

PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE
8th December 2021
ADDITIONAL PAGES UPDATE

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

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS ON SCHEDULE ITEMS : Page 57 - 58		
Item:	Ref No:	Content:
07	21/00522/FUL (Dutch Barn Nr Hookshouse Lane Charlton Down Tetbury)	<p>RELEVANT APPEAL DECISION –</p> <p>The Class R Appeal (ref. 3188502) for application ref. 17/02087/FUL as referenced within the Officer Report is available within the online case file</p> <p>This document is available to view within the online case file - https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/planning-andbuilding/planning-permission/view-planning-applications/</p> <p>FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED –</p> <p>Three further third party objections received relating to –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning history of the site; • Contrary to Local Plan Policies and the NPPF; • Highways initially advised refusal; • Officer is wrong to accept the change of use permitted by Class R; • There remains a democratic route to protecting the local and national policies from being neutered; • Application should be refused; • Permission would create a precedent; • Appeal decision for another Dutch barn (ref 17/02087/FUL) is different to what is being assessed; • Works go beyond what is necessary; • EC6 and EC3 should still be applied; • ‘Hibbitt’ conversion case law should be taken into consideration; • This application is not about the operation of the café it is about the building works necessary to build it; • Design; • Harm to AONB; • Design not in line with Historic England advice for barn conversions; • Light spill; • Highway safety impacts; and • Inconsistencies between the plans submitted for the Class R approval at the site and the current application

		<p>These representations are available to view within the online case file - https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/planning-andbuilding/planning-permission/view-planning-applications/</p> <p>CASE OFFICER UPDATES -</p> <p>The application (Ref. 18/03198/FUL) referred to in Point 8.4 of the Committee Report was refused by the Planning Committee in November 2018 and not June 2018.</p> <p>(Report Formatting Errors)</p> <p>The first word of Point 8.56 of the Committee Report should be 'Policy' and not 'olicy'.</p> <p>In Section 10 (Proposed Conditions), 13 conditions are proposed, and not 14 as shown in the Committee Report.</p> <p>Condition 3 is split into conditions 3 and 4. This is a formatting error. Condition 3 should read</p> <p>'Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the detailed design and/or specification of the following items shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>(a) Window design details (including heads and cills, materials, finishes, and manner of opening);</p> <p>(b) Door design details (including heads and cills, materials, finishes, and manner of opening);</p> <p>(c) Rainwater goods, (including materials, sections and finish); and</p> <p>(d) Boundary (including gates) and surface materials treatments</p> <p>The design and details shall be accompanied by drawings to a minimum scale of 1:5 with full size moulding cross section profiles, elevations and sections. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and shall be retained as such thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: In light of the above details not being submitted at determination stage for consideration and approval, this condition, which has been agreed with the applicant, is necessary to ensure that the works are completed in a manner sympathetic to the site and its surroundings, in accordance with Policies EN1, EN2, EN4, EN5, and EN12 of the Local Plan and Sections 12, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'</p> <p>As a result, the subsequent conditions are incorrectly numbered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition 5 should be numbered as condition 4; • Condition 6 should be numbered as condition 5; and so on.
--	--	---