



Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday, 26 April 2023.

Councillors present:

Ray Brassington (Chair)
Mark Harris
Stephen Hirst
Sue Jepson

Patrick Coleman (Vice-Chair)
Julia Judd
Andrew Maclean
Dilys Neill

Gary Selwyn
Steve Trotter
Clive Webster

Officers present:

David Morren, Interim Development Manager
Caleb Harris, Senior Democratic Services
Officer
Ana Prelici, Democratic Services Officer

Andrew Moody, Senior Planning Case Officer
Harrison Bowley, Senior Planning Case Officer
Mike Napper, Development Management

185 Apologies

No Apologies were received

186 Substitute Members

There were no substitute members.

187 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Brassington declared that he knew the agent on the Tunnel House application from his previous employment at the Council but added that he had never socialised with him.

Councillor Webster declared that he had a seat on the Cotswold national landscape board.

Councillors Harris and Judd had declared that they had worked with the Bathurst Estate in the past.

188 Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes from the meeting held on the 8th of March were approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

VOTING RECORD: 10 for, 1 abstention

Councillor Webster noted that two additional members should have abstained, as they were not present at the meeting. There was no revote, as the resolution would have passed anyway, but the Chair confirmed this would be noted in the minutes.

189 Chair's Announcements (if any)

As this was the last meeting of the Committee for the municipal cycle, the Chair thanked all the members for their co-operation, and wished those who would not be returning well for the future.

The Chair also announced that Mike Napper would be retiring after 30 years at the Council. He was remarked upon as being always professional, friendly and polite. The chair thanked him for all his work and his assistance during his tenure as Chair.

190 Public questions

There were no Public Questions.

191 Member questions

There are no member questions.

192 22/03495/FUL - Land West Of Worwell Farmhouse, Cirencester Road

The application was for a mixed use development comprising a healthcare facility, 27 dwellings (including 11 affordable units), landscaping, site access, internal estate road and associated works at Land West Of Worwell Farmhouse Cirencester Road Tetbury Gloucestershire GL8 8RY.

The recommendation was for DELEGATED PERMISSION subject to i) completion of S106 in respect of Affordable Housing, ii) completion of S106 in respect of library contribution, and iii) confirmation of Local Highways Authority comments.

The Senior Case Officer introduced the item, listing the updates that had been distributed through supplements. The case officer highlighted that an additional response had been received from the Local Highways Authority and circulated in the 'additional pages update' supplement pack. Not all members had time to consider these items, and did so during the meeting before the Case Officer introduced the report.

Public speakers

Mr Richard Barley had addressed the committee to object to the application, highlighting concerns about the loss of green space, and the mentioned the exclusivity deal that the applicant had entered. Mr Barley stated that he believed other sites should be considered for the development.

Ms Helen Young addressed the committee to support the application. Ms Young highlighted what she perceived to be the benefits of the development, making specific reference to the affordable housing and healthcare facility.

The ward member, Councillor Richard Norris had sent his apologies and did not address the committee.

Members' questions

Members asked whether neighbouring Ward Members had been invited to address the committee. The Interim Head of Legal Services advised that the protocol is limited to ward members.

Members discussed that the visual aspects to the site were important, but that the officer has no additional photographs of the pedestrian approach, and publicly available street photographs (eg. Google Maps) were out of date. Members therefore considered a site inspection briefing.

Members also discussed the exclusivity deal that the applicant had entered into. Officers advised that the healthcare provider had considered 19 other sites before entering into the exclusivity deal with the applicants. The Case Officer advised that the Committee can only take into consideration the application in front of them and is therefore not able to consider prospective sites. The Case Officer advised that the sequential test did not fully support the applicants argument that this was the only viable site. This had been taken into consideration when reviewing the application, however; the public benefit relating to the provision of a healthcare centre was afforded more limited weight in the planning balance as a result.

RESOLVED – To defer the item in order to carry out a full committee site inspection briefing.

For- 10, Against – 1, Abstain 0

Proposer- Councillor Mark Harris, Seconder Councillor Sue Jepson

193 21/03698/FUL - Tunnel House Inn

The application was for a single storey extension to both Inn and barn, and use of land for the siting of six accommodation units and associated works at Tunnel House Inn Coates Cirencester Gloucestershire GL7 6PW.

The recommendation was to permit the application.

The Major Developments Manager, as the Case Officer on the application, introduced the item and highlighted the materials that had been distributed in the additional pages update document.

As some members had not had time to read the additional documents, they were given time to read them before considering the item in the meeting.

Public Speakers

Councillor Mark Grimes, representing Rodmarton Parish Council, addressed the Committee to object to the application. Councillor Grimes made specific reference to the self-contained accommodation units, and potential damage to the surrounding countryside, as potential disruption to neighbouring residents from the hot tubs.

Ms Margaret Hopkins addressed the Committee to object to the application. Ms Hopkins objected to the proximity of the application to the canal bank, due to damage of the scenery, dark skies and the wild life.

Planning and Licensing Committee
26/April2023

Andrew Miles, who was the agent, spoke on behalf of the applicant. He highlighted that the purpose of the application was to keep the historic pub operational, and thereby preserve it. He highlighted that the design had been modified in consultation with the conservation officer, and that the ecologist and archaeologist who were all consulted with raised no objections.

Members' questions

Members asked whether there were any photographs of the approach. The Case Officer advised that none were available. Members therefore proposed to carry out a site visit, but asked further questions from the Case Officer, as it was advised that since the Case Officer was retiring, they would not have opportunity to do so after the site inspection briefing.

Members asked whether there would be no permitted development rights, and the Case Officer confirmed that this would be the case.

Members also asked about the hot tubs, and whether the use of these could be restricted in regard to time. The Case Officer advised that the Committee could condition to place restriction on these, or remove them altogether, but that there the disturbance of these would be minimal due to the existing disturbance from the pub.

Members asked whether, in the case of a potential refusal, the viability of the heritage asset would be threatened. The Case Officer advised that this would be the case, and that this is something members should take into account when deciding on the application.

Members noted the timescales associated with the application and mentioned the risk of non-determination. The Case Officer clarified that this was to do with the Beechwoods SSAC.

Members raised concerns over biodiversity, to which the Case Officer highlighted the landscaping plans, which are intended to enhance biodiversity, in addition to the conditioned ecological management plan for the woodland, which would be a new addition.

Members asked about the spread of domestic paraphernalia, and although they recognised that the conditions had already restricted the spread of this, they were concerned that guests could move furniture out onto the bank. The Case Officer advised that this would be possible to restrict through a condition.

RESOLVED – To defer the item in order to carry out a full committee site inspection briefing in order to evaluate access impact.

Voting Record- For 9, Against 2, Abstain 1

Proposer Councillor Mark Harris, Seconder Councillor Sue Jepson

194 22/01310/FUL - 1 Meadow Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1YA

The application was for the demolition of an existing garage and erection of a dwelling, first-floor gable roof extension to existing dwelling and associated works at 1 Meadow Road Cirencester Glos GL7 1YA.

The Officer recommendation was to permit the application.

Planning and Licensing Committee
26/April2023

The Senior Case Officer introduced the application and highlighted the additional information that had been circulated following the agenda, which was a photo of the view directly opposite to where the new entrance to the existing and proposed dwellings would be. There was also a further representation from an objector.

Public Speakers

Mr Nick Moffat addressed the Committee to support the application. Mr Moffat responded to several of the representations made in objecting to the application and highlighted that he believed the design to be in keeping with the surrounding area and that there would be no overlooking, as referenced in the Officer's report. Mr Moffat also made reference to the fact that off-street parking will be provided.

Councillor Gary Selwyn, as the ward member for the application, addressed the Committee. Councillor Selwyn highlighted long-standing issues with parking owing to the density of the area and the nearby nursery, and particularly noted visibility issues. Councillor Selwyn stated that there was therefore an unacceptable impact on highways.

Members Questions

Members noted the lack of an energy performance report, and asked the Case Officer why this had been lacking. The Case Officer apologised for the oversight, and stated that a condition to require this could be added if the application were to be permitted.

Members asked if the turning circle was functional for a standard sized car, which the Case Officer confirmed. Members also asked whether the turning circle would be retained, and the Case Officer confirmed that this had been conditioned accordingly.

Member Comments

Member highlighted the benefits of the application, meeting a demand for 3 bedroom housing and regenerating the area. Members also made reference to the fact that the development would have public transport links as it would be serviced by the number 51 bus.

Members suggested that the developers could engage with the nursery and local community to find a short-term solution to parking issues.

Members also explicitly noted that the nursery was a valuable community asset.

RESOLVED: To permit the application

Proposer -Councillor Julia Judd, Seconder Councillor Andrew Maclean

Voting record- For 9, Against 1, Abstain 1

195 Sites Inspection Briefing

The Committee noted that the Sites Inspection Briefing was to be held on the 7th of June, and that the members required for this would be confirmed in due course.

196 Licensing Sub-Committee

Planning and Licensing Committee

26/April2023

The Committee noted that a meeting of the Licensing Sub-committee would be taking place on the same day at 4.00pm.

The Meeting commenced at 10.00 am and closed at 12.46 pm

Chair

(END)