



Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on 12 May 2021

In accordance with relevant legislation, these minutes are a record of decisions taken. They are not intended to be a verbatim account of the meeting. A full recording of the meeting can be accessed at www.cotswold.gov.uk.

Councillors present:

Juliet Layton - Chair

Ray Brassington - Vice-Chair

Patrick Coleman

Stephen Hirst

Roly Hughes

Nikki Ind

Sue Jepson

Julia Judd

Richard Keeling

Andrew Maclean

Gary Selwyn

Clive Webster

Observers:

Lisa Spivey (until 1.20pm)

Officers present:

Team Leader - Development Management

Interim Head of Legal Services

Conservation and Design Consultant

Gloucestershire Highways Officer

Senior Case Officers

Case Officer

Planning Technician

Democratic Services

PL.118 Apologies had been received from Councillors Ind and Neill.

PL.119 **Substitute Members**

Councillor Maclean substituted for Councillor Ind.

Councillor Hughes substituted for Councillor Neill.

PL.120 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers.

PL.121 **Minutes**

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 14 April 2021 be approved as a correct record.

Record of Voting - for 9, against 0, abstention 2, absent 0.

PL.122 Chair's Announcements

The Chair advised the Committee of the appropriate procedure to ensure a Covid-safe meeting within the Council Chamber and on the operation of the new microphones and webcasting system.

PL.123 Schedule of Applications

21/00836/FUL

Demolition of existing rear extensions and erection of two storey and single storey extensions to rear and addition of porch to front at 4 London Road, Ampney Crucis, Cirencester, GL7 5RS

The Case Officer drew attention to additional information and then displayed a map of the site, existing elevations and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

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

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. She explained that the property was not currently the most beautiful in design but was required to be determined by the Committee in the fairness of balance.

In response to various questions it was reported that the Conservation Officer considered the building was of historic interest and typical in its design but was not considered to be of significance to warrant listing or as a non-designated heritage asset having regard to Local Plan Policy EN12; the application property and neighbouring property were believed to have been built at the same time, but Officers could not confirm if the properties had been connected historically; Officers considered that the proposals did not represent over-development of the site; there was no current policy which required energy efficiency, but this was being reviewed within the Local Plan review and the application's proposals had to meet and pass the relevant policies, which Officers considered it did.

A Member commented that there were benefits arising from the application, particularly in relation to the addition of a porch and the use of natural stone walling.

Another Member commented that he considered the design still fell short of what should be expected within a conservation area.

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

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again but advised she had no further comments to make.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 10, against 1, abstention 0, absent 0.

20/02709/FUL

Change of use of a residential garage to a holiday let and associated external alterations at Garage 15 Main Street, Coln St Aldwyns, GL7 5AN

The Case Officer drew attention to additional information and then displayed a site location plan, existing block plans, elevations and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

A representative from the Parish Council, an Objector and the Agent were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was not present at the meeting.

In response to various questions it was reported that there was a further property behind the site which would be overlooked and hence the request from Officers for the proposed windows to be glazed, in addition to the top part of the garage doors; the 22-metre distance ruling did not apply to front windows, but Officers had considered the possible amenity impact, which Officers did not consider would be significant; there was space for two cars to park in front of the existing garage space on private land; the harm from parking in the area surrounding the site was considered to be historic; Officers did not consider the garages were actively used for the parking of vehicles; Highway Officers estimated parking was available for approximately 20 vehicles on the street and the harm of parking was not considered to be severe and to therefore warrant refusal; there was no requirement for holiday let providers to provide outside amenity for guests; if the opacity of the windows was not sufficient this would be considered to be a breach of condition; the property was not considered by Officers to be suitable for use as a permanent dwelling as was below minimum space standards and did not have outside space amenity; the onus was on the Applicant to ensure conditions were complied with; the Committee could approve planning permission, but the proposals would need to meet Building Regulations and if not, the permission could not be fulfilled; the internal space standards for the residential use of the building were considered to be more flexible as the property would not be in permanent occupation; building space standards, nevertheless, applied regardless of tenure, which was a material planning consideration; electric vehicle charging points and cycle storage were not standard requirements but could be requested by the Committee and waste would be dealt with via domestic residential collections.

A Member commented that he was supportive of the option of having dedicated bin storage and raised concern that tenancy regularly changing could lead to issues of excessive waste building up at the site.

Another Member commented that he considered insulating the building to modern standards would lose approximately three square feet from the property's size.

A different Member explained that he considered the application should be refused due to the impact of additional holiday accommodation on the village. He added that he also considered the proposals failed to satisfy amendable space standards and that the proposals would also not enhance the conservation area. It was also considered that the loss of privacy should be added to the reasons for refusal.

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

Refused on grounds of i) inappropriateness of building and for conversion to proposed use causing harm to amenity and character & appearance of Conservation Area, and ii) harm to the vitality of the settlement by a further unit of holiday let accommodation.

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

Note:

The reason was contrary to the Officer's recommendation for the reasons outlined above.

21/00301/FUL

Conversion to ancillary accommodation at Ampneyfield Farm, Ampney Crucis, Cirencester, GL7 5EA

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of the site and then displayed an aerial photograph and location plan, proposed plans, survey and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

A representative from the Parish Council was then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. She explained that she considered it was important that concerns raised by the Parish Council were addressed by the Committee's deliberation, particularly in relation to windows and the conservation of the barn.

In response to various questions it was reported that if the Applicant wished to turn the property into a holiday let, this would require a further planning application and the proposals would need to be considered on its merits; there was a further barn located to the south west of the application site; there was no indication from the Applicant that the application had been submitted in the intention of using the property as a short term holiday let; the historic core of the building was considered to be pre-1750; Conservation Officers considered the proposed storage use for the building was an ideal, non-intensive use that ensured the preservation of the barn and Planning and Conservation Officers would be responsible for ensuring that if permission was granted, the historic elements of the building remained protected; the barn doors were not considered to be historic.

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

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again but advised she had no further comments to make.

Approved, as recommended.

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

21/00302/LBC

Conversion to ancillary accommodation at Ampneyfield Farm, Ampney Crucis, Cirencester, GL7 5EA

The Case Officer had no further comments to make on the application in addition to those made under the previous item.

A representative from the Parish Council was invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member did not wish to make any further comments.

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

In response to a specific Member's question, Officers reported that any windows proposed for the application site were not considered to be characteristic for the building.

Approved, as recommended.

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

20/04402/FUL

Single storey side and rear extensions, new porch, and associated ancillary development, and detached double garage at Kernow, Ampney Crucis, Cirencester, GL7 5SA

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of the site and then displayed a map, existing and proposed site plans, existing and proposed elevations and photographs of the site from various vantage points. The Case Officer also advised of an error within the report, which referred to 'town' as opposed to 'parish' council.

A representative from the Parish Council and the Agent were then invited to address the Committee.

The Ward Member, who did not serve on the Committee, was then invited to address the Committee. She commented that she considered the property was not intended to be of a vintage style when constructed in the 1970s and that a Methodist chapel that previously occupied the site had been removed in the 1990s. The Ward Member added that she considered the Committee was required to balance whether the proposed garage would be detrimental to the conservation area, despite Kernow itself not being located within the conservation area. She concluded that the property was in a prominent position and the proposals required careful balancing when considering their possible impact.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that Officers had discussed demolition of the property with the Applicant but this option had not been supported by the Applicant; the garage was considered to be more prominent than Kernow itself; the proposal drawings specified natural or reconstituted stone; granting partial permission for the proposals excluding the garage was not considered appropriate by Officers as the Committee should consider determining the application in its entirety and if any part warranted refusal due to harm, then no

permission should be granted; the installation of a car port had not been considered by Officers; Officers had received a copy of the Construction Management Plan, the logistics of which were required to be provided by the Applicant; the requirement to install an electric vehicle charging point within the garage was for Members to consider if they felt reasonable and necessary to include; Members should not consider the quantum of the CIL contribution when determining any application and Officers were not aware of any proposed external lighting included within the proposals for the garage.

A Member commented that he considered that the Committee's role was to not discourage applicants from making and submitting applications and therefore expressed that he supported approval of the application.

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

Various Members commented regarding the difference and suitability of natural and reconstituted stone for the construction, if the Committee were minded to approve the application. The Chair highlighted to the Committee that the Applicant had offered to construct the buildings in natural stone as a first choice, so therefore this statement should be accepted by the Committee.

A Member requested that a condition be added to the Proposition to approve the application, that the buildings be constructed in natural stone and with a requirement for a vehicle charging point to be provided at the site to assist mitigation of the garage.

On being put to the vote, the Amendment was SUPPORTED, The record of voting was as follows:-

For 8, against 1, abstentions 2, absent 0.

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again. In doing so, she explained that if the Committee were in any doubt as to the suitability of the proposals, then the Committee should be minded to undertake a Sites Inspection Briefing. She added that if the Committee were looking to approve the application, then the Applicant should be encouraged to work with the neighbours and local community to minimise any disruption.

Approved, as recommended, with additional conditions to i) ensure use of natural stone walling for garage and ii) require the provision of electric vehicle charging point.

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

21/00646/FUL

Erection of an agricultural livestock barn at Church Farm, Little Rissington, GL54 2ND

The Case Officer reminded the Committee of the location of the site and then displayed an aerial photograph and map of the site, site plan, proposed elevations and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The Committee Officer then read out comments on behalf of the Agent and an Objector.

The Ward Member, who was serving on the Committee as a Substitute, was then invited to address the Committee. He explained that there had been a large amount of public response to the application and advised that the Committee had previously approved an application for the site to convert the existing barns into 8 houses, though the work for which had not yet been started by the Applicant. He added that the Parish Council were concerned in relation to the volume of traffic that would use the access roads, but that the current application for farm use would not increase this volume greatly. The Ward Member concluded that the barns were still being used for agricultural purposes and therefore the Committee should support the application.

In response to various questions from Members it was reported that the application had been presented to the Committee in accordance with the current Protocol and Scheme of Delegation which stated that if issues raised relating to an application could not, in the opinion of the Senior Officer responsible for Planning, be resolved by condition or negotiation, then it should be presented to the Committee for decision. The application was required due to the barn being used for the keeping of livestock and being situated 400 yards from nearby dwellings, which were not the main farmhouse.

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

The Ward Member was invited to address the Committee again but advised he had no further comments to make.

Approved, as recommended.

Record of Voting - for 9, against 1, abstention 1, absent 0.

(i) Additional Representations

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

(ii) Public Submissions

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

21/00836/FUL)	Gareth Hughes (Agent)
20/02709/FUL)	Clare Brignall (Parish Council)
)	Raymond Michael (Objector)
)	Kath Slater (Agent)
20/00402/FUL)	Andrew Pywell (Agent)
21/00646/FUL)	Archie Bell (Objector)

) Duncan Macleod (Agent)

PL.124 Sites Inspection Briefings (Members for Wednesday 2 June 2021)

It was noted that Members for the Sites Inspection Briefing on 2 June 2021 (if required) would be confirmed following the appointment of the Committee for Council Year 2021-22 at the Annual Council Meeting taking place on 26 May 2021.

PL.125 Licensing Sub-Committees (Members for Wednesday 23 June 2021)

It was noted that Members for the Licensing Sub-Committee on 23 June 2021 (if required) would be confirmed following the appointment of the Committee for Council Year 2021-22 at the Annual Council Meeting taking place on 26 May 2021.

It was also noted that Councillors Hirst, Judd, Layton, Neill and Webster would represent the Committee at the virtual Licensing Sub-Committee meeting on 19 May 2021.

PL.126 Other Business

There was no other business.

The Meeting commenced at 10.00am and closed at 1.40pm.

Chair

(END)