



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

**Councillors present:**

Ray Brassington (Chair)  
Patrick Coleman  
Joe Harris  
Stephen Hirst

Julia Judd (Vice Chair)  
Sue Jepson  
Andrew Maclean  
Dilys Neill

Gary Selwyn  
Steve Trotter  
Clive Webster

**Officers present:**

Mike Napper - Development Management  
Andrew Moody - Case Officer  
Charlotte Bowles-Lewis - Case Officer  
Caleb Harris, Democratic Services  
Wayne Smith, Democratic Services

Helen Blundell, Principal Solicitor

**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.

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 9<sup>th</sup> 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 had been deferred to the next meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> 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, as the application was under Appeal for non-determination, the Planning Inspectorate be advised that the application would have been refused, if the Local Planning Authority had been able to make the 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 with corrections and an additional supporter was noted.

The application was 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 a tree.

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 be affected by the appeal proposal.

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 Planning team outlined by Pegasus Group.

The Case Officer informed the Committee that the Forward Planning 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 had already been considered for housing within the village.

The Committee noted the response from the Case Officer regarding why the Committee had not been able to examine 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 an open space within the village.

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 officer's 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 was the Case Officer who presented to the Committee.

The objection comments from Mickleton Parish Council, which were originally omitted from the additional pages, were read out to the Committee.

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 site frontage.

It was noted that officers felt that the plans were proportionate and that they would not result in a significant impact on the wider site context.

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 asked the Lead Officer, Mike Napper, about whether the permitted development rights were normally removed in estate-scale developments. It was noted that each site needs to be considered on its own merits to assess whether these rights need to be removed in part or in full.

The Committee asked the officer about proposals in high density areas 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. The Lead Officer also noted that restrictions to working hours could potentially delay the completion of developments.

The Committee asked about why the energy performance of the house was not in the report as this was part of the NPPF. The Lead Officer noted the comments, which would be reinforced by the completion of the Local Plan review.

It was noted by some Members of the Committee that the issues raised are relatively minor and would not be likely to be defensible in the event of an appeal.

It was noted that the proposal seemed to be an efficient use of the land available to it.

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 Councillor Jepson that a site inspection panel visit should be made 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

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

Councillor Webster proposed a condition in the recommendation for 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 that an Informative Note be attached to encourage the wiring for an electric car charging point to be integrated into the construction. 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 Note was approved.

Item 4 21/04349/FUL

The Lead Officer introduced the additional comments 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 Conservation Officer 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. The Conservation Officer stated that the response given from the applicant was that they would be double-glazed. However the specification regarding specific thermal efficiency was not known.

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

There were queries raised about the use of the outbuilding and whether this could be used to provide ancillary accommodation. It was confirmed that the use of the outbuilding on the current site would be used for ancillary domestic accommodation.

The Committee noted 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 from a loss of historic fabric standpoint, it was the view of the Committee that the application had net heritage benefits for the Listed building and its setting, and as part of its long-term viability.

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

The conditions identified by officers were given to the Committee. These would include samples of materials, door and window details and sample panels. The Committee was content to delegate the reasonably necessary conditions to officers.

#### **Vote**

**11 for, 0 against, 0 abstention.**

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

Item 4 21/04350/LBC

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 thick. 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.

The Committee was content to delegate reasonably necessary conditions to officers. Councillor Jepson and Councillor Judd proposed that it would be permitted with delegated authority to officers in respect of the conditions.

#### **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 Case 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 Case Officer noted that there was a balance in energy, efficiency and design when considering applications of this nature. However, the guidance for listed buildings is continually under review to reflect that balance.

The Committee further noted that there were no energy efficiency standards listed in the report which was a disappointment. The officer noted the request and that this could be part of the public benefit in relation to the long-term preservation of the building.

The Committee noted that agreement was reached for windows on the side of the house, but the application excluded the front windows. However, the owner was at liberty to submit a further application 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.

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 4<sup>th</sup> May

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/April2022

**93**      **Licensing Sub-Committee**

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

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 5.00 pm

Chair

(END)