

Sue Bradbury Speech to Planning Committee 9<sup>th</sup> October 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 the following 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. The applicants would also be restoring the original Cottage from its unattractive extension. I have lived next-door 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. Historically there was a double storey barn on site close to where the proposed extension would be built. The cluster of our 3 cottages, Keens, Cobblers and Bliss Cottage reflects that of Denfurlong House, Barn and The Oxbyre situated to the West across one field.

2. Two years ago we extended our home Keen's Cottage as we too were preparing for life long living. We added at the suggestion of our Conservation Officer an oak and glass single storey building, This is also set into the gradient of the land and again it 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 and there is very little light pollution.

Liking what we have done the applicants therefore applied almost a year ago for a similar style link and the original application had 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. It also had barn like slit windows on the west side they too have been removed The fact that five comments of support come from residents facing the north outlook would suggest light pollution wouldn't be a concern.

We on the other hand face skyline development of a very large house which was permitted only 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. Incidentally they have just been permitted a swimming pool and gym room to replace a barn, with 3 large glass doors and a glass gable end facing toward us. This to me shows no consistency in planning regulations.

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. I am certain that the rest of the site would be suitably designed and landscaped so as not only act as screening, but to give the applicants privacy. Even without further planting, the artist's impression is a much-improved building to what is currently there.

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 neighbours and I would strongly urge the committee to permit their application.

**Sue Bradbury**

**Keens Cottage, Lower Chedworth, Cheltenham. Gloucestershire.**



**Ceri Powell Speech to Planning Committee: 10<sup>th</sup> October 2019 – Application 18/04188/FUL**

In April I presented our case to enhance Bliss Cottage into a Life Long Living home for our retirement, having lived in Lower Chedworth for 29 years, but currently in a home that is not suitable for old age.

At the April meeting there was confusion over recusal; the vote was 6-6 and with the Chairman's casting vote the committee rejected the proposal. However, if recusal had been honoured the vote would have been 6-5 in favour.

The decision was then set aside. However, during the discussion, Councillor Coleman suggested that the application be honed with Planning officers to get an agreed solution.

The design placed before you is, we thought, the agreed solution arrived at via meetings involving the conservation officer and expressly including her design wishes. We agreed to many compromises. Disappointingly, after 4 months of collaborative effort, the planning team has still chosen to recommend refusal. Hence, I sit before you once again.

- Bliss Cottage has 3 double-bedrooms today, we wish to convert it into a Life Long Living 3-bedroom home in line with policy - (the wheelchair turning circles are on the plans). Chedworth Parish Councillors believe this change will enhance the village demographic for public good. We should not wish that old people have to move from Chedworth due to lack of emergency service access up the stairs in these old cottages.
- My husband's mother died of Motor Neurone Disease, spending her final years wheel-chair bound. It is hereditary. Hence the desire to have a future-proof home IF the worst was to happen. The extension means cottage would also be improved for others after our lifetimes.
- We will enhance the existing 200-year old cottage by removing the ugly 1950s additions and conservatory. The aesthetic of the Bliss road frontage highlighted as being of note in the Chedworth Conservation Area Statement will remain intact, and we will use traditional materials for the extension. Any Non-Cotswold stone materials proposed are at the request of the Planning officers.
- The sloping ground allows the extension to "nestle down" below the ridge line of adjacent Cobblers/Keens Cottages and be subservient to existing Bliss Cottage. We cannot understand how the officer's report can say "the proposed extension remains almost as big as the cottage and visually competes" – the visualisation shows this clearly.

NOBODY in the village objects to our proposal. We have 12 support comments to the application including our closest neighbours. As to the harms mentioned in the officers' report, we struggle to understand how our extension can create more light pollution than the 32m long glass fronted swimming pool complex approved by CDC just last month, visible directly from Bliss and Keens Cottage on the ridgeline of Chedworth Valley in the Conservation Area.

We believe that our application will enhance Bliss Cottage and its surroundings. We are long-term residents of Chedworth and we ask our application be supported so we can contribute to the village for the next decades, and see out our days in a suitable home.

Parish Council comments in respect of application  
19/02226/FUL

Dear Planning Committee,

Further to the already stated objections as detailed in the Planning Bundle, Ampney Crucis Parish Council wishes to make the following points.

- 1) The revised submission reworded the application from a Replacement Dwelling, which it never was, to an Additional Dwelling and this further reinforces the issue of going against the current Local Plan Policies.
- 2) The PC is very concerned that in allowing this application to take place it may be cited as a reason for allowing future applications by both the Applicant on other areas of property in and around this small cluster of what was originally a Farm and Farm House, that has grown over time to comprise 4 dwellings and 2 Holiday Cottages, other applications in areas of Ampney Crucis village together with developers across both the District, wider County and potentially the Country
- 3) The revised dwelling is smaller, but still measures (there are no values on the drawings so it is very rough) approximately 150sq mtrs, some 3 or more times that of the original dwelling.
- 4) The dwelling however only increases the occupancy capacity by 1 bedroom.
- 5) The PC does not agree with the Officers view that the design is in keeping with the Cotswold vernacular, the design gives more of an impression that 2 lean too's have been added and in particular the one on the south side is a long line of windows and doors, more the sort of thing you might find on a modern house where they have added a full width conservatory or sun room.
- 6) The PC believe that adding a condition (3) on the application such that the current dwelling cannot be used for anything other than ancillary purposes is unenforceable, it is in a private location and the original conversion of the garage was done so without permission and only became the subject of regularisation as a consequence of the applicant submitting the original plans in 2018 under 18/02312. To the PC's knowledge it was not a situation that had been notified to the Planning Department or they had discovered themselves and then sought action. That conversion of what was a garage to ancillary accommodation for Wiggold Farm Cottage located across the road would never have come to light had the original application not been submitted. It should also be noted that the Planning Notices were only displayed on a telegraph pole outside the site and not in any public location making it virtually impossible for any member of the public to be aware that this application had been submitted.
- 7) The PC also believe that the conclusion point (9) about it being liable for CIL, which is a material planning consideration, is contradictory, It states that CIL will be chargeable, but as this is a Self Build / Residential Extension / Residential Annex that relief may be sought. How can this New Dwelling now be classed as an Extension or an Annex. To what is it forming one of these arrangements when the current dwelling is going to become ancillary and is separated from the new dwelling?
- 8) This application also takes place wholly within the Cotswold ANOB, so allowing such a precedent could be very dangerous in attempting to maintain any appropriate control across the region.
- 9) The PC believes since the original dwelling is a rather unattractive building and in respect to the Grade II listed building nearby, the current dwelling should be demolished and a replacement building far more in keeping with the Cotswold vernacular and of much

smaller scale might be an acceptable solution.

10) The reasoning behind suggesting allowing this application seems fundamentally flawed, this is a new build in open countryside however you wish to dress it up and goes counter to policies within the current local plan.

11) The PC note that a recent application within the Parish to relocate an existing tennis court adjacent to a property, also wholly within the ANOB, was dismissed on appeal with some of the reasoning being that it would harm the ANOB and the PC cannot see how allowing such a substantial dwelling and the precedent it creates would do anything other than undermine the policy of protecting such a valuable natural environment.

12) Consistency needs to be maintained along with adhering to policies and the more times departures without very good reason are allowed the more likelihood will be that the local plan becomes unenforceable.

Historically the Planning department has been inconsistent in the decision making, certainly in respect of applications within our Parish, which has led to a straining of the relationship between the PC and CDC. With this new planning committee maybe there is now an opportunity to improve that situation.

The PC requests that this application is refused.

Doug Crook

Chair Ampney Crucis Parish Council

9th October 2019

## Planning Objection to 19/02556/FUL

56 Roman Way

Bourton on the Water

GL54 2EW

While the Parish Council consider the Garden Room to be over large and an over development of the small garden space, this was not our main objection to this application. The flat roof does little to enhance the property as it projects out from the house in a displeasing and frankly ugly manner. Notwithstanding this view, we believe there are better ways to extend this property to provide the extra accommodation required.

Our main objection to the application centres on the construction to the front of the property. The Local Plan has only recently been adopted and **there already appears to be conflict with EN 4, EN 5 and Section 15 of the NPPF**. We strongly object to the large permanent construction in the front garden which would set a most undesirable precedent for the whole village. The building has three bedrooms with a kitchen and bathroom so **its main stated purpose for an art room would seem extremely over provided for**. So if the applicant's main purpose is for art **and not for ancillary holiday letting** or indeed a separate dwelling, then it is highly probable that a subsequent owner will use it as such. There are 3 parking bays on one of the drawings which would suggest this form of usage has been considered.

The Parish Council also notes the objection raised by Thames Water with regard to their Foul Water pumping station. The accommodation proximity to the boundary of **less than 2 metres**, conflicts with their policy where their recommendation is **for 15 metres in best practice in Sewers for Adoption (7<sup>th</sup> edition)**. This also conflicts with best practice within the NPPF. These **concerns are in the form of odour, light, vibration and noise**.

The Parish Council would urge the Planning Committee to reject these proposals particularly with respect to building accommodation in the front garden of 56 Roman Way.

Cllr Bryan Sumner

Bourton Parish Council

8.10.19