



## Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday, 10 January 2024

### Councillors present:

Ray Brassington – Chair  
Dilys Neill  
Michael Vann  
Mark Harris

Patrick Coleman – Vice- Chair  
Ian Watson  
Gary Selwyn  
Julia Judd

David Fowles  
Daryl Corps  
Andrew Maclean

### Officers present:

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

Helen Blundell, Interim Head of Legal Services  
Wayne Campbell, Planning Consultant

### **34 Apologies**

Before commencing onto apologies, the Chair introduced the Committee.

There were no apologies.

### **35 Substitute Members**

Before commencing onto apologies, the Chair introduced the Committee.

There were no apologies.

### **36 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **37 Minutes**

Members requested that the resolution on item 32 be amended to “RESOLVED: To permit the application”

Members also requested that the Chair and Vice-Chair be identified.

Members commented on the use of pronouns being ‘they’ as default. The Vice-Chair stated that the use of gender-neutral pronouns was common in many public organisations. The Senior Democratic Services Officer confirmed that avoiding gendered pronouns was a matter of Council policy.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE the minutes

Voting Record – For 9, Against 0, Abstain 2

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Andrew Maclean		Councillor Dilys Neill
Councillor Daryl Corps		Councillor Ray Brassington
Councillor David Fowles		
Councillor Patrick Coleman		
Councillor Gary Selwyn		
Councillor Ian Watson		
Councillor Julia Judd		
Councillor Mark Harris		
Councillor Michael Vann		

**38 Chair's Announcements (if any)**

There were no Chair's announcements.

**39 Public questions**

There were no public questions.

**40 Member questions**

There were no member questions.

**41 23/02137/FUL- Valley View, Chapel Street, Maugersbury**

The application was for the erection of a side and rear extension at Valley View, Chapel Street, Maugersbury, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL54 1HR.

The recommendation was to permit the application.

The Case Officer introduced the application, and highlighted additional representations included in the agenda supplement, as well as the update to the NPPF. The Case Officer explained that for the purpose of the application, the changes to the NPPF only affected the paragraph numbers referenced, not the wording of the policies.

The Case Officer highlighted that the application had been on the agenda for the meeting of the Committee held on 11 October 2023, but had been withdrawn due to a lack of a heritage statement. This was subsequently submitted by the applicant on 3 November 2023, after which a full 21 day re-consultation was carried out by the Council. The comments received during the re-consultation had been included in the agenda pack and additional papers.

The Case Officer explained that the site was situated within the Stow on the Wold Conservation area, the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and was a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. The site was also in proximity to a grade II listed building.

Hugh Chapman, an objector, addressed the Committee.

Richard Booher, the applicant's agent, then addressed the Committee.

Councillor Dilys Neill, the ward member, addressed the Committee highlighting the local representations made by both sides in the village and the issues the Committee to consider.

Before continuing onto member questions, members who attended the Sites Inspection Briefing (SIB) summarised their findings. Members stated that they felt the SIB added to their understanding of the potential impact on the Conservation Area and the listed building in proximity. Members stated that the current building was very small and not suitable for modern living standards, which the proposed extension would seek to remedy. Members made reference to the gap in the streetscape, which was important.

### Member Questions

Members made reference to the large percentage increase that the extension would result in and asked for further clarification from officers as to the policies around this. The Interim Development Manager highlighted the design code, which under DI9 stated that extension should be subservient, often in mass and height. Although the extension was large, in the officers' opinion, it was sympathetically designed and therefore in accordance with the design code and Policy EN1 on non-designated heritage assets.

Members stated that some neighbouring properties had been extended and asked whether the officer had taken this into account in their recommendations. The Officer confirmed this to be the case, but that the design in the application was ultimately what had led to their recommendation. It was explained that a previous application had caused the Conservation Officer to object, but that the applicant then amended the design, and the Conservation Officer withdrew their objections as a result.

Members asked about the gap in the streetscape, which the Case Officer stated would be reduced but still remain, and the character of the Conservation Area would remain. The gap was confirmed to be an important aspect of the Conservation Area.

Members also asked about the energy efficiency of the building. The Case Officer stated that the efficiency would be improved through the application and that the applicant had provided an Energy Statement in support of the application. It was confirmed that this would form part of the approved documents in the event that permission was granted.

### Member Comments

Some Members stated that the character would be changed through the relocation of windows. They added that the extension could lead to the loss of a small, affordable dwelling.

Councillor Andrew Maclean proposed that the application be permitted.

Councillor Mark Harris seconded the proposal.

Members stated that there would be benefit in extending the house due to the fact that the existing property was too small for modern living standards and in poor condition.

Planning and Licensing Committee  
10/January2024

Members also added that the extension would still result in a modestly sized dwelling.

Members asked if the design of the dormer window could be re-evaluated. The Interim Development Manager stated that if Members thought that otherwise the application would be refused, this could be done, but added that it was in keeping with the design code. Members chose to then not pursue this point further.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT the application

Voting record- For 9, Against 1, Abstain 1

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Andrew Maclean	Councillor Julia Judd	Councillor Dilys Neill
Councillor Daryl Corps		
Councillor David Fowles		
Councillor Patrick Coleman		
Councillor Gary Selwyn		
Councillor Ian Watson		
Councillor Ray Brassington		
Councillor Mark Harris		
Councillor Michael Vann		

**42 Sites Inspection Briefing**

A Sites Inspection Briefing was not required.

**43 Licensing Sub-Committee**

A Licensing Sub-Committee was not required.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 3.03 pm

Chair

(END)