



Planning and Licensing Committee
13/April2022

Minutes of a meeting held remotely of Planning and Licensing Committee held on
Wednesday, 13 April 2022.

Councillors present:

Ray Brassington	Julia Judd	
Patrick Coleman	Sue Jepson	Gary Selwyn
Joe Harris	Andrew Maclean	Steve Trotter
Stephen Hirst	Dilys Neill	Clive Webster

Officers present:

OfficerPresentTitleOnlyColNo1of2

OfficerPresentTitleOnlyColNo2of2

Observers:

Councillor

86 Apologies

There were apologies received from Councillor Juliet Layton.

87 Substitute Members

Councillor Joe Harris substituted for Councillor Juliet Layton.

88 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interests for the Committee to note.

In regards to Items 4 and 5, it was noted by the Committee that Councillor Webster had used the same agents for a private application before he became a Member.

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/April2022

The Chair also notified the Committee knew the agent Jacqui Pembroke in her capacity as a former planning officer at Cotswold District Council.

89 Minutes

The Committee considered the minutes of the last meeting.

The Committee noted that the line at page 5 where it should read 'a range of views'.

The titles of Chair and Vice-Chair had also been missed on the minutes and Democratic Services noted that these would be included in future.

Councillor Coleman proposed that the minutes be approved subject to amendments being made. This was seconded by Councillor Webster.

RESOLVED: The Committee considers the minutes as a true and accurate record of the last meeting on 9th March 2022.

9 for, 0 against, 2 abstention

90 Chair's Announcements (if any)

The Chair informed the Committee that Item 3 on the agenda 19/01916/FUL has been deferred to the next meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee on 11th May 2022. This was because the applicant was away on holiday and could not attend in person.

91 Schedule of Applications

Item 1 21/04185/OUT

The Chair reminded the Committee of the recommendation that the Planning Inspectorate be advised that the application would have been refused, if the Local Planning Authority had been given a chance to take a decision.

The case officer Andrew Moody gave a presentation to the committee on the application and updates.

The additional pages updates were presented to the Committee as corrections and an additional supporter was noted.

The appeal would be for up to 8 dwellings on the site which would be surrounded by existing housing and the local school.

The Committee noted the changes that would be required to give means of access to the 8 dwellings which would include the removal of trees.

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/April2022

The Committee was shown maps and photographs of the site from different directions.

It was also described that the conservation area was away from this site and would not have an effect on this application.

Councillor Gareth Cope presented to the Committee as the Parish Council representation for Down Ampney

Statements were read out by Democratic Services for Geoffrey Tappern as an objector and the agent Pegasus Group.

Councillor Spivey addressed the Committee as the ward member

The Committee asked the case officer about any objections from the Forward Plan team outlined by Pegasus Group.

The case officer informed the Committee that the Forward Plan team had been contacted for comments. The team had also been contacted about the open space allocation on the site in relation to previous Local Plans.

The Committee noted the need for local housing and that a number of developments that had already been looked at for housing.

The Committee noted the response from the case officer regarding why the Committee had not examined the application previously. This was due to outstanding consultation responses before the appeal was then lodged by the applicants.

There were comments also given by Thames Water regarding its position of not having an objection. Cotswold District Council's drainage team had no objections which the Committee noted.

The Committee noted the concerns of the developments being made on an area which is part of the village green.

It also noted the disappointment that the applicant could not be here in person to defend its application, and be a part of the process.

The Committee noted that it was concerned by the speed of the application, and noted that it would have preferred that more time was given.

Councillor Harris proposed the officers recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Webster.

Voting Record

11 for, 0 against, 0 abstention

The officer's recommendation to the Planning Inspectorate to object was accepted.

Item 2 21/00837/FUL

Harrison Bowley as the case officer presented to the Committee.

The comments from Mickleton Parish Council which was missed of the additional pages were read out as part of its objection.

Maps of the site and photographs of the development were provided to the Committee. This also included photographs of the proposed side and rear extension.

It was also noted that the existing driveway would also be enlarged on the front space.

It was noted that officers felt that the plans were proportionate and that they would not a substantial impact on the area around it.

Democratic Services read out a statement provided by Teresa Bennett (objector)

Mr Neil Harvey addressed the Committee (applicant)

Councillor Blomefield as the ward member addressed the Committee (ward member)

The Committee asked the officer about the increase in floor space. It was noted by the officer that this would mean a 34% increase with the garage space included.

The Committee wished to ask Mike Napper about the permitted development rights whether these should be retained. It was noted that each site needs to be considered on its own merits if these rights need to be removed in part or in full.

The Committee asked the officer about proposals in high density area and the policy of the Council for noise management. The officer reinforced the determination on a case by case basis to look at the specific context of the application. Mike Napper also noted that restrictions would potentially add a delay.

The Committee asked about why the energy performance of the house was not in the report as this was part of the NPPF. It also noted its concerns about external insulation which was Mike Napper noted the comments but that this would need to be a conversation with forward planning team.

Comments

It was noted by some Members of the Committee that the issues raised are relatively minor, and would not likely hold up on appeal.

The current model of housing to uses the space efficiently and that this application was part of that. However it was noted by the Committee that this was part of an older development.

It was noted that the extension of the house was a reasonable request considering that the applicant had made efforts to justify the concerns.

It was proposed by Sue Jepson that a site inspection panel visit looked at for this application to examine the proposed development. This was seconded by Councillor Coleman.

Voting record

For 5, 6 against, 0 abstention

The vote was lost

Stephen Hirst proposed the officer recommendation be accepted and Joe Harris seconded. It was noted that the applicant had satisfied a number of the objectors concerns within their application.

Clive Webster proposed a condition in the recommendation on a light touch construction plan as outlined by officers and Cllr Coleman seconded. This additional condition was accepted by Councillor Hirst and Councillor Harris to be proposed as part of the vote.

It was also proposed as an informative that the wiring for electric car charging point to encourage the wiring to be put in place. This was also accepted by other Members as part of the proposal.

7 for, 4 against, 0 abstention

The application with the additional condition and informative was approved.

Item 3 21/04349/FUL

Mike Napper introduced the additional comments presented to Members before the presentation. These included the support of Shipton Parish Council and the additional amendments to description of the application

The Committee was shown maps and photographs of the application.

The officer (standing in for Ed Leeson) introduced the presentation.

A statement from Kate and James Hathaway was presented by Democratic Services.

Jacqueline Pembroke presented on behalf of the applicant.

Councillor Robin Hughes addressed the Committee as the ward member.

The Committee noted the references to the NPPF and section 14 which was missing from the report as part of the energy concerns for this development. There were also concerns about unclear information about the windows. Charlotte Bowles-Lewis stated that the response given from the applicant was that they would be double-glazed. However the specification regarding thermal efficiency was not known.

It was noted that the size of the historic dwelling does not need to comply to modern building standards of space.

There were queries raised about the use of the outbuilding and whether this would be used to provide ancillary accommodation. It was confirmed that the use of the building on the current site would not prevent accommodation being built on this site.

It was noted by the Committee that the public benefits referenced in the document regarding how a listed building is preserved and the viability of the heritage asset.

The Committee highlighted that the work being done to the building was enhancing the building, and making it more practical for modern use.

Whilst the Committee noted the officer's recommendation for refusal was noted from a heritage standpoint, it was the view of the Committee that the application had net benefits.

Sue Jepson proposed that the application was permitted as a whole and this was seconded by Julia Judd as it was enhancing the development up to modern day standards whilst recognising the less than substantial harm identified.

The condition identified by officers was given to the Committee. This would include samples of materials, sections drawings of windows and sample panels

Vote

11 for, 0 against, 0 abstention.

The application was permitted with conditions attached to be drafted through delegated authority given to the officers.

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/April2022

No additional presentation was given by officers or by the applicant for the listed building consent.

The Committee asked about the detail of the glazing and whether this would be 12mm. This was confirmed by officers as being part of the Cotswold Design guide. It was also confirmed that the size of the glazing was considered to make it more in keeping with the design.

Delegate conditions to the authority. Councillor Jepson and Councillor Judd proposed that it would be permitted with delegated authority to officers.

Voting record

11 for, 0 against, 0 abstention

The application was accepted.

Item 5 21/03907/LBC

Councillor Harris raised his interest as a close friend of the applicant, and someone who had lived near the applicant. He therefore left the room.

The officer presented to the committee.

The Committee noted the site location plan and the details of the construction.

The current windows are 40 years old and the proposed replacement is with heritage double glazing in keeping with the design.

The applicant Lisa Spivey presented to the Committee

The officer noted that there was a balance in energy, efficiency and design when approving these applications. However, the guidance for listed buildings is always under review to ensure there is the right balance.

The Committee further noted that there was no energy efficiency standards listed in the report which was a disappointment. However the officer noted the request and that this could be taken up as part of the public benefit.

The Committee noted that agreement was reached for windows on the side of the house, but the application excluded the front windows. However, a further application may be submitted by the applicant if desired at a later date.

It was further noted the positive changes that had been made to allow double glazing to be fitted to listed buildings.

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/April2022

Councillor Webster proposed and Councillor Maclean seconded the officer's recommendations to permit the application.

Voting record

10 for, 0 against, 1 absent

The application was accepted.

92 Sites Inspection Briefing

The Committee noted the next date if required on 4th May

93 Licensing Sub-Committee

The Committee noted the next date of the Licensing Sub-Committee if required on 18th May

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 5.00 pm

Chair

(END)