

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday, 12 January 2022.

Councillors present:

Ray Brassington - Chair	Julia Judd - Vice Chair	
Patrick Coleman	Sue Jepson	Gary Selwyn
Mark Harris	Juliet Layton	Steve Trotter
Stephen Hirst	Andrew Maclean	Clive Webster

Officers present:

Susan Gargett, Interim Head of Legal Services
Caleb Harris, Strategic Support Officer
Amy Hill, Planning Case Officer
Hannah Rose, Senior Case Officer
Ben Patel-Sadler, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Deborah Smith, Development & Planning Enforcement Manager

Observers:

Councillors Lisa Spivey and David Cunningham (Ward Members)

62 Apologies

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Dilys Neill.

63 Substitute Members

Councillor Mark Harris was substituting for Councillor Dilys Neill.

64 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest from Members or Officers.

65 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on the 8 December 2021 were agreed as a true, accurate record.

Record of Voting – for: 11, against: 0, abstention: 0, absent: 1.

66 Chair's Announcements (if any)

There were no announcements made by the Chair.

67 Schedule of Applications

21/00949/FUL

Dukes Field, Land To The South Of The Pheasantry, Oak Road, Down Ampney, Gloucestershire

The Senior Case Officer, Hannah Rose, introduced the application:

Erection of 10 dwellings with associated access drives and drainage at Dukes Field, Land To The South Of The Pheasantry, Oak Road, Down Ampney, Glos..

The Committee further noted the location relating to the application, the current view of the site and the proposed style of the new buildings.

The Committee noted that solar panels would be installed on the south and west facing elevations.

The Committee further noted the proposed parking arrangements associated with the development and the additions to the existing footways which would be completed if the application was approved.

The following people addressed the Committee:

Councillor Ray Jenkins (Parish Council)

Gareth Cope (Objector)

Mike Glen (Applicant)

Councillor Lisa Spivey (Ward Member)

The Committee noted that if the number of houses associated with the application were reduced, the affordable homes would not be constructed as part of the development.

In relation to flooding and drainage, the Committee noted that the local flood authority had confirmed that the proposed development would meet statutory drainage requirements (filtration rates).

A number of Members referred to the density of development proposed, as the Ward Member and public speakers had referenced this in their comments. The Case Officer had not calculated the density of development but reiterated that the form of development was considered to be acceptable for the site and the locality.

The Development & Planning Enforcement Manager advised the Committee not to focus on the density percentage, but rather, consider whether or not the layout, form and scale of development was acceptable for the site, in terms of its visual impact.

The Committee noted the location of the bungalow on the proposed development.

The Committee noted that the local flood authority and Thames Water had raised no objections in relation to the drainage related to the proposed development.

Members noted that Officers would periodically check with Thames Water to determine what modifications were due to be made to the existing network when new housing developments were constructed.

The Committee noted that Gloucestershire County Council had not raised any objections in relation to this application from a drainage perspective..

The Committee noted the importance of applicants/developers incorporating carbon reduction measures as part of any future developments rather than attempting to retrofit buildings in the future (the installation of air source heat pumps rather than gas fired boilers for example).

The Committee further noted that in relation to garages, it was at the discretion of the applicant to outline the inclusion of these (or not) as part of the application process.

The Committee noted that it was the responsibility of the applicant to work with the Highways Authority to confirm who would be legally responsible for the future maintenance of any new footways as part of new housing developments.

The Committee noted that for future meetings where Member questions may need to be provided with specialist advice from external subject experts, Officers would undertake a judgement (based on the nature of applications) to invite subject experts to attend where possible.

It was the view of some Members of the Committee that the application included ample car parking.

The Committee acknowledged the importance of ensuring that any required, new housing developments were delivered whilst being cognisant of the need to complement existing buildings and landscapes.

Councillor Coleman proposed that the application be refused for the reason that, by virtue of the scale, form and layout of the development proposed, the proposals did not reflect the local context and were therefore visually harmful on this edge of settlement site. There would be an expectation for a transition of built form to the open countryside and beyond. The proposed development was therefore contrary to local plan policy.

This was seconded by Councillor Juliet Layton.

Record of Voting - for: 7, against: 4, abstention: 0, absent: 1.

The application was refused.

21/02440/FUL

Comberow Cottage, Church Road, Icomb, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, GL54 1JL

The Planning Case Officer, Amy Hill, introduced the application:

Two-storey side extension, alterations to front porch, replacement windows and associated works at Comberow Cottage, Church Road, Icomb, Gloucestershire, GL54 1JL.

The Committee noted the additional update paper which provided comments from the occupier of the neighbouring property.

The Planning Case Officer introduced the site, including the location of the property in relation to the neighbouring buildings, the current view of the site and drawings of the proposed works. These drawings included the existing and proposed block plans and the existing and proposed elevations relating to the application.

The following people addressed the Committee:

Richard Papp (Objector)

Victoria Campbell (Applicant)

Councillor David Cunningham (Ward Member)

The Committee noted that the main difference with the current application and one application made in 2006 which was permitted in relation to the same property was that the 2006 application did not have the dormer window to the front of the property, with the footprints of both applications being slightly different.

The Committee noted that in relation to the proposed application, there were no additional windows included which would be directly looking over the courtyard area of the neighbouring property.

The Committee noted that a proposed condition of the application was that the outer wall was required to be constructed of natural stone. Building Regulations in relation to wall insulation would need to be met.

The Committee noted that they could not condition opaque glass on windows not requiring planning permission. The Committee further noted that the roof lights shown on the drawings did not require planning permission.

The Committee requested and were shown the available photographs of the neighbouring property (Lawn Cottage).

The Committee noted that both properties were originally constructed in the late 1800s.

Planning and Licensing Committee
12/January2022

In relation to the proposed roofline, the Committee noted that the proposed extension would sit slightly lower than the existing building so it would remain clear which section of the building was original and which part had been added at a later date. This would have been a requirement sought by Officers as part of the application process.

The Committee noted that a sunlight assessment had been conducted which resulted in the proposed development being considered acceptable in this regard (this included sunlight entering through windows and sunlight on amenity space).

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed that a Panel site visit be undertaken due to the difficulty of judging 'overbearing' without physically attending the application site.

This was seconded by Councillor Sue Jepson.

Record of Voting - for: 7, against: 3, abstention: 1, absent: 1.

The application was deferred until after a Panel site visit inspection takes place on 2 February 2022.

68 Sites Inspection Briefing

The Committee noted that a Sites Inspection Briefing would take place on 2 February 2022.

69 Licensing Sub-Committees

The Committee noted the rota for attendance at the Licensing Sub-Committee on the 26 January 2022 (if the meeting was required).

The meeting commenced at 10:00am and closed at 11:50am

Chair

(END)