

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

14th November 2018

ADDITIONAL PAGES

ADDITIONAL PAGES - CIRCULATED TO MEMBERS BY POST

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

Additional Representations on Schedule Items

Pages 1 - 7

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

14th November 2018

ADDITIONAL PAGES ON AGENDA ITEMS

Item Ref. No Content

10 & 11	16/00127/ENF	Further information submitted from owner – Please see attached correspondence
---------------	--------------	---

ADDITIONAL PAGES ON SCHEDULE ITEMS

Item Ref. No Content

01	18/02207/REM	<p>Two further objections received -</p> <p>i) I have already commented back in July and feel moved to write again with the same points raised.</p> <p>We thought this was a development that was going to meet the needs of local people in terms of downsizing, thereby releasing larger houses, both social and privately owned housing stock existing in the village.</p> <p>This development does not cover this in any way, except for two bungalows which have been put into a corner with no direct access to the roadside which in itself is poor planning, and does not consider the needs of the people who are likely to live there.</p> <p>The village DOES NOT NEED any more 5 bedroomed properties.</p> <p>For instance, you look at plots 6 and 7 which look like they have tiny back gardens and a large space at the front with four bedrooms and double garages. Why not make these into dormer bungalows. One detached dormer and the other a semi-detached dormer bungalow perhaps. I am sure they could command the same market value between the three properties as two four bedrooms.</p>
----	--------------	---

If we are to have this development let it at least work for the village please, whilst appreciating that the developer needs to make money.

This is perhaps the one opportunity to get this right for everyone. Including the name of The Grange, change it to something like Pear Tree perhaps, but definitely not the Grange please which is too suburban, and how it is identified on the developers website.

- ii) The initial developer invited the 'Villagers' of Longborough, to attend a presentation which highlighted the proposed buildings. It was very well attended and many questions were asked. The original plans stated there would be a healthy and socially acceptable blend of bungalows, social housing and executive housing, with a play area designated for the children of the village, meeting the requirements of all parts of the community.

Seemingly, quite recently the plans have now changed, introducing far more executive houses, no bungalows and social houses which have been allocated very little outside space.

As a resident of Longborough, I feel it is safe to say that the residents do accept development and have embraced all newcomers into the village. However, I feel that removing the plans for the bungalows is a real oversight. It seems to me very unjust not to have addressed the needs of senior residents at all in the new plans.

Longborough has a high level of more senior residents, who are extremely active, work hard in the village community to support the bones of the village and help the local economy. I do think it is a complete oversight therefore not to include bungalows which may appear an attractive asset to someone who is looking to downsize from their family home.

Planning please reconsider these plans, be more inclusive before the only ones to benefit would be the developers.

On a final note I would question why when the original plans were shown at the Village Hall were so well attended, a similar event hasn't been arranged for the new plans, is it because they are hoping to slip them through unnoticed? If we allow this to happen when will the developers stop and

		then Longborough will lose its status as a quintessentially pretty Cotswold village.
03	18/02935/FUL	<p>Two additional objections has been received raising the following matters -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new house is being built on the adjacent plot, the area is in danger of being overdeveloped - Outside any settlement boundary - It is situated near a crossroads, near a corner, in a narrow lane with a limited view of oncoming traffic
04	18/03198/FUL	<p>1 further objection received -</p> <p>(i) the site is not appropriate for the creation of a new dwelling of this type;</p> <p>(ii) the proposal is not in keeping with the Cotswold domestic vernacular of the area and would sit uncomfortably in its surroundings.</p> <p>Paragraph 8 on page 89 of the Officer report should be disregarded as the planning statement submitted with the current application has not made reference to the General Permitted Development Order.</p>

ESTATE OFFICE
COLESBOURNE
CHELTENHAM
GL53 9NP

PLANNING STATEMENT – 5 November 2018

Little Colesbourne Farmhouse – New Wall

Further to my letter of 15 August 2018 I would like to add the following in the light of more recent correspondence with the Planning Department.

There have been two retrospective applications to reduce the height of the wall; the second one (17/00621) proposed to reduce the height still further but the Council refused this too. The reasons given were:

1. The height: but the reasons for refusal appeared to refer to the first application, not the second, in which the height was to be considerably reduced close to the original wall height.
2. The view: (presumably over the full height, not the amended height) would restrict views of the farmstead. In any event access to views is not a material consideration in planning terms and has been confirmed in many appeals and, therefore, this objection is out of order.

The Conservations Officer's letter of 3 October 2018 then referred to previous discussions which have never taken place and so on 3 October 2018 I asked to meet him to clarify the position and offered to call into Trinity Road on 10 or 12 October 2018 to clarify the position.

I received no reply until I had prompted him on 9 October 2018 when he advised that he was no longer able to discuss issues "outside the planning process". I had already paid for a "pre app" consultation for August 2017 which the Conservations Officer did not attend. However, the Planning Officer's response indicated that the wall, as erected "blocked the historic access" but you had already granted an alternative access to the farmhouse (17/02545/FUL).

As far as I understand it the only outstanding matter is the required demolition of the new wall and to reinstate it to the original position only a yard or two to the rear and to erect a pair of double doors to replace the original iron gate (sketch plan attached).

I question whether it is reasonable to move a top quality new wall by a couple of yards when it has been built at considerable expense to replace a wall that was largely fallen down.

I would be the first to admit that my son carried out the work in error for which my lawyers have apologised to the Council. Ever since then I have tried to resolve the matter with your Council but have found their response unhelpful or incomplete. The Parish Council have voted unanimously in favour of the new wall.

The old farmhouse has been very well restored, one old building shored up to prevent a fall and another undergoing stabilisation of a large split in the end wall. Within the resources available, it is now a house and garden to be lived in and enjoyed and I question whether a yard or two's difference in the position of the roadside wall is of material consideration in planning terms.

I have now paid for two planning application fees and one "pre-app" fee and had I had more meaningful responses from your Council this matter could have been solved a long time ago.





Whole wall
Reduce 4 No Courses
or finish "casket here"

Double timber doors
in approx position
of former gate.
8"x8" Posts all treated
Clear preservative



Remove wall
2.7m wide x
make good ends

Gateposts
8" x 8"

Play grass
verge to
imitate threshold

No Seal
Sketch only