



**Minutes of a meeting held remotely of Planning and Licensing Committee held on 9 December 2020**

Councillors present:

Juliet Layton - Chair  
Patrick Coleman  
Stephen Hirst  
Nikki Ind  
Sue Jepson

Ray Brassington - Vice-Chair  
Julia Judd  
Richard Keeling  
Dilys Neill  
Gary Selwyn

Clive Webster

Officers present:

Development and Planning  
Enforcement Manager  
Legal Services Manager  
Democratic Services

Senior Case Officer  
Planning Case Officers  
Conservation and Design Consultant

Observers:

Councillor Steve Trotter.

PL.70 No apologies had been received.

PL.71 **Substitute Members**

There were no substitute Members.

PL.72 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers.

PL.73 **Minutes**

**RESOLVED** that, subject to the deletion of the word 'thor' and its substitution by 'the' in the fourth paragraph of the preamble in relation to application 19/02248/FUL, the Minutes of the Meeting of the Meeting of the Committee held on 11 November 2020 be approved as a correct record.

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

PL.74 **Chair's Announcements**

The Chair advised that application 19/01100/FUL had been withdrawn from the Schedule of Applications to be heard at the meeting.

**PL.75 Schedule of Applications**

**20/02390/FUL**

**Change of Use of Land to Keeping/Grazing of Horses and Erection of Stables Complex at Church Farm, Little Rissington, GL54 2ND**

The Case Officer drew attention to additional information and then displayed a site location map and location plan, block plan, drawings of the proposed stables and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Committee Officer then read out comments on behalf of the Parish Council.

As the Ward Member was absent from the meeting, the Committee Officer read out the Member's reasons for referral to the Committee as published within the Case Officer's report.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that a previous application regarding the change of use of a building to the north of the site for commercial equestrian use had been approved, but this had not been when the site was in the ownership of the current Applicant; the Case Officer had explained the Parish Council's concerns to the Applicant and the Applicant had confirmed that the application was for personal use only, which Condition 4 also required; the Applicant owned 10 horses which were currently stabled at another site however the site being used was due to be sold; various highway improvements had been approved to the access road as a result of a previous application at the site adjacent to the application site; Officers did not consider the passing place proposed in front of a gateway to be an issue in terms of gaining entry into the site; the access road became an unmade track further on from the site and horses could access the fields to the north of the dwelling by using this track; the informative relating to great crested newts was recommended by the Council's Newt Officer, however as horses and not livestock would be grazing the fields, it was not considered necessary to require the imposition of a condition; the Committee, if minded to approve the application, could request the wording of Condition 4 to be amended to specifically state both the stables and stable yard; and there was at least 2.4 hectares or 5 acres of pasture which would be used for the horses at the site.

Various Members expressed that they considered there was insufficient pasture land to keep the number of horses intended at the site and that there was also a risk of creeping development from approving the application.

A Proposition, that the application be approved, subject to the amendment to Condition 4 to include reference to the stables and stable yard, was duly Seconded.

Other Members commented that the main issues raised by the Parish Council related to highway safety which Officers had determined was not an issue and that the proposals for the stables were for a simple construction which could not be easily converted to residential accommodation.

**Approved, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 8, against 1, abstention 2, absent 0.**

**20/02294/FUL**

**Erection of single and two storey rear extensions at 1 The Old Manor, Paxford, Chipping Campden, GL55 6XL.**

The Case Officer advised of updates to the Committee in relation to the 3D plans submitted by the Applicant which would be included in the powerpoint presentation and that the number of bedrooms would increase by 1, this reference had been previously omitted from the report.

The Case Officer drew attention to additional information and then displayed an Ordnance Survey Map (showing the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings), aerial photograph, site map, elevations, 3D drawings of the proposals, a Google Virtual Street View and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Applicant and the Heritage Consultant were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who served on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. She explained that she hoped the Committee had read what she considered to be a very thorough and detailed report by the Heritage Consultant, which reinforced some agreements that had been reached by the Applicant and Officers in relation to the proposed extensions. The Ward Member in referring to Policy EN10 explained that the Manor House had had many changes over the years and some previous extensions had added little or no character to the listed building. She continued that the Applicant had planned to blend the current proposed extensions with the property which were worthy of the property's Grade II\* listed status and which she considered would not cause sufficient harm to warrant its refusal. The Ward Member added that there was no risk of overlooking from the proposed extension; with little effect on the street scene and that the materials proposed to be used were commonly found in the area. She concluded that there had been no objections to the application and several supporting

comments and that the proposals would enable continued family living in the property.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that the Conservation Officer considered the main issue with the proposals was in relation to the scale and the fact that previous extensions to the property had not overlapped the original roof, as the proposals intended to do; as the property was Grade II\* listed, some materials were not considered suitable; Grade II\* properties were considered to be in the top 7-8% of historic properties in the country compared to Grade 1 which was the top 1-2%; Officers considered if the proposals for the extension were lower and less dominant there could be greater flexibility in reaching an agreement with the Applicant; pre-application advice was requested by the architect in 2019, but was not provided; the two storey element was understood by Officers to be pivotal to the Applicant's wishes and the Conservation Consultant had viewed the site from the road when considering the current application and had previously visited the site on many occasions as a result of previous applications for the property.

Various Members commented that whilst they agreed great care had been taken by the Applicant in relation to the design, they considered the extension risked competing with the main building and that they therefore supported the Officer recommendation of refusal on the basis of design and not the principle of some form of extension to the building.

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

A Member commented that she considered a Sites Inspection Briefing should be undertaken to consider the historic importance of the building in person.

A Further Proposition, that a Sites Inspection Briefing be undertaken, was duly Seconded.

A third Proposition, that the application be deferred to enable discussions to be undertaken between Officers and the Applicant was duly Seconded.

The Chair and various Members highlighted that an in-person Sites Inspection Briefing could not be undertaken at present owing to the ongoing Covid-19 restrictions and that the visit would also not demonstrate anything further than had been shown in the Officer's presentation.

The Proposition to undertake a Sites Inspection Briefing was then withdrawn by the Proposing Member.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. She explained that the property was situated within a lane that was not fully demonstrated in the Case Officer's presentation and expressed disappointment that the Committee had not discussed further the Heritage Consultant's report.

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 8, against 2, abstention 1, absent 0.**

**20/02995/LBC**

**Erection of single and two storey rear extensions at 1 The Old Manor, Paxford, Chipping Campden, GL55 6XL.**

The Case Officer advised that there had been one less representation of support for the Listed Building Consent application in comparison to the full application.

There were no further questions from Members.

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

A Member commented that she was disappointed the Committee were not encouraged to support the application to support a young family within a village community in a rural part of the District and that she hoped further discussions could be undertaken between the Applicant and Officers.

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 7, against 3, abstention 1, absent 0.**

**20/02957/FUL**

**Erection of boundary fence (retrospective) at 1 Martin Close, Cirencester, GL7 1XY.**

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of the site and displayed an aerial photograph, elevations prior to development, existing elevations, a Google Virtual Street View and photographs of the site both prior and after the installation of the artificial fencing, from various vantage points.

There were no public speakers.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee. He explained that he had not brought the application to the Committee but expressed that he supported the Officer recommendation of refusal.

The Chair then read out the reasons as published within the Case Officer's report why the application had been brought to the Committee.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that there would be no requirement for action if the hedge had grown as a natural conifer hedge as the Local Planning Authority had no control over natural

planting; the application had been submitted as a result of enforcement action to retain the fencing; the Applicant had the right to appeal to the Planning Inspectorate; the previous 1.8 metre fence was permitted at the time the properties were built circa 30 years previously; Officers considered the fence was overbearing on the street scene and did not respect the locality; Officers could not condition the sustainable disposal of the fencing materials used, only that the fencing be removed if the Committee was minded to refuse the application; the artificial hedging covered the 1.8 metre gate within the wooden fence but was only on the public view side of the fence; and the Applicant had referred the Case Officer to similar examples of hedging but none of which were located within the immediate vicinity (up to five properties away) and none of which were so prominently located as the application site; in any event, those boundary treatments had been erected more than four years ago so the Local Planning Authority couldn't take enforcement action to have them removed.

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

**Refused, as recommended.**

**Record of Voting - for 10, against 0, abstention 0, unable to vote due to being absent during debate 1, absent 0.**

Notes:

(i) Additional Representations

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

(ii) Public Submissions

Public submissions were made or read to the Committee as follows:-

20/02390/FUL	)	Little Rissington Parish Council
20/02294/FUL	)	Ben Cowles (Applicant)
	)	Richard Morriss (Heritage Consultant)
20/02295/LBC	)	Ben Cowles(Applicant)
	)	Richard Morriss (Heritage Consultant)

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.76 Sites Inspection Briefings (Members for 6 January 2021)**

It was noted that Councillors Juliet Layton, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill and Gary Selwyn would represent the Committee at the virtual Sites Inspection Briefing, if required.

**PL.77 Licensing Sub-Committees (Members for 27 January 2021)**

It was noted that Councillors Juliet Layton, Stephen Hirst, Richard Keeling, Dilys Neill and Gary Selwyn would represent the Committee at the virtual Licensing Sub-Committee, if required.

**PL.78 Other Business**

There was no other business.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm, adjourned between 2.13 pm and 2.17 pm due to a technical failing, and closed at 4.05 pm

Chair

(END)

Unconfirmed