



**Supplement for**

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 10 JULY 2024**

**Agenda No      Item**

**Schedule of Applications**

To consider and determine the applications contained within the enclosed schedule:

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**  
**10 July 2024**  
**ADDITIONAL PAGES UPDATE** *(Published 09.07.2024)*

**AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

<b>ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS: Page 1 - 3</b>		
<b>Agenda No:</b>	<b>Ref No:</b>	<b>Content:</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>23/03211/DMPO</b>  <i>(Rendcomb Airfield Rendcomb)</i>	<p><b>Ward Member (Cllr Paul Hodgkinson) submission to the CDC Planning Committee</b></p> <p>This application to vary the S106 agreement has taken years to come to the Committee. The length of time it has taken has dismayed and frustrated many people, including me, and I am hopeful now that we will get some closure on this contentious issue at last.</p> <p>The issue has polarised the local community – on one side people resent the noise pollution created by aircraft circling around the area and on the other side people argue that the wing walking activities create money for good causes and local employment.</p> <p>Let me list those views in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. People who live near to the airfield in North Cerney, Rendcomb, Calmsden and Chedworth experience varying degrees of noise. Those living closest certainly experience high levels of noise pollution and have made that clear for many years. They feel aggrieved that the Council has ignored their concerns and that flying activities have continued despite this.</li> </ol> <p>For those living a little further away in places like Bagendon, Perrott's Brook and Daglingworth for example the impact is less but I have had regular feedback from residents that they find the noise irritating and in particular the circling of aircraft which has become more common in recent years.</p> <p>Given that this is the AONB any suggestion that the number of flights could actually increase is anathema to those opposed to flights circling above them. It is the noise disturbance, as outlined in the officer's report, which is the</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Cont/.....</p>

		<p>key objection from residents – particularly for those who live closest to the airfield where aircraft circle overhead.</p> <p>2. On the other side of the argument, people in favour of varying the original S106 feel that the airfield safeguards jobs and helps charities via the wing walking activities.</p> <p>They believe that the impact of noise pollution is minimal and that other flights often pass over the area from the nearby military bases which are much louder and more intense.</p> <p>They also cite the fact that wing walking has taken place for some years without intervention from CDC to take enforcement action against this happening.</p> <p>The two views cannot be reconciled and I wish they could.</p> <p>The report lists all of the issues concerning the impact of noise in the AONB and this is the clear reason why refusal is recommended. If that could be addressed by the applicant in some way there could be room for a compromise but within this application there isn't that opportunity.</p> <p>Until those noise impacts are addressed people will continue to lobby for enforcement of the original S106 or for this application to be refused.</p> <p>I wish the Committee all the best in making its decision.</p>
<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>24/00186/FUL</b></p> <p><i>(Land South of Elkstone Studios Elkstone)</i></p>	<p><b>Additional Comment Received:</b></p> <p>I recently voiced a concern about the above application and requested that a traffic survey be carried out before permission was allowed.</p> <p>The reasons for my concerns are that: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The initial traffic survey was done when there was only 935 sq. meters of office space and there is now 32.000, a considerable and significant increase.</li> <li>2. At the time it was considered purely on the traffic volume related to office use. This has now changed however with 10 shops being opened within the 'office space', and services</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;">Cont/.....</p>

		<p>such as that at Origin Health, Padle Courts and a gym open all of which will lead to many more journeys per day per square foot.</p> <p>3. Since the original traffic survey assessment Knead Bakery and Jessie Smiths have opened. It was considered initially that this would only serve office workers on site and highways assessment was based on this premise, but they now attract considerable number of visitors who come specifically to visit them. (The volume of these premises is not included in the above figure</p> <p><i>Coombe End Farm – Planning Statement</i></p> <p><i>3.23 In terms of traffic movements, the café and farm shop will be an ancillary facility, as it is likely to almost exclusively serve those employed within, or visiting, the business hub. As such, there is unlikely to be a material increase of vehicle movements to and from the site as the majority of customers will already be on site. It is also important to note that given both the nature and location of the proposed development, a significant proportion of trips attracted to the site would not be new to the highway network, but rather attributed as passers-by. On this basis, the proposed use is not expected to generate a noticeable number of new trips and the trips generated are expected to be linked trips to the business hub or pass-by trips</i></p> <p>4. A Tipi has been erected, without the need for planning consent, but it is stated to accommodate 40 persons sitting or 80 standing which would have a significant impact on traffic volume when in use.</p> <p>For these reasons I believe that a traffic census should be carried out to ensure that highway safety is being maintained before more units are permitted</p>
--	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank