

*Parish Council's comments in respect of application
18/04977/FUL*

**COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING 13TH
MARCH 2019: SUBMISSIONS OF CIRENCESTER TOWN COUNCIL**

Item No 03: 18/04977/FUL - Demolition of the Old Memorial Hospital and the creation of 113 additional car parking spaces in total, and associated landscaping for a temporary period of 10 years at Old Memorial Hospital, Sheep Street, Cirencester.

Although Town Council planning committee members had no objection in principle to the demolition of the Old Memorial Hospital and the creation of 113 car parking spaces in total (of which only 36 are additional) and associated landscaping for a temporary period of 10 years the Town Council does, however, regret the loss of this historic building, the apparent disinterest in retaining it, or any mention of long term plans for the redevelopment of the site beyond the 10 year period. The Town Council does however take comfort from the Town Centre Master Planning work on which the District Council and the Town Council are jointly engaged under the Cirencester Futures initiative and notes that a marketing exercise aimed at developers will inform proposals for the future sympathetic redevelopment of the car park site that will be in keeping with the conservation area designation of this important town centre location. Nonetheless, the planning committee will want to be satisfied beyond reasonable doubt regarding the subjective assessment that the disbenefits of demolishing this unlisted heritage building of some architectural and historic significance, the impact of which will open up views to the Tesco supermarket building which has little or no architectural merit, will be outweighed by the limited public benefit to be gained from 36 additional car parking spaces which, taken by themselves, will fall well short of mitigating in any meaningful way the current and forecast pressures on car parking in the town centre.

Item No 05: 17/04141/FUL - Variation of conditions 2 and 5 of 15/3052/FUL to amend the approved landscaping scheme) at Stratton Court Village.

AND

Item No 06: 18/04095/COMPLY - Compliance with Condition 29 of Permission 15/03052/FUL (External Lighting) at Stratton Court Village.

Taking these applications together Town Council planning committee members had no objection to the variation of condition 2 and 5 of planning application 15/03052/FUL to amend the landscaping scheme and noted the actions to comply with the external lighting scheme. Nonetheless, the members were aware of a series of planning consent breaches, in relation to the two schemes under consideration and to the conditions of use related to the care home building, its restaurant and other residential accommodation, which had led to a Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) being issued by the Planning Authority in November 2018 and in warnings given to the applicant by Enforcement Officers in December 2018. The current variation and compliance applications are mostly to ratify retrospective changes carried out by the applicant in response to concerns raised by local residents, who it

is hoped will be satisfied with the changes they have obtained in response to a well organised highly orchestrated long-running campaign, to which the Town Council would add only that any work remaining to be completed should be closely overseen for compliance and possible enforcement action if there is any deviation from the agreed plans. The Town Council believes that an appropriate balance has been struck as between the legitimate concerns of neighbouring properties and the business needs of the applicant if Stratton Court is to function effectively as a care home retirement village.

Item No 07: 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.

Town Council planning committee members had no objection to the change of use from a public house to 3 2-bed flats and 3 1-bed flats, provided the frontage on to the street remained unchanged which it was understood will be the case. In coming to this decision members noted that the building as a public house was not viable and had been vacant for nearly a year with no on-site parking which would limit its ability to successfully operate as a licensed drinks premises and/or restaurant. Subsequently, a councillor queried the planning committee's response to the application to which the Chairman replied that members had given very careful consideration to the total lack of parking provision on site but had concluded on balance that those considering these apartments would either not need parking, preferring to walk, cycle or use public transport, or, if they did need parking, especially overnight when parking is free, use the nearby Beeches or Waterloo car parks. Others with cars might have other arrangements, e.g. renting a private garage or parking space, and, in addition, there was some, although limited, nearby on-street car parking provision. The members had noted too that the conversion to apartments of the former Baptist Chapel in Coxwell Street had not required parking provision for its consent noting its proximity to the town centre. Members also noted that whatever new use, or unchanged use, might be proposed for the Wagon and Horses this would almost certainly require some form of parking provision which may have been one of the reasons why its continued use and marketing as a public house had failed. Overall and in summary the chairman and members had concluded that the Wagon and Horses should not be designated as an asset of community value to continue as a public house and/or restaurant for which marketing attempts had failed, that the current change of use for conversion to dwellings retaining the historic frontage was justified despite the acknowledged limitations in parking.

**Councillor Stuart Tarr
Chairman of the Planning Committee
Cirencester Town Council
Thursday, 7th March 2019**

Supporter's comments in respect of application

18/02796/FUL

P J Charles Moray
Icomb Hill
Icomb
Cheltenham
Glos. GL54 1JB

Tel: +44 7795 482 224 / charles.moray@btinternet.com

11th March 2019

By email to:

Mr Robin Hughes, Chairman of Planning & Licensing Committee
robin.hughes@cotswold.gov.uk

Adrian Walker, Planning Officer Adrian.walker@cotswold.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

**Planning Committee 13th March 2019 – Agenda Item (9-4) Land at Hill View,
Icomb
Attendance and presentation in support of application 18/02796 – Single
Dwelling**

It is my intention, if my health issues permit, to attend and speak in full support of application reference 18/02796 for a new dwelling at Hill View, Icomb at the Planning & Licensing Committee meeting on 13th March 2019. I would be most grateful if you would notify the relevant officer further to the online procedural guidance of this intention.

If I am not able to attend (I will notify you if that is the case) I would be most grateful if you would read out this short letter on my behalf. This letter serves to qualify my earlier written support of a few months ago.

1. Effective Community Engagement

As a resident of our village for over eight years, I have been very impressed by the engagement of the applicants, Paul and Lisa Hadaway, with the community. This engagement has enabled a good understanding of the nature of their project and its detailed content.

I feel the applicants have made a considerable effort to address the issues raised by the village, such as:

- construction traffic and its access into and out of the site and its routing away from the village; and
- the siting of the dwelling and its impact on views from the public highway into the site. The chosen location for the dwelling in a fold in the land and set low on the hillside makes for an ideal location in terms of reducing any impact on the landscape.

I consider these matters have been satisfactorily addressed to the benefit of the local community.

2. Impacts on Neighbours

I am the most immediate neighbour to the application site here at Icomb Hill, as our property directly adjoins Hill View, Icomb. I am therefore the neighbour who is most likely to be affected by the proposal. I consider that the applicant's scheme is very well thought through in terms of mitigating impact on my amenities and those of any others.

3. Landscape Impact

I consider that the applicant's scheme has paid considerable attention to key issues such as landscaping and tree planting which will considerably enhance the character and appearance of the site and area in an AONB. Indeed, I have proposed to the applicants that they extend their intended planting of trees etc into our top field which shares a common hedge with the eastern boundary hedge of Hill View, the applicants' property.

4. Design

I have reviewed the extensive range of supporting documents for the application. I have read the supporting letter from the South West Design Review Panel. I can see that the applicants and their teams have gone to great length in seeking to create something very special and of exceptional quality. I consider that the community of Icomb will become very proud of the proposed house in its landscape when built.

5. Summary

In summary, I consider that the applicant's scheme presents an outstanding combination of well thought through landscaping, and careful attention to wildlife and the environment as well as presenting a truly outstanding architectural design.

I thank the Planning & Licensing Committee for this opportunity to present my support. I request that the committee supports this application for the reasons I have outlined.

Yours sincerely,

P J Charles Moray

*Objector's comments in respect of application
17/04141/FUL*

CDC Planning meeting Wednesday 13 March 2019

Speaking notes

17/04141 landscaping

Good morning. I am once again here to speak on behalf of residents of Albion Street and Stratton laurels, which border the Stratton Court development site. Sometimes it seems as though this application has been going on longer than Brexit ...

At the June 2018 meeting we highlighted the lack of mitigation of the overbearing built form, acknowledged as such in the minutes of the discussion of the 2017 retrospective consent.

The applicant has made some welcome adjustments to the landscaping plan and these are reflected in the proposal before you.

However, in my view, these amendments are minimal, and, as I stated in two sets of comments shown on page 99 of the Officers' report which is before you, it is an open question as to whether the proposed landscaping really provides the 'significant mitigation' that was directed by this committee at the meeting on 8th November 2017 in respect of consent to application 17/01689 when the retrospective consent was granted. At that meeting it was acknowledged that the built form had an overbearing effect on the adjacent properties in Albion Street and this required a strong degree of mitigation.

It is our contention that the few additional trees and minor adjustments to hard landscaping, while welcome in themselves, do not go anywhere near providing adequate mitigation of this overbearing, dominating development. Just look at this image – taken from the public realm in Albion Street - which demonstrates clearly the dominance of the built structure on the neighbourhood and the need for imaginative mitigation. Instead, as you can clearly see, we are faced with blank elevations of dull render staring out at us, mitigated by a poor group of spindly trees. The mature trees on the left are all we have left of what was an attractive and effective screen. To add insult to injury the lift overrun structure still remains unfinished.

In my view, the developer should have gone back after the November 2017 meeting and started with a clean sheet to create an imaginative, effective landscaping scheme. This means using tall, mature trees, shrubs and bushes to achieve screening and decorative effect. Stratton Court is supposed to be a luxury development: what is in place, and what is proposed, is a cheap scheme that does no justice either to the expectations of Stratton Court residents or to neighbours in Albion Street and Stratton Laurels.

Additionally there is the burning question of the long awaited works along the boundary with Stratton Laurels, which badly requires attention. This has dragged on for many months, to the detriment of residents whose boundaries adjoin Stratton Court. However what we have seen since then is a complete lack of action and broken promises.

So, may I put this straightforward question to you: looking at this image and the plans attached to the application, do you regard what is proposed as adequate mitigation? The Officers report says yes: we say no. It is an open question which you must decide. We are looking to you for support: we hope you feel able to give it by refusing to approve this flawed and inadequate scheme.

*Kanish Council's comments in respect of application
18/04095/COMPLY*

Residents of Stratton Laurels and Albion Street are opposed to the current level of lighting and that indicated on the applications drawings.

Our Six Key reasons are:

ONE - Current illumination levels are excessive in the extreme causing disturbance, light pollution, light intrusion, loss of amenity to Stratton residents.

TWO - Such high levels of illumination are completely unnecessary for a care home in the middle of a residential area

THREE - The lighting plan submitted does not comply with the requirements recorded in the June 2018 planning committee minutes.

- *'Members had significant concerns about the need for, and impact of, the wall-mounted lights; and its harm on neighbouring properties.*

However, the ground-level lighting was considered to be acceptable and justified from a safety perspective.

Refused, due to the intrusive nature of, and detrimental environmental impact in terms of light pollution caused by, the wall-mounted external lighting; and consequent negative impact on the amenity of neighbours and the area.

Record of Voting - for 13, against 0, abstentions 0, interest declared 1, absent 1.'

As there has been no discernible change in this 'new' application it too should be rejected on the same grounds

FOUR - .Stratton Laurels and Albion St Residents have had to endure these excessive lighting levels for 2 winters.

FIVE - The ground level lighting is excessive and we request that it is either activated by motion detectors OR significantly downrated. an example is Bollard light EX2 LED which has an extremely high level of illumination.

SIX - Exterior Lighting is turned on 24 hours a day - why?

Residents have submitted photographs from 4 homes which are close neighbours of the Aura Care home - including one of EX2 LED. All photographs were taken in Nov / Dec 2018 after this plan was submitted

Objector's comments in respect of application
18/04095/COMPLY

18/04095 Lighting

I would apologise for appearing before you twice in one morning: however what I have to say will illustrate why I am here.

Residents of Stratton Laurels and Albion Street are opposed to the current level of lighting and the proposed scheme shown on the drawings

Here are our key reasons:

1. Current illumination levels are excessive in the extreme causing disturbance, light pollution, light intrusion, and loss of amenity. This is evidenced by photos taken in November and December 2018, after this application was submitted, that have been included with residents' comments
2. These high levels of illumination are both inappropriate and completely unnecessary for a care home and retirement apartments. There is one particular installation of airfield landing-light strength that should be removed.
3. The lighting plan submitted does not comply with the requirements recorded in the June 2018 planning committee minutes.
 - *'The application was refused, due to the intrusive nature of, and detrimental environmental impact in terms of light pollution caused by, the wall-mounted external lighting; and consequent negative impact on the amenity of neighbours and the area.'*

Apart from the proposed timer mechanism, which affords some but not sufficient relief, there has been no discernible change in this 'new' application, therefore it too should be rejected on the same grounds. Some – but not all - wall-mounted uplighters appear to have been capped; but this capping can be removed at any time. These uplighters should be permanently removed

Neither the current or proposed schemes comply with Local Plan Policy 5 and the National Planning Policy Framework

which state:

- - Permission will NOT be given for development that:
 -causes ...unacceptable light levels
 - getting the design right at the planning stage is important
 - Light intrusion can impair sleeping ...etc,
 - Such intrusion can be completely avoided with careful design
 - The character of the area will affect what is considered as appropriate lighting

Our views are that -

- The current lighting levels result in unacceptable light intrusion sufficient to cause harm and loss of amenity to residents in their homes or gardens. This is not a carefully designed scheme.
- The current and proposed light installations are not designed to prevent or minimise light pollution.
- Further mitigating measures are required to make either scheme acceptable in such a residential area.

It is important to note that none of these statements were previously challenged.

The Officer's report includes this comment:

“The lighting selected is sympathetic and would have a limited level of light spill and glare.”

We just don't recognize this and certainly don't agree. It's simply not the case.

Once again, residents are asking this committee to support them by refusing this application. The applicant should go back and devise a lighting scheme using ground level, sensor-operated lighting that provides an appropriate level of lighting that is fit for purpose, and doesn't light up Stratton Court as though it was a shopping centre on an industrial estate.

Application for change of use, Waggon and Horses, Cirencester.

13th March 2019

I would like to make an objection to this application.

The Waggon and Horses, despite suggestions to the contrary, is in a good position in the town. It is more visible than the 12 Bells for example which continues to thrive.

Whilst not having car parking of its own there are two large car parks in the immediate vicinity and some on street across the road. The newly refurbished and recently award winning Barn Theatre and associated conference centre are also revitalising this area of Cirencester. There is a bar and restaurant connected but only offer one type of experience and not to everyone's taste. Therefore, an opportunity exists to exploit this potential.

The viability report points to the falling trade at the pub. What the author doesn't appreciate but has been put forward in all the letters of objection is that this was due entirely to this mismanagement of the last tenant. When he took the Waggon over he operated it very successfully with a very popular and busy Thai themed restaurant, he kept his beer well and it was a popular wet pub destination. However for various reasons he lost this enthusiasm and custom started to dwindle. By the last two years or so he had reduced his opening hours, closing at lunchtimes and by the end he was often closed during his advertised opening hours, before absenting himself completely. It is well known to anyone in hospitality or retail that if a customer makes the effort to go somewhere only to find it closed they will not return.

Looking at another pub, the Golden Farm on the Beeches, Cirencester demonstrates what can be done with enthusiasm and professionalism. A year ago this was on its deathbed – limited hours, no food offering, poor ale and attracting the wrong clientele. Now it is a thriving community focused pub with good food and beer, quizzes, pub teams and live music. Ei managed to find tenants capable of achieving this.

I feel that the viability report greatly underestimates the potential revenue for this pub. A turnover of £250 000 rooms and pub would be conservative and could provide a good living for an owner operator. A freeholder has a much greater choice of beer and at a better price than a Pub Co tenant. Also, recent figures released by Barclaycard and published in the Morning Advertiser show spending in pubs rose by 11% in 2018 compared to 2017 with general entertainment only 9% and clothing/ retail fell by 0.7%.

In conclusion, I believe at the right price the Waggon would make an attractive opportunity for someone. I would ask the committee to consider at what stage in Cirencester does closing a pub not constitute a marginal loss and what is the minimum number considered sufficient to offer the choice, accessibility and variety required. Cirencester is growing all the time so I suggest that more leisure facilities are needed not fewer and pubs are a vital part of these.

*Agent's comments in respect of application
18/04250/FUL*

18/04250/FUL - Waggon and Horses, 11 London Road, Cirencester

Planning Committee Speech - In support of the application

The Applicant has engaged proactively with the Council and to address the conservation officer's comments, one of the proposed flats has been removed to provide a large, attractive courtyard.

Statutory consultees raised no objections, including the Cirencester Town Council which stated it had no objection as long as the frontage onto the street remains unchanged, which is the case. Furthermore, Members noted the building as a pub is not viable.

The planning officer moved to approve the application under delegated powers, but two councillors have called the application to Committee, albeit at the time of writing, their reasoning is unknown.

The planning officer sets out in his Committee report that the proposal is acceptable and policy compliant in all regards. But rather than reiterate his conclusions, which the Applicant fully supports, I would like to use this time to respond to the concerns raised by objectors to the scheme, which solely focus on the loss of the pub.

The two key issues are: (1) viability, and (2) the contribution to the vitality and viability of the town centre.

A Viability Appraisal was prepared and concludes the use of the building as a pub is not viable.

An extensive marketing exercise was conducted by a reputable agent, specialising in licensed property from October 2017 - therefore in excess of 12 months. There were no offers for a public house, alternative community facility or commercial use.

This demonstrates such uses are not considered viable propositions at this location. This underlines a lack of demand, which must partly be considered in the context of wider changes to the pub market in the last decade and beyond, resulting in tough trading conditions. But also perhaps due to the prevalence of alternative, arguably better facilities, in more central, prime locations.

Indeed, there are 16 public houses within a half mile radius of the site [PAUSE] not to mention other premises in Cirencester that have licences to sell alcohol including restaurants, sports and social clubs.

Objectors comments in respect of application 18/04714/FUL

Dear Sir/Madam,

**PLANNING APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION TO CLEMATIS COTTAGE
(Ref: 18/04714/FUL)**

**In advance of the Planning Committee Meeting to be held on
13 Mar 2019 for the above application, I wish to submit the
following
comments.**

LOSS OF NATURAL LIGHT

**It is considered that the very close proximity of the proposed
extension coupled with its height (a 3 metre high brick wall with
a tall pitched roof) will deprive the kitchen and utility windows of
natural light.**

THE SITING OF CONSTRUCTION PILE No 2

**The drilling of an 8 metre deep hole for Pile 2 gives much cause
for concern. The proposed siting is just inside the boundary line and
would be within 20 cm of a foul water drain / inspection chamber
(see attached composite plan for details).**

**Furthermore there is a nearby brick retaining wall for our garden,
and the North facing wall of the house is only 2 metres from the
boundary. Any vibration caused by the drilling operation could result
in damage to our property.**

**Edward Needham
1, Keyts Acre
Ebrington**

This proposal represents an excellent opportunity to bring a vacant building back into positive use, where otherwise it would likely fall into disrepair.

Towns are subject to adaptation and change and should allow for a suitable mix of uses, including housing. Indeed, residential development plays an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres.

I respectfully ask members to approve the application, in line with their officer's recommendation.

Agent's comments in respect of application 18/04714/FUL

-
- **mm³ design**
- Dairy Farm - Hillesden - Buckinghamshire - MK18 4BX
- T: 01280 848 140 - M: 07789 867 561
- W: www.mm3-design.co.uk - E: studio@mm3-design.co.uk

06 March 2019

Reference: KR:309:6.01a

Clematis Cottage, Ebrington, Chipping Camden, Gloucestershire. GL55 6PD.
Committee Statement - **18/04714/FUL**

Rev - 06.03.19 Issued for Planning Committee Consideration

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Statement has been prepared by mm³ design ltd on behalf of Mr & Mrs Mathieson at Clematis Cottage, Ebrington, Chipping Camden, Gloucestershire. GL55 6PD.

The statement highlights various objections and comments that have been raised and where these are valid planning considerations we note that we have already provided concise evidence and justification as part of the submission.

It is noted that both the Councils Tree Officer, Planning Officer & Conservation Officer have supported the application and it is now before the Committee recommended for APPROVAL.

2.0 IMPACT ON TREES

The Councils Tree Officer has been extensively consulted on this application and has found no grounds for this application to be refused. The proposed extension can be demonstrably constructed without undue impact on the Copper Beech located on the site itself or the nearby Yew trees in adjoining gardens.

I would respectfully direct the Committee to the Councils own expert advice in this matter and further note that the necessary (Conditioned) method statements and mitigation will ensure that works proceed as stipulated.

3.0 SEVERE OVER-DEVELOPMENT/SHADING

The Parish Council have submitted that the submitted modest extension of 21m² (as described by the Councils Conservation Officer) constitutes severe over-development. To the contrary; the property will continue to benefit from parking, garden and amenity space following completion of the proposed extension and the additional footprint represents less than 10% of the total application site area.

The Parish' statement that the Beech Tree will render the remaining garden un-useable due to shading is misguided and inaccurate. The Beech Tree is positioned due East of the extension and any shading from the tree occurs in the early morning only. It is the significantly larger adjacent property of 1 Keytes Acres (positioned due South of Clematis Cottage) that casts shadow for the majority of the remainder of the day over Clematis Cottage and its garden.

4.0 SETTING OF A LISTED BUILDING

Clematis Cottage sits adjacent to a Listed Building and the proposed extension has therefore been properly considered in this respect and fully adheres to the Cotswold Design Code.

I would refer the Committee to your own Conservation Officer in this respect who has stated:

"The applicant has submitted revised plans for a single storey extension which would be of a modest scale and be built in matching materials to the host asset. The design code states that "extensions to existing buildings should be in scale and character with the parent building. Additions should not dominate the original building". The reduced scale of the extension would ensure that the host dwelling can still be read and therefore would have a limited impact on the character of the building. The use of high quality materials will ensure that the extension is of a high quality and is of a subservient nature in height, mass and area to the original dwelling therefore conforming to the Cotswold Design Code".

Objector's comments in respect of application 19/00038/COMPLY

13/03/19 CDC Planning Ref 19/00038/COMPLY 3min. public speech M Wreay Washpool Cottage GL560QN

'Good Morning'. We should not be sitting here. We are elderly and disabled. Piper Homes purchased the site with outline planning permission, and attached conditions. The private sewerage problems with the adjoining Plumtree Close have been well documented. Last month Piper Homes visited our home to discuss the odour and noise issues, emanating from the 'problem chamber' adjacent to the childrens playground. The odour issues have been ameliorated by the installation of a Permanent Treatment Unit. We can still suffer the rapid propulsive noise of raw effluent as the torrent surges through the 'Problem Chamber'. In the letter confirming our discussion Mr Parkin stated that the 'problem chamber' was "a Thames Water manhole and our options may be limited". This is erroneous. The chamber is Lime Cottage's connection. It was grossly enlarged in August 2012 by the Bromford Contractors, and is approximately 2.5 meters deep. It is this depth that can exacerbate the noise. By Law Thames Water cannot prevent any connection to the mains system, however it can take YEARS for Thames Water to negotiate and rectify any problems. The letter stated that PDAS Ltd would review the entire system, and

4.0 LOSS OF LIGHT/AMENITY TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES

The Parish Councils statement that the extension will give rise to loss of amenity to 1 Keytes Acre is incorrect and offers no scientific explanation or justification.

Clematis Cottage sits due North of 1 Keytes Acre, and the extension is proposed at a significantly lower height. Detailed sections and daylight calculations have been provided to demonstrate that there is no loss of amenity or daylight to 1 Keytes Acre as evidenced in the submission drawings.

5.0 OBJECTIONS DUE TO ACCESS, NOISE, CONSTRUCTION & INCONVENIENCE

We note that various objections have been made regarding limited access to the property, vehicles parking, construction noise and general inconvenience.

Whilst these are not planning considerations, the applicant is committed to ensuring that the construction process runs as smoothly and quickly as possible for both their own and the neighbours benefit.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed extension fully accords with Cotswold District Council Local Planning Policy & the NPPF. Accordingly, there are no substantive grounds for refusal of this application that has been carefully assessed, considered and recommended for approval by Cotswold District Council Officers.

We trust that the Planning Committee will determine this application in accordance with the Policies identified in the Cotswold District Local Plan.

provide us with a copy of the report. We are still waiting. Piper Homes intend to use the existing 4litres a second pumps. These are too small for adoption by Thames Water. Piper Homes have stated that PDAS together with an associated management company will maintain the systems. That is, the 9 Bromford dwellings and the 14 Piper homes will incur an extra cost. Should the residents default, who will be responsible to bear the costs should a problem occur? Prompt action is essential and therefore should be legally binding. Is it right that the value of our only home be devalued by the possible stench and repetitive noise of the development with an estimated population of 105 persons? We have written evidence of the past failures. Now is the time to correct these, to safeguard the future development of the village community. Professional Accountable Conduct is Paramount.