your planning and conservation officers. We have also made the following additional detailed amendments:

1. We amended the roof pitch from 35° to 45°, as requested.
2. We completely removed the front porch, as requested.
3. This is a simpler single story modest annex, as requested.
4. We have used materials similar to the current garage, timber cladding.
5. We have removed the middle roof light, as suggested by the conservation officer.
6. We have reduced the height of the stone plinth as the conservation officer requested, following her suggestion that it might look better if the timber cladding extended a bit lower.
7. We have two additional parking spaces for potential guests, please bear in mind that this is one of the largest plots of land in the immediate area.

I would respectfully stress again that your officers have never raised any concerns about the principle of the proposal or other planning matters, such as impact on neighbouring residents or parking provision. Their concern has always been about the size and design, which has now been addressed.

I would also like to thank Cotswolds Tourism, who I am a member of, for their letter of support.

I hope, Chairman, that your Committee will endorse your officer's recommendation to approve this modest annex. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the other holiday let that I operate in the area is graded 5 Stars and received a Gold award from VisitEngland only last month. I am working hard to achieve the same for Nethercote Bridge Cottage. - Thank you for listening.

Objector's comments in respect of application nos 18/02975/FUL and 18/02976/LBC  
Good Morning Thank you for the opportunity for allowing me to speak today.

My name is Phil Barnett and together with my wife Linda we live at Brake house, Church Street, Meysey Hampton which is one of the properties directly impacted by this proposal. I would like to highlight the following points.

**Firstly, regarding the woodland area known as The Brake.**

We have lived in our house for 11 years and during that time the trees within The Brake remained completely unchanged. Approximately 2 years ago a TPO was placed on the trees within The Brake. Following a discussion with the tree officer I was given to understand that this would result in more protection. In reality this has had the opposite effect in that a significant number of trees have been destroyed over the last 2 years and most importantly to my knowledge none have been replaced. If they had been replaced this would prevent any

road going through The Brake to allow access to the proposed development. Further, if this development is approved, I believe it will result in more trees being felled and I have no confidence that any of these trees will be replaced. In addition, I believe that there will be significant pressure from any prospective resident of this proposed property to remove even more trees due to the lack of natural light.

Further it has been suggested that the tress at the bottom of our garden mainly the willow and the poplar will be left to provide screening from the proposed development. I'm not sure if you are aware but it appears that the willow tree is dead.

**Reference Eleanor Wards comments**

Having read the comments I would suggest that her views that this development provides public benefits to the village is very subjective. In fact, the residents of the village impacted by this development, who are members of the public, have in the main objected. I would also add that if you were to ask the Parish Council about parking in Church Street you would find that this is already an issue with the residents particularly around school opening and closing times. This would be exacerbated if this proposal went ahead given the number of heavy contractor vehicles that would be using Church Street.

Finally, as referred to earlier this proposed development is in direct line with the rear of my property and of my neighbours. This therefore totally undermines and removes the privacy that we currently enjoy.



I hope these comments are fully taken into consideration when making your final decision and that the Committee will challenge the recommendation that this development goes ahead.



Objector's comments in respect of applications no;  
18/02975/FUL and 18/02976/LBC

FILE COPY  
NOT TO BE REMOVED

I represent the owners of 16 Church Street and am here to convey their significant and legitimate concerns in respect of the application proposal. The application site lies directly to the rear of their property and, contrary to conclusions reached within the reports before you, its development is in clear conflict with a number of key policy requirements. However, Members will also be aware that my clients are not alone in their concerns, as all other residents directly affected by the proposed development have also raised concerns in respect of the proposal.

Firstly, in terms of the principle of development, I ask that Members reassess the proposals against criterion c) of Local Plan Policy DS3 which states that small-scale residential development must complement the form and character of the settlement. In this regard, it is pertinent to note the officer's assessment in relation to the conservation area is that the prevailing pattern of development within the vicinity of the site is buildings and their plots aligned along Church Street without backland development. As the proposed development of a single backland plot accessed from the back of the nearby car park bears no relation to the prevailing character identified within the report, the only reasonable conclusion is that there is a clear conflict with the requirements of Policy DS3. Accordingly, the proposals must be considered against Policy DS4 and, since there is no exceptional justification for it, there are clear policy grounds on which to refuse the application.

In relation to other aspects of the proposal, the proposed new dwelling will have an overbearing impact on both No.16 and Brake House and significantly intrude on the quiet enjoyment of each occupier's private amenity space. Although the proposal to remove all permitted development rights is welcome, it should be noted that the alleged screen planting along the common boundary between the properties will do nothing to alleviate the harm caused, since the associated trees are already dead, and any new planting will take years to establish.

It should also be noted that numerous other TPO'd trees have already been removed to facilitate the proposed development and there will no doubt be pressure for others to be felled due to the inevitable overshadowing of the proposed new dwelling that will occur during the afternoon and evening.

In conjunction with the alterations to the car park to facilitate access, the proposed development will have significant implications for the overall urbanisation of this part of the village in conflict with Local Plan Policies EN1 and EN2 which, even if there are no overriding concerns in respect of existing heritage assets, are sufficient of themselves to warrant refusal of the application. Accordingly, I would urge the Committee to challenge the basis of your officer's recommendation for approval and, in recognition of the clear policy conflicts, refuse permission for the proposed new dwelling.

Agent's comments in respect of applications nos 18/02975/FUL  
and 18/02976/LBC

Land at the old Rectory, Meysey Hampton (1647)

13<sup>th</sup> November 2018

**LAND AT THE OLD RECTORY, MEYSEY HAMPTON**

**REPRESENTATIONS FOR APPLICATIONS**  
**18/02975/FUL & 18/02976/LBC**

**COMMITTEE PRESENTATION**

**Second Draft**

The sole reason this application has been brought to the Committee is for Cotswold District Council's own transparency because the proposed access to the site runs across the car park owned by CDC. The Applicants have a lawful right of way to access their land across the car park which was retained in perpetuity when a previous owner of The Old Rectory transferred the land to the Parish Council, later succeeded by the District Council.

The design, location and access to the development has been derived through extensive consultations with the Council's Planning Officers, Conservation Officers, Tree Protection Officers and Estate Officers. The design has been developed to cause minimum impact on the site, neighbours and local amenity.

In his report the Case Officer supports the application and would have granted permission under delegated powers had it not be for the technical reason regarding land ownership outlined above. He has proposed several conditions to limit development and ensure the protection of local amenity all of which are acceptable to the Applicants.

The Applicants have owned and lived in The Old Rectory for the last 30 years. They love and respect the countryside, the setting of their property and the village of Meysey Hampton and they want to carry out some very limited development which is in keeping with the village. We hope they you will view the proposal in this same light and accept the Case Officer's recommendation that the application should be approved.

**END.**

JR/TF/13.11.18.