



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday,
11 December 2024**

Members present:

Ray Brassington - Chair	Patrick Coleman – Vice Chair	
Michael Vann	Gary Selwyn	Daryl Corps
Mark Harris	Julia Judd	Andrew Maclean
Ian Watson	David Fowles	

Officers present:

Caleb Harris, Senior Democratic Services Officer	Richard McEllistrum, Interim Development Management Manager
Alexander Kirk, Lawyer	Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer
Justin Ayton, Senior Conservation and Design Officer	Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic Services Support Assistant

71 Apologies

The Chair began the meeting by welcoming Members and members of the public in attendance, and reminded those in attendance of the Committee's procedure rules.

Apologies had been received from Councillor Dilys Neill. Councillor David Fowles had indicated to the Chair that he would be late arriving to the meeting.

72 Substitute Members

There were no substitute members.

73 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest

The Chair declared that he knew the agent Paul Fong who is married to an officer of the Council when he was an officer himself in Environmental Health and there were

some social occasions over a decade ago. The lawyer present advised that whilst it was not an interest that needed to be declared, it was important to avoid bias or the perception of bias where possible.

David Fowles joined the meeting at 14:05

74 Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee on 13 November 2024 were considered as part of the pack.

There were no comments or changes proposed to the minutes.

The acceptance of the minutes was proposed by Councillor Patrick Coleman and seconded by Councillor Daryl Corps.

Minutes of 13 November 2024 (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Mark Harris, Julia Judd, Andrew Maclean, Gary Selwyn, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	10
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

75 Chair's Announcements

The Chair made the following announcements:

The Chair began by noting that the Senior Democratic Services Officer, Caleb Harris, was leaving the Council and wished to thank him on behalf of the Committee for the support given to him personally and to the Committee.

The Chair then noted the disappointing turnout at the most recent Sites Inspection Briefing and reminded Members of the importance of the meetings, and to communicate with the Chair if they were not able to attend. It was noted that some Members may have not seen the agenda for the meeting beforehand, but that these meetings were held at a regular point each month.

76 Public questions

There were no public questions.

77 Member questions

There were no member questions.

78 24/00066/FUL - New Barn Farm, Temple Guiting

The application was for the conversion of a traditional barn to residential use and the erection of five new-build residential dwellings, the provision of landscaping, demolition of five existing agricultural barns and associated works at New Barn Farm, Temple Guiting, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, GL54 5RW.

The Chair invited the Principal Planning Officer to introduce the application.

- There were no additional updates to the report included in the agenda.
- Various maps and photos were shown of the site to outline the current landscape and the proposals within the site.
- The siting of the proposed dwellings was displayed including the removal of the barns.

Councillor Michael Krier from Temple Guiting Parish Council spoke and outlined the background to the site, the farm buildings and the previous proposals for the site. It was noted that the Parish Council had discussed the application and confirmed its support for the revised application following the addressing of the recent concerns.

The agent Paul Fong then spoke and addressed the application. It was noted that the site provided opportunities to provide housing in the District and that the main differences between the parties related to the design. It was noted that the sustainability of the proposal was key, and the former agricultural heritage of the site was being retained through the plans.

Councillor Len Wilkins as the Ward Member addressed the Committee, noting that the differing views on the design of the proposal were subjective. It was highlighted that there needed to a balanced assessment of the proposed design and how the application could save the 18th century barn and restore it for a new use. It was highlighted that Temple Guiting had tourists passing through the area, and the current site was not the most attractive.

Members who attended the Sites Inspection Briefing then spoke. It was noted that the proposals would be very beneficial to bring the barn back into use and help to develop the image of the area. But it was also noted by many Members that the design proposals for housing at the back of the site would be a juxtaposition with the restoration of the barn.

Members Questions

It was asked about whether any changes could be made to the design to allow a housing development of a similar size to be done in a more sympathetic way to the current site. The Senior Conservation Officer noted that the principle of development was acceptable to officers, but the site was in the conservation area. However, there were changes proposed in the pre-application stage such as ancillary structures to fit into the history of the site. But it was highlighted that there were no changes made to the current housing design proposal following the advice given.

At paragraph 10.15 on the financial viability appraisal, it was raised that the affordable housing proposal and financial contributions could not be met. It was asked if there would be some flexibility with this. The Principal Planning Officer noted that Planning Policy H2 did make exceptions, but the starting point was on-site affordable housing up to 40% of the development. Following consultation with independent consultants, it was confirmed that the financial viability of the scheme had not improved from this point for on-site affordable housing to be secured.

Members asked if the proposals during the early stages of the application would have adjusted the build price. The Senior Conservation Officer noted they couldn't comment on costs, but that there were options given depending on the designs. It was noted that the barn was a non-designated heritage asset and not a listed building.

Members asked if there were any other examples similar to the proposed site. It was noted in reply that officers were not aware of any other recent examples, but that officers wished to retain the Cotswold vernacular where possible.

It was asked if there was a guide that Council officers would seek as appropriate design. The Senior Conservation Officer noted there was an internal guide that officers may use, but there were various books on contemporary Cotswold design. It was noted that the traditional structures of the Council were quite simple in design, and the current application did not fit with this. The Interim Development Management Manager noted that the suitability of the application depended on the policies of the Council which were recognised by all officers.

It was asked if the dialogue with the applicant had been extensive and had reached the end of the process in regard to the design. The Senior Conservation Officer noted the pre-application that had been received, and that various suggestions had been provided for the design. It was highlighted that there had been changes to the historic barn but not of the contemporary housing other than the installation of solar panels.

Member Comments

Planning and Licensing Committee
11/December2024

It was noted that it was pleasing to see a Parish Council supporting a development for new housing.

It was highlighted that the applicant needed to listen to the advice of Council officers in regard to the design, and there would be an opportunity for a new application to come back to the Committee with some of the changes requested.

There were various comments that the site could be developed to enhance the area, and to develop upon the need for affordable housing with a change of design.

There were some comments that the Parish Council had done a lot of work to support the application and to allay some of the concerns highlighted.

It was asked whether the application could be deferred to sort the application. It was noted by the Interim Development Management Manager that ordinarily this wouldn't be considered unless there was a specific point to address.

Councillor Mark Harris proposed that the Committee should accept the officer's recommendation to refuse the application, and this was seconded by Councillor Julia Judd.

24/00066/FUL - New Barn Farm, Temple Guiting (Resolution)		
RESOLVED: That the Planning and Licensing Committee REFUSED the application.		
For	Ray Brassington, David Fowles, Mark Harris, Julia Judd, Andrew Maclean, Gary Selwyn, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	8
Against	Patrick Coleman and Daryl Corps	2
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

79 Sites Inspection Briefing

There were no sites inspection briefings planned.

80 Licensing Sub-Committee

There were no Licensing Sub-Committees planned.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 3.10 pm

Planning and Licensing Committee
11/December2024

Chair

(END)