

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE

13<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2019

Present:

Councillor RL Hughes - Chairman

Councillors -

SI Andrews  
AR Brassington  
Sue Coakley  
Alison Coggins  
PCB Coleman  
RW Dutton

David Fowles  
SG Hirst  
RC Hughes  
Mrs. SL Jepson  
MGE MacKenzie-Charrington  
Dilys Neill

Substitutes:

Jenny Forde

Maggie Heaven

Observers:

RG Keeling (from 9.30 a.m. until  
10.25 a.m.)

Apologies:

Juliet Layton

LR Wilkins

PL.109 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Member Declarations

Councillor Fowles declared an interest in respect of application 18/02796/FUL, as he was acquainted with the Objector as a friend and associate.

Councillor Fowles declared an interest in respect of applications 18/04977/FUL, 17/04141/FUL and 18/04095/COMPLY, as he was acquainted with the Town Council representative. He left the room during the discussion and debate of applications 17/04141/FUL and 18/04095/COMPLY.

Councillors Hirst, Coleman, MacKenzie-Charrington, RC Hughes and RL Hughes all declared an interest in respect of application 18/04977/FUL, as they all served alongside the Town Council representative on the Cirencester Programme Board.

Councillor Forde declared an interest in respect of application 18/04977/FUL, as she served on the Council's Parking Board who had considered the application.

(2) Officer Declarations

There were no declarations of interest from Officers.

PL.110 SUBSTITUTION ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor Heaven substituted for Councillor Wilkins.

Councillor Forde substituted for Councillor Layton.

PL.111 MINUTES

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2019 be approved as a correct record.**

**Record of Voting, for 10, against 0, abstentions 5, absent 0.**

PL.112 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements from the Chairman.

PL.113 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No Public Questions had been submitted.

PL.114 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been received from Members.

PL.115 PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

PL.116 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

It was noted that the details of the policies referred to in the compilation of the Schedule did not comprise a comprehensive list of the policies taken into account in the preparation of the reports.

The Planning and Development Manager drew attention to the general update provided in the first set of Additional Representations relating to progress with the Local Plan, and the fact that receipt of the Inspector's Final Report meant that the Plan, in its modified form, could now be afforded substantial weight in decision-making, both at Officer level and in the work of the Committee.

**RESOLVED that:**

**(a) where on this Schedule of Applications, development proposals in Conservation Areas and/or affecting Listed Buildings have been advertised - (in accordance with Section 73 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Regulations 1977) - but the period of the advertisement has not expired by the date of the Meeting then, if no further written representations raising new issues are received by the date of expiration of the advertisement,**

**those applications shall be determined in accordance with the views of the Committee;**

**(b) where on this Schedule of Applications, the consultation period in respect of any proposals has not expired by the date of the Meeting then, if no further written representations raising new issues are received by the date of expiration of the consultation period, those applications shall be determined in accordance with the views of the Committee;**

**(c) the applications in the Schedule be dealt with in accordance with the following resolutions:-**

**17/04151/FUL**

**Variation of Condition 1 of reserved matters permission 12/03810/REM dated 23/01/2013 to provide detailed plans and sections of open space provision and to provide amended plans for hard surfacing and planting at Land Parcel at Upper Rissington, GL54 2NP -**

The Case Officer informed the Committee that it had previously considered the overall scheme for the site at its Meeting in December 2018 and was now therefore solely considering the vehicle access to the allotments. The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and to the amended Officer recommendation for delegated authority to approve the application. The Case Officer displayed a map and aerial view of the site, the proposed vehicular access route and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

An Objector was then invited to address the Committee.

The Chairman then invited those Members who had attended a Sites Inspection Briefing at the site to express their views. Those Members commented that they supported the Officer recommendation of approval, given that the access road would look to follow the same route as an existing footpath and that there was a vehicle passing place already present. The Members added that the visit had been undertaken during the winter months when there was not so much growth and that it was also important to ensure that all residents could access the allotments and that there was suitable parking space for a small number of vehicles.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member thanked those Members who had attended the Sites Inspection Briefing at the site and commented that the distance of the proposed access road would be around 100 metres. He explained that, whilst he was not at the December 2018 Committee Meeting when the overall site was considered, he had expressed support for the Parish Council view as there were no options proposed at that stage. The Ward Member continued that a scheme had then been presented which designated five parking spaces, following which a further scheme had also been presented which took the access route from the north of the site and contained a large amount of cut and fill. The Ward Member informed the Committee that it was now considering Option 1, which had been slightly amended since first proposed; and he wished to thank the Case Officer for her work in relation to bringing this option forward. He commented that the option proposed by the Case Officer contained three parking spaces, and required the Committee to also consider the residents and biodiversity element. The Ward Member concluded that the allotments were

required to be created following a request by the Secretary of State and drew attention to a photograph of the site dated 2003 showing a vehicle access route. He added that the allotments needed to be accessible by all and that Option 1 proposed was the best option, given that Option 3 was not considered possible.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that there were 35 allotments expected at the site; residents could form access gates from their property to the open space and allotment site; Option 1 was the option that Members were required to consider as Officers had discounted two alternative options; in the view of the Council's Biodiversity Officer, the existing trees on the boundary of the open space and adjacent to the dwellings were important to the Lesser Horseshoe Bat but it was considered that vehicles using the access route would not cause the bats any disturbance; the route surface would be shared hoggin; a gate at the entrance to the site had been considered by Officers but as it would not be a locked gate to enable all residents of the village to access the site, it was not considered necessary; and that further changes could be made to the proposals as the application presented at this Meeting was a further change to the original permission being appropriately considered.

A Member commented that allotments were on the increase nationally and that the proposals presented were ones that should be celebrated. She added that those that would maintain an allotment were those that cared about their surroundings and that, therefore, the Officer recommendation of approval should be supported.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Another Member stated that when the site had previously been presented to the Committee, it had taken the view that the allotments should be accessible by vehicles and explained that the need of the application was to balance amenity and accessibility for the residents who would use the site. She added that she wished to commend the Case Officer for her work on the application and that the option presented was the best solution.

A different Member commented that it was important to recognise that the road would be primarily for walking and occasional driving, but that he was swayed by the concerns of the residents in regard to Option 1 not being the best option.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member explained that he supported the principle of vehicle access and considered it strange that, in 2019, allotments could be built without vehicle access being considered. He added that he considered it a shame that Option 3 was the least preferable but that he recognised that Option 1 was the only one available to the Committee. The Ward Member concluded that he considered the Council should seriously consider landscaping proposals and drew attention again to the photograph of the site from 2003, showing a double vehicle track through the field and added that a condition had been made clear to mitigate, via landscaping, the views of the roadway from the terraced houses.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 2, against 0.**

**18/01756/OUT****Erection of two detached dwellings at Land Parcel to the South of Windrush Edge, Marshmouth Lane, Bourton-on-the-Water -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and displayed a map and aerial view of the site, the development boundaries, illustrative street scene and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Chairman then invited those Members who had attended a Sites Inspection Briefing at the site to express their views. Those Members explained that the current site was an eyesore in the vicinity and as level ground was a good site to develop, in addition to being outside of the development boundary. The Members also added that the proposals were more suitable, with two properties on the site, as the three previously proposed, in their view, would have been too many.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that he had brought the application to the Committee as the site was outside of the development boundary and as the original application for three properties on the site had produced many objections from residents and the Parish Council. He added that it had been refreshing that the application had been revised to two houses, which in turn had produced no objections, and urged the Committee to support the Officer recommendation of approval.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that information regarding the Housing Delivery Test as mentioned in the report would be provided to Members after the Meeting; the site was a brownfield site; and the Parish Council and previous Objectors had made no comment on the amended scheme.

A Member commented that as the proposals were for a brownfield site and that there were no objections from local residents or the Parish Council, she supported the Officer recommendation of approval.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

The Lead Officer informed the Committee that the reason for the Case Officer's recommendation was that, although the starting point for considering the application was refusal, as the site lay outside of the village's development boundary, Officers had concluded the site to be an exceptional circumstance having regard to the Local Plan background. He added that, in most circumstances, a similarly located application would be unlikely to be supported, but the application itself delivered specific enhancements and was therefore, on balance, acceptable in this instance. Any further reduction of the enhancements would also be unlikely to be supported.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again but explained he had no further comments to make.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, against 0.**

**18/04977/FUL****Demolition of the Old Memorial Hospital, and the creation of additional car parking spaces to create 113 spaces in total, and associated landscaping for a temporary period of 10 years at Old Memorial Hospital, Sheep Street, Cirencester -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and displayed a map and aerial view of the site, the development boundaries, a virtual Google street view scene and photographs of the site from various vantage points. The Case Officer highlighted the need as explained in the Officer's report, for the Committee to afford great weight to the harm identified to the Conservation Area in considering the 'titled balance' with other material considerations and public benefits.

A representative from the Town Council and the Agent were then invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Officer then read out comments on behalf of the Ward Member. The Ward Member stated that, had the building been conserved and well looked after, it would have continued to provide a suitable space for the community; however this was not the case, and the building had been allowed to decay. The Ward Member drew reference to the view of Historic England who had strongly objected to the application due to the significance of the site and its surroundings; and the Council's Tree Officers' view that the application would have an impact on the mature and visually important trees on the site. The Ward Member continued that she strongly objected to any threat of damage to the air raid shelter and the surrounding properties at the site and that, whilst she understood the need to demolish the unsightly side and back of the building which had become an eyesore, she felt that a thoughtful restoration would enable the site to become an asset for the community and would prove a better use than, albeit required, car parking.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the building had been purchased by the Council in the 1990s as it was no longer required by the NHS and had been bought in poor condition with the intention of becoming part of a development, which had later fallen through; the proposals were considered by Officers to cause 'less than substantial harm'; the re-development of the site formed part of the Council's adopted Local Plan; retaining part of the building for lesser spaces would not be a viable option in the view of Officers; there was an option for the Council to take no action and to look for developers for the site, but in accordance with Local Plan policy, any redevelopment plans would not be supportable by the Council until a masterplan had been produced to mitigate the loss of parking spaces; the decked car parking development at the Waterloo Car Park in Cirencester 'unlocked' the Old Memorial Site for future development; the Committee should consider the fact that the proposals for the site had previously been considered by full Council who, whilst mindful of the heritage and social interest of the site, had agreed to move forward with the application as part of the parking strategy; Article 4 regarding non-demolition was not relevant in regard to the site as it was protected by being a non-designated heritage asset within the Conservation Area and, in addition, the Council owned the building; the building had historic interest and there were various arguments for which parts of the building could be retained; if the façade was to remain, a substantial building would be required to maintain this façade in place; the building was currently in

reasonably sound condition, but once any demolition had commenced, damage would be caused to parts of the building intended to be kept; the memorial element of the Hospital related to a staircase previously contained within the building, which had now been returned to the home town in Ireland of the soldier which it commemorated and the site was not an official war memorial site; the surrounding cottages to the Hospital were protected as listed buildings; there had been approaches by some developers regarding the site in more recent years, but these had not materialised; and the façade was an applied façade with timber work and, in the view of Officers, as soon as it was tampered with, it was likely to be damaged.

A Member commented that given the view of Officers and the fact the façade was unable to be protected, he supported the Officer recommendation of approval.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Another Member explained that the application had been discussed at great length over a long period of time by various groups and was a strategic site located in the middle of Cirencester. He added that there was a need to look to the future and, as the building did not have any architectural merit, the site might also be considered at some point for a temporary decked car park at the site which could enable up to 136 desperately needed parking spaces being provided.

Various Members expressed their support for the Officer recommendation and commented that every single opportunity for the site had been explored. Those Members drew attention to the return of the historic staircase to the original family in Ireland and that the proposals would enable the air raid shelter on the site to be enhanced and more visible (it being currently hidden behind an unattractive building).

**Approved, as recommended, subject to Secretary of State consultation.**

**Record of Voting - for 8, against 7, abstentions 0, against 0.**

**18/02796/FUL**

**New dwelling at Land at Hill View, Church Road, Icomb -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to models the Applicant had brought to the Meeting. The Case Officer displayed a map and aerial photograph of the site, proposed site plans, floor plans and elevations and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

An Objector and the Applicant were then invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Officer then read out comments on behalf of the Ward Member. The Ward Member had stated that he considered the Applicant should be commended for the effort he had taken to communicate his aspirations to the local community and to absorb the comments of those concerned. The Ward Member explained that the proposals related to the construction of a new dwelling in the open countryside outside the village located within the AONB. He added that the application had been the subject of a Sites Inspection Briefing and had attracted both adverse comments and support from village residents. The Ward Member concluded that there were complex matters of

design and effect to be considered both now and in the future and that he deferred to the expert opinion of Officers.

The Chairman then invited those Members who had attended a Sites Inspection Briefing at the site to express their views. Those Members explained that the height of the proposed buildings would be lower than the hedge line and were of a credible design, but were proposed for a very rural location with impressive views. Those Members also questioned why the Applicant had chosen to locate the buildings at the top of the hill when a more suitable location nearer the road, with still impressive views, could have been proposed.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that a lift within the property was contained within the proposals; no comments had been received from the Parish Council; in the view of Officers, the establishment of the woodland would take between 15 and 20 years to mature; the bringing-in of mature trees to the site could not be conditioned as larger trees would not establish as well as young, newly-planted trees; in the view of Officers, the design was not considered truly innovative owing to the heavy linear and concrete elements and lack of use of natural stone and materials which related to the location; and the Council's Landscape Officer considered that the proposals would create a moderate adverse effect on the dark skies. Officers also commented that design should not always be considered subjective, particularly if harm could be demonstrated.

A Member commented that the site for the proposals was well screened and, as the Committee had viewed the site in winter, explained that the site would also not be not seen in the spring and summer. The Member also drew attention to the letter of support from the owners of the adjacent property and explained that he considered the proposals to be 'rather interesting'.

Another Member explained that she did not support the application as, if the building was of exceptional design, she questioned why it should be 'hidden away' on a hillside. The Member also explained that the application should be considered at the alternative, more sensible, location on the site and drew attention to the objections and to those that had made representations at the Meeting. She also concluded that light pollution was a concern with the development and that the site was a large greenfield site with no surrounding buildings.

A Proposition, that the application be refused, was duly Seconded.

Various Members expressed their support for the Proposition and argued that once the building had been granted permission, it would be built, despite in some respects it resembling a good example of contemporary architecture.

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 10, against 5, abstentions 0, against 0.**

**17/04141/FUL**

**Redevelopment to provide the erection of a 64 bed care home, 8 care suites, 34 assisted living units, ancillary accommodation and associated works (Variation of conditions 2 and 5 of 15/3052/FUL to amend the approved landscaping scheme) at Stratton Place, 42 Gloucester Road, Stratton, Cirencester -**



The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and that the application had previously been presented at the June 2018 Committee Meeting. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, landscaping scheme and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

A representative from the Town Council and an Objector were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that credit was due to residents and those adjoining Stratton Place who had dealt with various issues raised by the development with great patience. The Ward Member explained that the root of the problem was that the drainage scheme had involved foul water access where a tree had previously been proposed and that he hoped the Committee agreed that the comments made by the Objector were persuasive. The Ward Member concluded by thanking the Town Council for their work in relation to the issues and made reference to page 115 of the circulated papers explaining that this demonstrated what the residents had favoured and questioned whether what was contained on page 114 was an improvement on what had been originally requested.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the suggested amendments identified by the residents' group to the developers did include the main elements, but that any form of landscaping would not screen the building and existed only to soften the views; the majority of the planting at the site was largely complete and consisted of mostly deciduous trees; planting against the building could not be enforced as, aside from causing potential maintenance problems, Officers did not consider the building to be harmful; and the planting season was considered to run from November through to March.

A Member commented that the development was very different to what had originally been proposed and whilst she had great sympathy with the residents and the Ward Member, explained that the Committee had worked hard to achieve what had been outlined on page 115 of the report; and that this had also been what the residents had originally requested. She added that Officers had also worked hard to achieve the residents' request and that she now considered that the response from the residents was emotional, given they were still not satisfied with the outcome.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. The Ward Member explained that the Council should learn from this development that it could not always trust developers and explained that he was not content that everything requested had been achieved. He added that the Committee should be mindful that, if minded to approve the application, the Developer would be required to install a fence along the whole length of Stratton Laurels and that there was a chance this would not start for another 11 months until the end of the next planting season. In conclusion, the Ward Member urged the Committee to refuse the application to enable the Committee to be presented with more suitable alternatives.

In response to a specific Member question, the Case Officer informed the Committee that the installation of the fencing could be undertaken within approximately three to six months.

The Proposer then commented that she wished to amend the original proposal to support the installation of the fence within three months of any permission being granted and that the planting be concluded by no later than the end of the next planting season in March 2020. This was agreed to by the Seconder and accordingly it was, resolved that the application be

**Approved, as recommended, subject to the installation of the fence being completed within three months of any permission being granted and the planting being concluded by no later than the end of the next planting season in March 2020.**

**Record of Voting - for 8, against 2, abstentions 4, interest declared 1, against 0.**

**18/04095/COMPLY**

**Compliance with Condition 29 (external lighting) of Permission 15/03052/FUL - Redevelopment to provide the erection of a 64 bed care home, 8 care suites, 34 assisted living units, ancillary accommodation and associated works at Stratton Court Village, Stratton Place, Stratton, Cirencester -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee that this application represented the second application following the Committee's refusal of the original application at its Meeting in June 2018 and that the application was linked to the previous Schedule item. He also displayed photographs of the site from various vantage points.

An Objector was then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member commented that, in his view, the lighting at the site was more akin to that expected at a hotel and that the residents of Stratton Court would be unlikely to require permanent external lighting throughout the night. He added that the standard requirement would now be for motion-censored lighting which would also help to reduce the number of lights at the site and that the level of street lighting around the site also provided a decent level of light to warrant a change in the current situation.

Various Members commented that the level of lighting at the site was unnecessarily high and drew attention to the potential impacts of high levels of artificial light on both residents and wildlife. Those Members also stated that they agreed with the curfew as, whilst in summer the issue of lighting was lesser, darker winter periods required some form of lighting from around 4 p.m.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

Other Members commented that there had been no comments submitted by the residents of Stratton Court and that the age and lifestyle of the residents may necessitate this type of lighting.

A Further Proposition, that the curfew be amended for the times of 9 p.m. to 6 a.m. was Proposed, but not Seconded.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again and explained that the Applicant had requested the times of 8 p.m. to 7 a.m. and that the

Committee should respect the fact that the Applicant would be most aware of the times when lighting was, and was not, needed at the site.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 7, against 6, abstentions 1, interest declared 1, against 0.**

**18/04250/FUL**

**Change of use from public house to 4 x 2-bed flats and 1 x 1-bed flats and associated demolitions and alterations at The Waggon And Horses, London Road, Cirencester -**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals. The Case Officer displayed an aerial photograph of the site, proposed site and block plans, floor plans and elevations and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

A representative from the Town Council, an Objector and the Agent were then invited to address the Committee.

A Member, who was not the Ward Member and served on the Committee, and who had referred the application, was then invited to address the Committee. The Member apologised to the Committee for his delay in submitting a reason for referring the application to the Committee but explained that this reason was now contained within the Additional Representations for the Meeting. The Member informed the Committee that he considered there was a large level of activity regarding loss of pubs within Cirencester and that the Committee should be mindful of Local Plan Policy 25 when making a decision on this application. He added that a significant level of investment had been made into Cirencester town centre and that a previous unsuccessful tenant of the public house should not mean that an asset of the town should be lost to housing development.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that a report had been submitted which did outline that the property had been marketed as a public house for 12 months, but that, in any event, a viability assessment was not required as the property was outside the town's Primary and Secondary Frontage boundaries and was within a principal settlement; it was reported that Policy 25 was out-of-date and had been superseded by the new Local Plan policies; no part of the original building would be demolished; and it was estimated that around 500 properties had been built in the surrounding vicinity over the last 10 to 15 years.

A Member commented that if the application was approved, the building would never return to being a public house and therefore the application should be refused owing to the loss of vitality and the fact the area of the town had been re-emerging both socially and economically.

A Proposition, that the application be refused, was duly Seconded.

Another Member thanked the Member for bringing the application to the Committee and commented that if no person came forward to run the public house as a business and the Council did not permit any development, the building could fall into disrepair. She also commented that businesses depended on a high level of surrounding housing to thrive and, as there were

16 other public houses within half a mile, it could face difficulties in succeeding. The Member concluded that the Agent had explained in her representation that all marketing options had been exhausted and that the Committee should therefore take this as correct and should not aim to encourage the spreading of the town centre, as there was a risk of diluting its success.

The Member who had referred the application to the Committee was invited to address the Committee again. The Member explained that he would suggest the reason for refusal was that the application was contrary to Policy 25 of the Council's Local Plan and drew attention to the fact that, if approved, the building would not contribute in any way to social housing.

**Refused, contrary to the Officer recommendation, for reasons relating to the loss of a facility which was beneficial to the emerging character of the area of Cirencester.**

**Record of Voting - for 8, against 6, abstentions 1, against 0.**

PL.117 DURATION OF MEETING

Attention was drawn to Council Procedure Rule 9, and a vote was taken as to whether the Meeting should continue.

**RESOLVED that the Meeting be continued.**

**Record of Voting - for 11, against 3, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

PL.118 SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS (CONTINUED)

**RESOLVED that the remaining applications be dealt with in accordance with Minute PL.117 above.**

**18/04714/FUL**

**Single storey rear extension and reconfiguration of entrance steps at Clematis Cottage, Keynes Acre, Ebrington, Chipping Campden -**

The Case Officer advised the Committee that the Agent was unable to attend the Meeting and that her prepared speech was contained within the Additional Representations. The Case Officer then reminded the Committee of the location of this site and outlined the proposals. The Case Officer displayed a map and aerial photograph of the site, proposed floor plans, front, rear and side elevations, sunlight assessment, tree survey and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

A representative from the Parish Council and an Objector were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. The Ward Member explained that she had referred the item to the Committee owing to the strong objections from residents and the Parish Council to the application proposals. The Ward Member explained that the site was curtilage listed and was adjacent to another building. The Ward Member also drew attention to the fact that the site was located within a conservation area and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which the Council was tasked with preserving. The Ward Member concluded that in her view, the

application represented over-development and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and urged the Committee, if in any doubt, to undertake a Sites Inspection Briefing.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that a historic application for a two-storey extension at the site had been refused due to the over-bearing nature and impact on the listed building; there was provision for one parking space at the property; if the application was approved by the Committee, the Applicant would be required and requested to submit a Listed Building Consent application for any works to be undertaken to the property; concerns regarding a drilling hole were a civil, not planning, matter and therefore something this Council could not be responsible for; and the height of three metres for the proposed extension was considered proportionate to the property given the property's former historic use as a dairy.

A Proposition, that the application be deferred to enable a Sites Inspection Briefing to be undertaken, was duly Seconded.

A Member commented that there had been strong objections presented by residents and the Parish Council, and that a Sites Inspection Briefing would enable the Committee to better understand those concerns.

**Deferred, to enable a Sites Inspection Briefing to be undertaken.**

**Record of Voting - for 10, against 4, abstentions 1, absent 0.**

**19/00038/COMPLY**

**Compliance with Conditions 5 (surface water drainage), 6 (SUDS), 7 (exceedance flows), 8 (foul drainage), 13 (access) and 14 (pathway) of Permission 17/00321/OUT - Development of up to 14 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and other associated works (Outline application) on Land At Plum Orchard, Moreton Road, Longborough -**

The Case Officer drew attention to the extra representations received since publication of the Schedule of Planning Applications and explained that both the Parish Council and another Objector had now withdrawn their objections. The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of the site and displayed a map and photographs of the site.

An Objector was then invited to address the Committee.

The Committee Officer then read out comments on behalf of the Ward Member. The Ward Member had stated that he had been persuaded by the Developers that the foul drainage system as proposed would be effective in banishing the odour problem that had blighted a part of the village of Longborough for over three years. The Ward Member explained that the issue arose from the fact that the established setting of Plum Tree Close had been producing too little sewage and therefore the new development of houses, when occupied, would combine with the existing to produce a greater volume of sewage which would keep moving through the system and thus prevent any smell arising. He added that neither Thames Water nor Bromford had taken any responsibility for addressing the issue over the last three years and that Bromford would now be managing the 'combined' system in the future. The Ward Member informed the Committee that the existing output created disturbance to residents but that the Developers had again informed him that engineering skill would be put into

practice to help address this. The Ward Member concluded that the past poor record of Bromford in management and communication did little to provide reassurance to residents and that he hoped the Committee would approve the application only with rigorous conditions applied.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that Thames Water were responsible if there was an issue with any sewerage connections; Environmental Health Officers had undertaken a visit to assess the site and had not recorded any noise concerns; the Case Officer would write to Thames Water, copying in the Ward Member, explaining the concerns the Committee had raised; and that Members could, if they chose, place pressure on Thames Water as the issue related to issues facing residents of the District.

A Member commented that he considered there to be no reason why the Council could not place pressure on the relevant authorities because there was no breach in law to enable other action.

Another Member commented that the Developers had undertaken the work requested of them by the Council and that she considered they should be commended for this; and added that, by approving the application, the Council would be seen to be taking action in regards to the issues facing the residents concerned.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, was duly Seconded.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 15, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.**

Notes:

(i) Additional Representations

Lists setting out details of additional representations received since the Schedule of planning applications had been prepared were considered in conjunction with the related planning applications.

(ii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

17/04151/FUL	)	Mr. D Torris (Objector)
18/04977/FUL	)	Cllr. S Tarr (on behalf of the
	)	Town Council)
	)	Mr. H Mellor (Agent)
18/02796/FUL	)	Mr. T Lawson (Objector)
	)	Mr. C Moray (Supporter)
	)	Mr. S Whale (Applicant)
17/04141/FUL	)	Cllr. S Tarr (on behalf of the
	)	Town Council)
	)	Mr. C Forbes (Objector)
18/04095/COMPLY	)	Mr. C Forbes (Objector)

18/04250/FUL	)	Cllr. S Tarr (on behalf of the
	)	Town Council)
	)	Mr. J Brown (Objector)
	)	Ms. A Eatough (Agent)
18/04714/FUL	)	Cllr. H Elson (on behalf of the
	)	Parish Council)
	)	Mr. Needham (Objector)
19/00038/COMPLY	)	Mrs. M Wreay (Objector)

Copies of the representations by the public speakers would be made available on the Council's Website in those instances where copies had been made available to the Council.

PL.119 SITES INSPECTION BRIEFINGS

1. Members for 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2019

It was noted that Councillors Alison Coggins, PCB Coleman, SG Hirst (substituting for Sue Coakley), LR Wilkins and RL Hughes would represent the Committee at the Sites Inspection Briefing on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2019.

2. Advance Sites Inspection Briefings

18/04983/FUL - Erection of a single dwelling and associated works at Land West of Brans Cottage, Brans Lane, Upper Oddington; in order for Members to be able to assess the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of Oddington Conservation Area and the Cotswolds AONB.

PL.120 LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEES

1. Members for 20<sup>th</sup> March 2019

It was noted that Councillors Alison Coggins, Dilys Neill, RC Hughes and RL Hughes would now represent the Committee at the Licensing Sub-Committee Meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2019; the Meeting having been postponed from 20<sup>th</sup> March 2019 owing to further investigation needing to be undertaken by Licensing Officers.

2. Advance Licensing Sub-Committees

No advance Licensing Sub-Committee meetings had been notified, other than the postponed Meeting from 20<sup>th</sup> March 2019.

PL.121 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

The Meeting commenced at 9.30 a.m., adjourned between 11.10 a.m. and 11.20 a.m., and again between 1.55 p.m. and 2.20 p.m., and closed at 3.10 p.m.

Chairman

(END)