

Parish Council comments in respect of application no: 19/01178/FUL

South Cerney Parish Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on this most recent planning application at Clay Meadow.

There is considerable un-ease within the parish surrounding the proposed change of use to B1. The site is situated in open countryside and was itself bare agricultural land until its sale in 2012.

The land and buildings, consented for agricultural use post 2012, and later varied to include equestrian use, are outside of the development boundary and within the green belt.

The access to and from the Cirencester Road is compromised and the PC would respectfully suggest the supplemental drawings put forward by the applicant's agent do not achieve the sight lines requested by the Highways Officer. Also, those sight lines required are not exclusively under the control of the applicant; in other words, the ongoing maintenance to ensure safety cannot be assured.

The PC believes that a change of use would be material and the extent of activity in terms of factors such as noise, visual impact and traffic movements are highly relevant. We also consider this to be an unsustainable location for the proposed change of use.

The site has a consented and as yet undeveloped site for a residential property tied to the agricultural necessity (varied to equestrian use). The proximity of this property to the buildings may be appropriate within an agricultural or equine setting but would lead to an over-bearing use, out of scale and character in terms of appearance for the locality given the proposed mixed use.

In the PC's opinion, the existing farm buildings would still be required for an agricultural or an equine use of the adjoining land, i.e. the very reason why planning consent has been granted for them in the past 6 years. Their conversion to B1 is very likely to drive a further requirement for more buildings over time.

Applicant's comments in respect of application no: 19/01595/F01

Statement to Cotswold District Council Planning Committee

Good morning

I am Matthew Newell. I have been a fully qualified gamekeeper for 23 years. I lease the shooting rights on the Colesbourne Estate. I am permitted in my lease to have 25 shoots a year: 4 for the estate owner, 7 for a local syndicate and 13 sold mainly to returning teams. In addition to myself the shoot gives employment to two underkeepers plus a part time caterer and hostess and administrator. On shoot days we employ a further 25-30 staff to help run the shoot.

I rear my own birds from day old chicks in rearing sheds which are adjacent to the mobile home in question. 10000 pheasant chicks arrive in April, they spend 6 weeks under constant surveillance followed by release at 6 weeks to pens around the estate. 9000 Partridge chicks arrive in July and follow the same regime. In this intensive period the birds are under constant surveillance for signs of illness, fluctuations in temperature and need for food and water. Once released to the pens the birds require intense scrutiny to keep them in or near to the pens and free from vermin. The birds are fed in their pens during the whole shooting season.

The keepers have to take annual leave in the non-rearing and non-shooting weeks and all continue to provide a service to managing the shoot as well as maintaining the drives and pens ready for the next season.

I'm sure I don't have to remind you of the high rural crime rate particularly in remote areas like mine and only recently I had a buggy stolen which was taken from an outbuilding in a 15 minute time slot when nobody was at the farm.

Having a dependable keeper, living on site near to rearing sheds who can share the intensive period of activity involved in rearing and releasing birds fulfils a crucial need in my business. However, the diligence needed for the safety and security of the site and care of 15 dogs is a year round necessity.

**In Mr Fox's conclusions at 4:01**

- **Ideally keepers would live close to their shoot from when the birds arrive (mid April to the end of the season February 1.**
- **It would be difficult to employ or retain a skilled underkeeper during the rearing and shooting season without being able to offer accommodation.**
- **Without alternatives, which the report does not identify, 'it would be essential to the shoot to be able to offer some accommodation for the 9 months covering the rearing and shooting season.**
- **The mobile home is ideally situated.**

In concluding that permission to house a keeper on site all year round is 'reasonable but not essential' and proposing that 'a keeper vacates the accommodation between Feb 2<sup>nd</sup> and early April' would render the points raised previously unworkable.

This application seeks consent until next March when the lease is up for renewal. Given that there is an essential need until February 1<sup>st</sup> I hope you will support this application.

Objector's comments in respect of application no:  
19/01115/OUT.

## **Public Comment for Planning Application 19/01115/OUT**

### **Application Summary**

Application number: 19/01115/OUT

Address: Land To Rear Of Ashlar, Coppers And Wyldlands Broad Campden  
Chipping Campden Gloucestershire GL55 6UR

Proposal: Erection of 2 no. dwellings and associated works (Outline application with all matters reserved except access)

### **Customer Details**

Name: Mr David Hughes

Address: 1 Pool Farm Close Broad Campden Chipping Campden GL55 6WB

### **Comment Details**

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

## **Comments**

Councillors who have visited the site for this planning proposal may have taken the opportunity to also visit the adjacent farmstead style development built on the site of a former swimming pool.

In submitting **this** application considerable emphasis has been given as to why approval for building on the former swimming pool site at Broad Campden provides a sound reason for building houses on the adjacent land. It is suggested that the proposed development successfully draws its references from this existing layout and I quote "is respectful of the character and distinctive appearance of the locality" (Planning Statement, Planning Considerations 4.22).

However, in recommending approval of the development of the swimming pool site the Planning Officer made the following three observations (Case Officer Delegated Report 16/03163/FUL 11 September 2018):

- 1 "The (swimming pool) site is served by an existing access from the highway."

*But access into this site is constrained by ownership therefore a new 3.7m access road is proposed. (Planning Statement, Design and Access 2.15)*

- 2 “The (swimming pool) site is considered to be predominately brownfield/previously developed land.”  
“Environmentally ...given that the majority of the (swimming pool) site is previously developed...it would not be detrimental to the environment.”

*But this site occupies an area of garden land to the rear of properties fronting onto the main road leading through the village. (Planning Statement, Character and Appearance 2.7)*

- 3 In conclusion the report recommending approval of development on the former swimming site stated that “the site is considered to be predominately previously developed land...( and).. the scheme would not give rise to harm (to the) neighbouring amenity.”

*But this site is not on previously developed land and the scheme undoubtedly will impact upon the neighbouring amenity.*

In summary, according to the Planning Statement accompanying this application, paragraph 172 of the National Planning Framework states that “great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in ...Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.” **This proposal achieves neither.** More likely, if approved this application will be the precursor to infilling further back gardens within Broad Campden.

Nor is the proposal it be in keeping with the linear pattern established by properties along the road leading to the centre of Broad Campden. It certainly does **not** “round off this part of the settlement” as quoted in the Planning and Design statement, *particularly as a new access road will be necessary.*

**As such the planning application should be refused.**

# Applicant's comments in respect of application no: 18/03102/FUL

Hello,

We are James and Bridget Tibbs-Hamilton and we run Cotswold Alpacas at Korinn Farm in Cowley.

Farming livestock is a 365 day a year job, with no Christmas day off. Regular holidays have become a thing of the past. Horse livery owners expect on site cover for their horse and I'm sure we all agree the health of a pregnant female is essential in ensuring the health and wellbeing of her offspring. An alpaca is pregnant for 11.5 months and returns to the stud three weeks after giving birth. Therefore, caring for a breeding herd of alpacas is a full time year round job.

We started out with 12 females and 1 stud. Today we have a herd of 43 alpacas of which 22 are breeding females and 4 studs. This first class breeding herd with top genetics is now taking awards at shows and gives us excellent quality fibre and progeny.

There is a high demand for our surplus stock – we consistently have a waiting list for alpacas. Over the last 3 years we have sold over 30 animals as pet boys, breeding females and males for stud work

Alpaca fibre was known by the Incas as Fibre of the Gods and is closer to cashmere than wool. Each year we process and store more and more fleece to make yarn and products for market. Bridget Hand Dyes the yarn using plant dyes giving us a colour range with spectacular colours. These increased volumes mean Bridget requires a dedicated area for these tasks as well as space for developing new products and ideas.

At the farm we run workshops on such diverse subjects as hand spinning, natural dyeing, weaving, felting and Alpaca husbandry as well as neonatal and birthing. Having a dedicated space will allow us to run more workshops and add new ones like Dentistry and Parasite management.

One of the biggest killers of alpacas is parasites and the global problem of parasite resistance to wormers means our dedicated biotech area in the new building will give us the ability to better monitor each animal's health in our herd as well as for our clients.

We are currently at a critical stage with the business desperately needing a permanent dwelling and us needing security on the farm to be able to continue to grow, we are hoping to be in a position to employ someone in the near future to help with administration. A positive outcome from this decision will give us the ability to carry forward these plans.

We are running an eco and sustainable business with good green credentials, encouraging biodiversity and an organic ethos. All our energy requirements will be met by alternative energy sources in the proposed building which has a low carbon footprint and the design, construction and siting of the building reflects our sustainable ethos and ensures we will be better able to monitor the herd.

To conclude, It's our passion to be in farming that get us up on the cold wet mornings and keeps us going when the days are long and arduous and means we have persisted in running an ever growing business from a mobile home

Thank you for listening and we very much hope we have demonstrated both with the figures and reports in front of you as well as with our passion that our rural business is thriving and growing and is an asset both to our local community and to the wider Cotswolds. Please give us your support.

Town Council comments in respect of application  
no: 18/02520/FUL

## FTC Comments on 18 02520 FUL July 2019

The Town Council is concerned the Officer's update doesn't answer all the questions raised last time or in our letter to you, Madame Chairman [or in the Highways Authority's latest comments].

Firstly, we need to know the Lead Local Flood Authority (GCC)'s opinion on the feasibility of SuDS for the proposed development, taking account of the information on groundwater levels in the Water Resource Associates report, which we made available to the Council. The Council's Drainage Officer has also questioned the feasibility of SuDS for the development. The EA has said the related surface water risk, which is the main issue for this site, isn't their responsibility, so you need to go to the correct authority (GCC) to get a meaningful opinion, and can't rely on 'no objection' (and proposed conditions) based solely on fluvial flood risk. [PPG 7-033-20140306 refers]

Secondly, there's the question of the impact on the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II listed East End House. Given the information in the applicant's own Heritage Assessment and drawings, the judgement that there's NO visual impact is simply not credible. Indeed, it is perverse and irrational, and therefore open to legal challenge. With the wholly unexceptional design of the buildings proposed, which looks rather like that of the modern houses in Moor Lane, the 'harm' to the significance of these assets must be at least 'less than substantial', even if you could rely on the hedge and other planting for screening in the longer term. This requires the 'harm' to be weighed against the public benefits of the development to decide whether this is justified, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 196. It's unclear to us what these benefits might be, and there certainly seem to be a number of disbenefits to be considered in the balance.

Finally, you need to know that adequate safe and lawful access to the site is possible, for emergency vehicles, deliveries of larger items and construction purposes, taking account of the fact that there's shared and public access in the area near the main road. This is a matter of public safety. Those of you who visited the site will have seen the problems, and the Highways Authority has recommended refusal based on the current information. At the very least, if you're minded to approve the application, we believe it's essential that a specific planning condition is imposed requiring a Construction Method Statement, to be approved before development starts, detailing how access, deliveries of large materials etc are going to be achieved safely over the whole site including the shared access area. Otherwise, there must be a risk that the wall could be partially demolished but the development could not be completed for other reasons, contrary to NPPF paragraph 198.

We'd urge you to refuse the application on these grounds.

[198. Local planning authorities should not permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset without taking all reasonable steps to ensure the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred.]

**“Any development proposal should take into account the likelihood of flooding from other sources, as well as from rivers and the sea. The sequential approach to locating development in areas at lower flood risk should be applied to all sources of flooding, including development in an area which has critical drainage problems, as notified to the local planning authority by the Environment Agency, and where the proposed location of the development would increase flood risk elsewhere.”**

**(Extract from PPG Ref 7-033-20140306)**