

Supporter's comments in respect of application 18/04983/FUL

Speech on behalf of support for Planning Application 18/04983/FUL

I have been asked to speak on behalf of the supporters of this proposal; The proposed site shows this application sits within a generous plot of land. It provides a good sized garden commensurate with the size and nature of the proposed dwelling, as required by Local Policy Plan EN2 (the Cotswold Design Code). We feel its design will not give rise to loss of amenity in regard to privacy, overlooking or overshadowing.

The site is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (ANOB) but with the proposed well thought out lighting and landscaping this plot of land can be enhanced without damaging wildlife that may already present and in fact may well encourage more.

There is already precedent set for modern building design and materials within Upper Oddington, all of which have been approved and were not considered by the Planning Committee to cause any visual harm to the ANOB, this proposed development is no different.

The dwelling will not be visible from the village roads, and hardly visible from the main A436. The site could reasonably be classed as "in-fill" as it sits between the houses in Brans Lane and those in the more recent development known as Embrook.

We are pleased that the planners recognise that this site is suitable for a well-designed small scale family home. We are also pleased to see well planned landscaping to this currently unmanaged site.

We do understand the immediate neighbouring residents personal concerns about loss of views, but this aspect as far as planning permission is concerned does not have any regulatory interpretation or legislation.

In the supporters opinion there are no reasonable objectionable causes for this application to be refused, as such feel this proposal should be permitted.

Parish Council comments in respect of application
18/04770/FUL

Objection to Application Ref: 18/04770/FUL – Demolition of agricultural buildings & construction of two new dwellings at Grain Dryer & Storage Barns, Back Lane, Ampney Crucis, GL7 5TE. Cllr Neil Holt, Ampney Crucis Parish Council

Good morning.

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** to this application for the following reasons:

The applicant and CDC have both clearly accepted that this application is a departure from the existing Development Plan.

As a consequence, CDC permission would require very exceptional circumstances.

Policy DS4 prohibits new build open market housing outside Principal and Non-Principal Settlements, unless it accords with other policies that expressly deal with new housing in such locations.

The Case Officer has not referred to any of those policies in his Report. The applicant has also confirmed that his proposals don't qualify for any of the exceptions listed in DS4 or Para 79 of the NPPF.

The Officer has confirmed that the site is in open countryside. Therefore, Policy DS3 is NOT relevant as it only applies to development IN Non-Principal Settlements.

If DS3 did apply, the application would FAIL to meet at least two of the four required specific conditions.

It does not demonstrably support or enhance the vitality of our community. The school is fully subscribed, the hotel on the A417 is thriving and there is no shop.

It is at the far end of a very narrow, single track lane, some distance from the edge of the village and as such, it is counter to the existing character and layout of the village and does not enhance sustainable patterns of development.

This proposal does not create a cumulative traffic impact for the village because of the existing Class Q permission to convert the agricultural buildings.

HOWEVER, that permission was given without specific review by County Highways, despite repeated appeals from the Parish Council and residents.

This application is still directly against CDC's own policies.

The Officer's argument in favour of permitting this application centres upon the existence of the Class Q permission to convert being a "fallback" position, which may be used to support any appeal.

The Applicant has permission to convert and may do that.

Instead, he wants to demolish his redundant agricultural buildings and build new houses in their place. The proposed reduction of houses from 3 with a total of 10 bedrooms, to two with a total of 9 bedrooms and potential for a tenth is irrelevant.

The case has been made that the old buildings are unsightly. They are what they are – agricultural buildings set in an agricultural landscape. Conversion as originally permitted would allow reuse of redundant buildings while retaining the agricultural character of Back Lane.

Permitting this application will send a clear message to developers across the District that use of existing Class Q rules is a short cut to getting CDC permission for new build housing in the countryside.

The Parish Council asks you to **REFUSE** this application.

FINAL – 450 Words 2 mins 50 seconds

Objector's comments in respect of application 18/04770/FUL

Objection to Application Ref: 18/04770/FUL – Demolition of agricultural buildings & construction of two new dwellings at Grain Dryer & Storage Barns, Back Lane, Ampney Crucis, GL7 5TE. Mrs Rosanna Armitage, speaking on behalf of village objectors

Good morning.

I am speaking on behalf of residents from across Ampney Crucis who have written to CDC OBJECTING to this application.

As of this morning, there were **32** Objection Comments registered on CDC's Planning Portal.

I will summarise the most common concerns as follows:

The impact of **increased traffic on the Village Street and its approach lanes** will be considerable, not least because they are all either so narrow as to be mainly single track, or have become so as a result of parked cars and vans, especially during the working day.

This does not allow for the impact of two, previously agreed but as yet unbuilt, three-bedroomed houses and the cottage nearing restoration, all at the village end of Back Lane.

There would be little change in traffic resulting from approval of this application compared to completion of the permitted conversion.

However, that ignores earlier and repeated concerns of villagers about the localised and wider traffic impact of any building conversions or new buildings along Back Lane.

Back Lane is very narrow and single track with only one viable entrance or exit.

That exit is blind for exiting traffic, as well as for traffic entering and exiting the Village Street at The Pound, much of which regularly exceeds 30mph. There have already been several near misses.

Back Lane is already well used by commercial traffic accessing the industrial units to the south, as well as the highly variable traffic flows to and from the Crucis Park Estate.

The proposed provision of just one passing place is wholly inadequate and it is inevitable that there will be further erosion of grass verges along its length.

The proposed Package Treatment Plant to handle **sewage** from the site has no identified discharge path. As there are no viable watercourses and with the adjacent fields being prone to flooding, this is a significant local environmental concern.

The field adjacent to the site regularly floods in autumn and winter and there are longstanding drainage problems on the site. Even so, there has apparently been no **drainage study** undertaken.

Large quantities of **asbestos** are believed to exist in the old agricultural buildings.

Nearby residents are understandably concerned about asbestos dust during the demolition stages, but residents along the Village Street are also concerned about such materials being carried away, through the village.

If the Committee is minded to approve this application, we strongly request conditions be placed upon appropriate management and movement of any demolition waste, including requirements to take it away using Batch Lane, a largely unmade track to the west of the site, or through the applicant's own surfaced estate road.

Finally, residents remain very concerned that their objections appear to have been largely ignored throughout this and earlier applications and believe this reflects badly on the Planning Authority.

On behalf of village residents, I ask you to **REFUSE** this application.

DRAFT FINAL v.2: 479 Words 2 mins 50 secs

Sue Bradbury Speech to Planning Committee 10th April 2019

Bliss Cottage, Lower Chedworth. GL54 4AN

Supporter's comments in respect of application 18/04188/FUL.

I would like to give my support to this application giving these three reasons.

1. As the closest neighbour to the property and therefore the most affected by it. I believe the application enhances the area and blends harmoniously into the landscape. Historically there was a double storey barn on site and the proposed extension would be on its footprint. The applicants would also be restoring the original Cottage from its unattractive extension of some 20 years ago. I have lived nextdoor to the applicants for almost 30 years. The site is already much improved from the west side after the very large conifers were removed to allow a driveway for off road parking.

2. Two years ago we extended our home Keen's Cottage which we had lived in for 26 years at that point. We added at the suggestion of our very helpful Conservation Officer an oak and glass single storey building, as well as setting it into the gradient of the land and again was on a footprint of where a building once stood. Apart from the Cotswold stone roof, it cannot be seen from the road and because of landscaping there is very little light pollution. The applicants therefore have applied for a similar style link and a gable end facing North to enjoy the views over the valley. The extension would be in the hillside at that point and would give little light pollution due to the trees planted in the garden below and the others in the valley. I took a photo from the other other side of the valley to prove this. The fact that four comments of support come from residents facing the north outlook would suggest this wouldn't be a concern. We on the other hand face skyline development of a very large house which was permitted six years ago but don't object to seeing that or it's lights there, as it is nice to see a bit of life going on.

3. I am a professional Landscape Gardener and the applicants have already planted an evergreen prunus hedge where the proposed extension is planned and beyond this to the west a native hedge and trees have been planted for further screening. Slit windows have been suggested for the west side of extension too to reduce light pollution. I am certain that the rest of the site would be suitably designed to not only act as screening but to give the applicants privacy. So like ours will blend in and hardly be seen.

The applicants have put huge effort to get these plans just right in order to be able to future proof their home and spend another 30 years in Chedworth. They have the support of Parish Council and many neighbours and I would strongly urge the committee to permit their application.

Sue Bradbury

Keens Cottage, Lower Chedworth, Cheltenham. Gloucestershire.

Applicant's comments in respect of application 18/04188/FUL

Ceri Powell Speech to Planning Committee: 10th April 2019 – Application 18/04188/FUL

Thank you for allowing me, the applicant, to speak before you.

My husband and I have had a home in Chedworth for 29 years and intend to see out our days in our beautiful village, enabled by a home suitable for modern living whilst restoring and enhancing the historical beauty of Bliss Cottage. In consultation with the local community, we have developed our plans and have formal support from 5 close neighbours, and Chedworth Parish Council. The benefits as we see them are:

- By removal of the existing double-storey obtrusive 1980's extension & conservatory, we intend to allow the Old Bliss aesthetic to-remerge, including keeping the road frontage intact and using traditional materials replacing, for example, the current non-traditional roof slates.
- Making use of the sloping residential curtilage to "nestle" a new extension further down into the landscape, connected by a short link to old Bliss, deliberately separating old and new in a sympathetic way, as has been used in Chedworth a number of times.
- Insulating new and old buildings to the highest standards, making it far more energy efficient, and using renewable energy instead of oil-fired heating.
- Designing a Life Long Living 3-bedroom family home in line with policy EN2 on residential amenity. There are not enough of these properties in Chedworth and we, and Parish Councillors, believe this enhances the village demographic.

To counter points made on harm:

- That the slab level to ridge height of the extension is greater than of Old Bliss and that the extension will impact the open landscape of the valley.
To the contrary, the ACTUAL ridge height of the proposed extension is below Old Bliss ridge and will be subservient to the mass of adjacent Keens/Cobblers and does not impede views. I refer to Page 4 of the LPC letter in your papers. In fact, removal of the existing extension at Bliss would reveal a new view across the valley to Pancake Hill from the public highway.
- The Planning Report assumes, in section 9, that we do not need to repair existing Bliss, suggesting the cottage is suitable for "modern living". This is incorrect. The cottage has not been renovated for the last 30 years and the previous elderly residents of Bliss were forced to move 3 years ago as the emergency services could not, due to current Health & Safety regulations, evacuate them down the twisting steep staircase.
- We have the opportunity to design a suitable home for Life-Long Living My husband's mother died of Motor Neuron Disease, spending her last years wheel-chair bound. It is hereditary. Hence the desire to have a future-proof home IF the worst happens.

We are long-term residents of Chedworth who care deeply about our village. We believe emphatically that our proposed extension will preserve and in fact enhance Bliss Cottage and the surroundings, and are pleased that those who will live in closest proximity are supportive of our plans.

Thank you.



Planning Committee

10th April 2019

18/04737/FUL 18/04738/LBC 8 Wraggs Row

I have been asked by the applicant, Mr Barnard, to speak on his behalf as his heritage consultant, setting out the background to this proposal and the heritage led approach to deliver necessary improvements to the cottage, whilst sustaining the building's special interest.

Your officer's report sets out the policy framework that guides decision makers, though it should be noted the emphasis is on managing change rather than preventing it. There is a reason for this and Historic England explains that because most historic buildings are in private ownership to secure their long term use and maintenance there needs to be some benefit to the building owner to justify investment.

Seeking ways to secure this investment, whilst sustaining what makes a historic building special requires a balanced and informed approach and the applicant has sought advice from your officers to help in delivering the right solution. However, following the earlier grant of permission for a small extension and other alterations, it became clear to the applicant that implementing that proposal would entail significant investment in repairs and renovation, but without much improvement in the level of the accommodation, hence this proposal.

This is not to ignore your officer's advice, but it is about finding the right balance to deliver on the government's objective to sustain the historic environment whilst seeking to meet the owner's needs. It relies on an understanding of the building's special interest and how it would be affected by the proposed development, which I come onto now.



8 Wraggs Row is listed for its group value – the historic building is experienced as part of a group that faces onto a small green, contributing to the qualities of this approach into Stow in the Wold. The buildings are more formal to the front than the rear, which possesses a vernacular and functional quality about it with a variety of rear single and two storey extensions.

8 Wraggs Row has suffered from a lack of maintenance and repairs by previous owners and has also been altered internally and externally. This is as one might expect for most vernacular historic buildings, their adaptation and repurposing over time, changing the way buildings look and changing how they are experienced.

The existing rear lean-to extension is a later addition, but also has been subsequently altered with new openings in the walls and with a 'modern' corrugated asbestos roof. It does not hold such architectural or historic interest or contribute to the significance of No 8 or the group that it cannot be altered. This is clear in your officers' approval of the earlier scheme. The main difference between that approved scheme and this is essentially in whether or not a modest two-storey extension would undermine understanding and experience of the cottage's heritage significance. The extension would be similar to others in the groups (you can see these in the historic photographs in the heritage report - page 10) and would form part of the vernacular and informal qualities that typify the rear elevations. Other elements of this proposal are substantially similar to be the approved scheme – the detail of which can be controlled by conditions.

Your officers conclude that the 'linear' form of the building and the difference in formality between front and back are important characteristics to preserve. In our view the small two-storey extension will not obscure the whole of the rear elevation such that the characteristic of the two bay main range and linear quality will still be evident and understandable. The two-storey element would be consistent with the character of the group of buildings, reflecting its functional adaptation to suit



changing needs. Arguably, the design proposed resonates with Historic England's advice (referred to in your officer's report, top of page 194) that '*later phases of a building's evolution, especially those that are characteristic and also vernacular in form can actually add to the building's significance*'.

In relation to the lean-to element, the characteristic form with catslide roof will be reinstated over part of the rear elevation (this can be in natural slate as in the previous approved scheme). Finally, your officers remark on the qualities of the front elevation mentioning in terms of the buildings architectural qualities that '*the emphasis is towards the street frontage*' (page 194). Poor quality modern windows currently spoil this principal elevation. As a part of these proposals the windows will be replaced with ones that are more appropriate, thus enhancing the building's significance and its contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Should it be considered that there is some harm that would result from these proposals then it is considered that this would be justified by the enhancement of the front elevation and the renovation of the cottage, helping to secure its long term maintenance and contribution to the stock of permanent (small) residential accommodation in the area. Thus the proposals are considered to be consistent with national and local planning policy and the committee is requested to support the applications and grant planning permission and listed building consent.

Nicholas Worlledge
Worlledge Associates

Parish council comments in respect of application 18/04597/FUL

Parish Council Statement to be read at the planning committee meeting 10/4/18 in respect of 18/04597/FUL Lavender Cottage, 15 Mill Lane, Lower Slaughter, GL54 2HX

Following submission of revised plans in respect of this application, at the Parish Council's meeting on the 18 March the occupant of 16 Mill Lane, Mrs Higginson, made representation on this application. She advised that she still had concerns following the submission of revised plans and that she and other residents had submitted objections to Cotswold District Council.

Her concerns were as follows: the house at no 16 was offset within the plot and had a smaller garden. Since the extension would run along one third of the length of no. 16, this would cause the proposed extension to be overbearing and create a sense of being hemmed in by the property at 15 Mill Lane. The eaves height shown in the plans would be 4.2m which was in excess of the permitted height of 3m. Mrs Higginson invited the members of the council to visit the property to see for themselves the likely effect of the extension.

Since Cllr Thomas had declared an interest in this item the remaining Councillors agreed to the request from Mrs Higginson for a site visit. Since Cllr Chapman was unable to attend until the following weekend, it was agreed that Cllrs Randles and Roche would attend on 19 March and would share their findings with Cllr Chapman, following which a decision would be made whether to submit comments to Cotswold District Council.

Members of the Parish Council visited 16 Mill Lane on 19th March. It was evident that the staggered building line and short boundary between the properties would make the development at 15 Mill Lane overpowering and oppressive to neighbouring 16 Mill Lane. The rear of 16 Mill Lane being set back exacerbates the detrimental impact the proposed planning application would have on this property, particularly considering the scale and height of the development as currently proposed. The council submitted its comments.

As a Parish Council, we understand that owners of properties have every right to improve the quality and ultimately the value of their investments. We have read the case officers comments and it is our opinion that the applicant has complied with all but two aspects of planning guidelines. The distance from the boundary should in our opinion be 2 meters which would make it compliant with planning guidelines.

On a more subjective point Appendix D of the Local plan states that extensions should respect the amenity of dwellings, giving due consideration to issues of garden space, privacy, daylight and overbearing effect.

Whilst we understand that the case officer has visited 15 Mill Lane it is the opinion of the council that the two story extension will create a significant impact to the residents of 15 Mill Lane, due to the overbearing nature of the proposed development.

Whilst we recognise and express gratitude to the developers for the reduction in dimensions of the proposed development due to previous concerns about the overbearing nature, we remain of the opinion that the current proposals will still result in an oppressive development in respect of the residents of 16 Mill Lane.

We would therefore be very grateful if the Planning Committee could recognise the particular circumstances associated this case and reject the proposals in their current form.