

# TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held at the Council Offices,  
Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Thursday, 31 August 2017 commencing  
at 9:00 am**

**Present:**

Chair

Councillor J H Evetts

**and Councillors:**

R E Allen (Substitute for R D East), P W Awford (Substitute for Mrs J Greening), Mrs G F Blackwell, D M M Davies, M Dean, D T Foyle, R Furolo, Mrs M A Gore, Mrs R M Hatton, Mrs A Hollaway, Mrs E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, A S Reece, Mrs P E Stokes, P D Surman, H A E Turbyfield (Substitute for T A Spencer), D J Waters and P N Workman

**PL.21 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- 21.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.
- 21.2 Members were reminded that, at its meeting on 17 May 2016, the Council had confirmed the Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committee as a permanent arrangement. The Chair gave a brief outline of the scheme and the procedure for Planning Committee meetings.

**PL.22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS**

- 22.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R D East, Mrs J Greening and T A Spencer. Councillors R E Allen, P W Awford and H A E Turbyfield would be acting as substitutes for the meeting.

**PL.23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 23.1 The Committee's attention was drawn to the Tewkesbury Borough Council Code of Conduct which was adopted by the Council on 26 June 2012 and took effect from 1 July 2012.

23.2 The following declarations were made:

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Application No./Item</b>	<b>Nature of Interest (where disclosed)</b>	<b>Declared Action in respect of Disclosure</b>
P W Awford	17/00448/OUT Deepfurrow House, Main Road, Minsterworth.  17/00104/OUT Land Adjacent to Rosedale House, Main Road, Minsterworth.	Is a Borough Councillor for the area.  Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor for the area.	Would speak and vote.
Mrs G F Blackwell	17/00550/FUL 11 Kaybourne Crescent, Churchdown.	Is a Member of Churchdown Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.  Lives in a neighbouring property.	Would not speak or vote and would leave the Chamber for the consideration of this item.
R Furolo	17/00201/FUL Green Lea, Green Street, Brockworth.	Is a Member of Brockworth Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
Mrs R M Hatton	17/00201/FUL Green Lea, Green Street, Brockworth.	Is a Member of Brockworth Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
J R Mason	16/01425/OUT Land to the East of Evesham Road, Greet.  16/01426/OUT Land to the East of Evesham Road, Greet.	Is a Member of Winchcombe Town Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
Mrs P E Stokes	17/00550/FUL 11 Kaybourne Crescent, Churchdown.	Is a Member of Churchdown Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.

H A E Turbyfield	17/00201/FUL Green Lea, Green Street, Brockworth.	Is a Borough Councillor for the area.  Had spoken with the applicant but had not expressed an opinion.	Would speak and vote.
------------------	---	--	--------------------------

- 23.3 The Legal Adviser indicated that several Members had queried whether they should make a declaration in respect of Item 1 – 16/01425/OUT – Land to the East of Evesham Road, Greet and Item 2 – 16/01426/OUT – Land to the East of Evesham Road, Greet, on the basis of the connection between one of the applicants and a Borough Councillor. She clarified that it was not necessary to make a declaration simply on that basis; however, Members should still apply the Code of Conduct and make any other declarations accordingly. No further declarations were made on this occasion.

#### **PL.24 MINUTES**

- 24.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 1 August 2017, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

#### **PL.25 DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - APPLICATIONS TO THE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

##### **Schedule**

- 25.1 The Development Manager submitted a Schedule comprising planning applications and proposals with recommendations thereon. Copies of this had been circulated to Members as Appendix A to the Agenda for the meeting. The objections to, support for, and observations upon the various applications as referred to in Appendix 1 attached to these Minutes were presented to the Committee and duly taken into consideration by Members prior to decisions being made on those applications.

##### **16/01425/OUT – Land to the East of Evesham Road, Greet**

- 25.2 This was an outline application for the erection of up to four dwellings and associated development with all matters reserved for future consideration except for access. It was noted that there had been no Committee Site Visit in respect of this application; however, the site had been visited in relation to the next item in the Schedule.
- 25.3 The Development Manager indicated that Members would have seen some of the appeal decisions received recently, the majority of which were reported in the Current Appeals and Appeal Decisions Update which appeared later on the Agenda. He explained that there had been some inconsistency in the way Inspectors had dealt with Policy HOU4 in particular, but also Policy LND2, which related to Special Landscape Areas and was applicable in this case. This was important because it affected whether the presumption in favour of sustainable development “tilted balance” applied. If relevant policies were considered out of date, the presumption in favour of sustainable development “tilted balance” did apply, irrespective of whether a five year deliverable supply of housing sites could be demonstrated. Whilst different Inspectors had dealt with the policies differently, this had not changed the way Officers dealt with Policy HOU4 – it remained their view that Policy HOU4 was not out of date and should be given considerable weight in planning decisions, as agreed by the Inspector who had dealt with the Mill Lane, Prestbury appeal. This was because Policy HOU4 was

consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in that it sought to protect the countryside and encourage sustainable patterns of development. This approach

appeared to be supported by the Secretary of State in the appeal decisions he had made recently.

- 25.4 In terms of this application specifically, Members would note from Paragraph 5.29 of the Officer report that there was an outstanding issue in respect of drainage. This matter had been discussed with the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Legal Adviser and it was considered that, as the applicant owned the land to the rear of the site, drainage issues could be addressed by a Grampian condition which may ultimately require easements to be provided by way of legal agreement. This proposal clearly conflicted with Policy HOU4 and would result in landscape harm as set out in the report; furthermore, it conflicted with the adopted Winchcombe and Sudeley Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) which was now part of the development plan. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act required applications to be dealt with in accordance with the development plan unless material planning considerations indicated otherwise. Given the conflict with Policies HOU4 and LND2, and Policy 3.1 of the newly adopted NDP, the presumption was that planning permission should be refused unless there were material considerations that suggested otherwise; any such considerations must be powerful due to the precedence given to the development plan by law. There was strong objection from the Town Council and further objections from consultees including the Landscape Officer and Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE), as well as 41 local residents and the local MP. Whilst there would be some minor benefits arising from the proposal in terms of the provision of housing and the associated economic benefits, this did not justify a departure from policy given the small scale nature of the scheme.
- 25.5 The Chair invited a local resident to address the Committee. She indicated that her comments also applied to the next item in the Schedule. The points she wished to raise had already been set out in the 41 objections from the residents of Greet. In terms of location, there had been significant new housing developments on the borders of Greet and 14 houses were currently being built in the village; residents felt that another development on this valued green space, outside of the recognised settlement boundary, would tip the balance from rural village to urban sprawl. The green areas, such as the development site, were important assets for both Winchcombe and Greet as they attracted tourists and walkers, as well as contributing to the wellbeing of residents. In the recommendations, the Planning Officers recognised the intrinsic value of the proposed development site and she wholeheartedly endorsed their view and conclusion on design and visual impact. With regard to highways and accessibility, the road was unsafe with an inadequate footpath, poor visibility and speeding traffic. In 2016, a Highways Officer had expressed serious concern about public safety after an inspection of the route between Winchcombe School and Greet. Whilst there may not have been any serious accidents recorded, a number of walkers had been hit by wing mirrors from speeding cars. This portion of the road had been closed the previous week, with traffic directed down Market Lane, giving her an opportunity to see the volume of traffic and high speed of many of the drivers first-hand. On the Evesham Road, some motorists had removed cones and proceeded despite the road closed signs. In respect of flood risk, many properties on Market Lane experienced ground water remaining at surface level for prolonged periods of time and many houses needed to use sandbags to prevent flooding. During periods of rain, water ran off the proposed site into the adjoining property on Evesham Road and the back garden was waterlogged. This would be exacerbated by the proposed development and there was no clear explanation of how drainage and run-off would be dealt with. The impact of the development was deemed to be negligible by ecological appraisal; that was the view which had been taken for each of the recent developments in Greet and she questioned whether the cumulative effect was being taken into account; this was one of the last open spaces in the village so if it was developed wildlife would surely be rare. Numerous species of animals and birds such as badgers, weasels, hedgehogs, bats, frogs, owls, kestrels and sparrow hawks had been seen in the fields, including the proposed site, and adjoining gardens. She expressed the view that, if this side of

Winchcombe continued to be developed, the area would no longer be an attractive place to live or visit.

- 25.6 The Chair invited the applicant's agent to address the Committee. As with the last speaker, he indicated that his comments would also apply to the next item in the Schedule. He recognised that the application was difficult for Officers and agreed with the Development Manager's comments regarding the inconsistency of recent appeal decisions. During the course of the application, the position in respect of being able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites had changed and the local NDP had been adopted. These changes had significantly altered the pre-application advice which his clients had received; this was disappointing as they had only decided to proceed with the application with the Officer's support, in principle. Whilst pre-application comments were not binding, they were material considerations and his clients had invested so much based on the Officer's advice. Furthermore, there was an alternative assessment of planning policy to that set out within the Officer report which could allow Members to support the application; the government had advised that NDPs which did not allocate housing should be considered out of date and the five year housing supply should not be considered as a target - even if the Council could demonstrate that supply, Inspectors had recently stated that this was not relevant as the Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan was out of date. The Council had advised in January 2017 that it could demonstrate a five year housing land supply but his clients had only been informed in June 2017 that this would change the pre-application advice in relation to this application and application ref: 16/01426/OUT which was on the same site. During this time they had provided a significant amount of requested information, particularly in relation to archaeology and drainage. He would not be asking Members to overrule the Officer's assessment if his clients had not acted faithfully on the original pre-application advice or provided so much additional information after the change in policy position. He noted from the Officer report that the Landscape Officer agreed a small residential scheme could be appropriate in this location and that the Urban Design Officer would prefer road frontage dwellings; given it was an outline application, this could be accommodated at the reserved matters stage, or the application could be amended. Without over-simplifying the pre-application advice, Officers had supported the site due to its proximity to Winchcombe and, whilst policy may have changed in the intervening period, the site location had not – it remained close to all of the facilities in Winchcombe and as close to the development site immediately opposite as it had when his clients had first approached Officers. For all of these reasons, he hoped Members could support the pre-application advice and permit the application.
- 25.7 The Development Manager agreed it was a difficult situation, and it was unfortunate that pre-application advice had been superseded by the approval of the Joint Core Strategy Main Modifications by Council in January, but this could happen when moving from one development plan or policy to another and, in this case, the pre-application advice was clearly out of date and could not be a material consideration in determining the application. The decision had to be made in the policy context as it was now, as set out in the report. A Member understood that the housing land supply requirement for an adopted NDP was three years, as opposed to five years. In response, the Development Manager indicated that this was only relevant when an NDP allocated land for housing; in the case of the Winchcombe and Sudeley NDP, all allocations had been removed before adoption. Notwithstanding this, the Legal Adviser also clarified the question over the application of policy given a three year supply was only relevant if the Council was unable to demonstrate a five year supply, which was not the case. A local Member indicated that, at a meeting held with residents during the formulation of the NDP, it had been suggested that any housing allocated to Winchcombe would have to be within Winchcombe Town. He questioned whether the fact that Greet had never been considered as a possible location for housing could leave the NDP open to challenge. The Development Manager advised that the Winchcombe and Sudeley NDP had been through examination and was adopted; there would have been many discussions leading up to that and, whilst all policies could be challenged, the plan

should be given full weight in making a decision on this application.

- 25.8 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to refuse the application and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer recommendation and, upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That the application be **REFUSED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

**16/01426/OUT – Land to the East of Evesham Road, Greet**

- 25.9 This was an outline application for the erection of up to 10 dwellings and associated development with all matters reserved for future consideration except for access. The Committee had visited the application site on Tuesday 29 August 2017.

- 25.10 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation was to refuse the application and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer recommendation and, upon being taken to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That the application be **REFUSED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

**17/00424/FUL – Land at Consell Green, Tewkesbury Road, Toddington**

- 25.11 It was noted that this application for the erection of five dwellings with garages, parking, improved vehicle access, access roads/footpath and landscape had been withdrawn.

**17/00452/OUT – Land to the North of Shuthonger Garage, A38 Pages Lane to Church End Lane, Shuthonger**

- 25.12 This was an outline application for four self-build dwellings with all matters reserved for future consideration except for vehicular access. The application had been deferred at the last Planning Committee meeting to allow Officers to properly digest the information received from the applicant's agent and to consider ways in which planning permission could be conditioned to restrict the houses to self-build dwellings only.

- 25.13 The Development Manager indicated that this was an unusual application and an issue which the Council had not particularly had to deal with before. Members would recall that the application had been deferred to give Officers the opportunity to consider an appeal decision relating to a site in Warminster which had been circulated on the evening before the last Planning Committee meeting, as well as to look at the possible restrictions that could be put in place. Officers agreed with the applicant that self-build could be given significant weight in decisions as it had by the Secretary of State in the Warminster appeal; however, having had chance to consider the Warminster decision fully, it was clear that the circumstances were significantly different in relation to this application. In the case of the appeal decision, the site was very close to the edge of Warminster itself and the Secretary of State had determined that it was an acceptable location for housing; that was not the case here given the clear conflict with Policy HOU4 and the identified landscape harm set out in the Officer report. Whilst the government's self-build policy and the legal requirements in relation to the self-build register, identifying need in the area, was recognised, this was not in itself a reason to grant planning permission in areas where applications would normally be refused. There was ample opportunity to meet the need demonstrated in the self-build register through sites that already had outline planning permission, or had been identified in the Borough Plan through emerging NDPs. Self-build plots could even be negotiated within larger development sites within the Joint Core Strategy. All of these options would ensure that new development was properly managed in appropriate locations. The applicant's comments in relation to accessibility were noted; however, it was clear that most residents would be highly reliant on the private car and this weighed against the proposal. The Warminster appeal also included 30% affordable housing and the scale of development – 35 houses – meant that the social and economic benefits were

far greater in that case. The applicant's agent had suggested that there was no substantive objection to the scheme; however, Twynning Parish Council had objected to the application, particularly in terms of the conflict with the adopted NDP. Whilst it was not comparable to this case, the Warminster decision did show that development in suitable locations could be acceptable even with an up-to-date development plan and a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Notwithstanding this, Officers did not consider that the sole additional benefit of self-build housing would make what would normally be considered an unacceptable development, acceptable. In terms of a Section 106 Agreement, it was agreed that this could be used to restrict the development to self-build but it would still need to pass the strict Community Infrastructure Levy test so it would need to be relevant to the development proposed and necessary – in making something otherwise unacceptable, acceptable. It was his view that it was not the case here that self-build would make the development acceptable. If planning permission was granted, the Development Manager felt that a future application for market housing would be difficult to resist as it would appear that this location had already been accepted as appropriate for residential development.

- 25.14 The Chair invited the applicant's representative to address the Committee. He indicated that, at the last Planning Committee meeting, the local Member had proposed a motion, which had been duly seconded, to permit this application. The applicant had supplied a very recent self-build appeal precedent which had been upheld by the Secretary of State. After further debate it had been resolved that the application be deferred in order to allow Officers to properly digest the information received from the applicant's agent and to consider ways in which permission could be conditioned to restrict the houses to self-build dwellings only. He considered that this proposal could easily be restricted to self-build, as with the Warminster appeal and numerous other cases. Under the suggested terms, the applicant would have two years to sell the plots as self-build; if unsold after that time they would be offered to registered social landlords as affordable housing plots. He confirmed that the applicant was open to discussion on the specifics of the agreements but no contact had been made by Officers in this regard. The Officer report stated that the application was contrary to Policy HOU4, but, of the four appeals determined in the Tewkesbury Borough area since the last Committee meeting, three Inspectors had given it little or no weight. In his view, Policy HOU4 was clearly out of date with regard to its ability to meet the duty to provide self-build homes and he pointed out that there were three applications on the Agenda today which were contrary to Policy HOU4 but recommended for permission. One of those applications was for open market dwellings at Stratford Bridge Garage, Ripple which was recommended for permission despite Officers describing the bus service as 'relatively frequent'; this site was not only closer to Tewkesbury and Twynning, and with many more services, but was on exactly the same bus route as that application and yet the service was described as 'infrequent' in this report. In summary, he indicated that this was an owner-led application for self-build only; there was a duty to permit self-builds; the proposal was sympathetic to existing developments nearby; no objections had been made by the neighbours, County Highways or Severn Trent Water; and the site was accessible and serviced by buses and footpaths. On that basis, he asked Members to permit the application, subject to a Section 106 Agreement limiting the dwellings to self-build.
- 25.15 A Member sought clarification as to whether permitting the development would set a precedent for market housing, or other development which would be contrary to Policy HOU4, even with a condition to restrict this application to self-build only. The Legal Adviser explained that it was more nuanced than that but, in this case, it appeared that there were no material considerations to justify permitting the application against policy other than the dwellings being self-build, which Officers felt to be very thin; if an application came forward for market housing the argument would be that this site had already been recognised as a suitable location for housing. The Development Manager clarified that it was not suggested that the bus service was infrequent in respect of this application and he pointed out that, even in the Stratford Bridge Garage

application the locational disadvantage weighed against the proposal; however, in that case there were other material considerations which meant that it had been recommended favourably. He did not feel there had been inconsistency in approach and advised that Officers had weighed up the planning balance and did not feel that material planning considerations existed that would outweigh the conflict with the development plan.

- 25.16 A Member noted the comment made by the applicant's representative that the plots would be offered to registered social landlords for affordable housing if they could not be sold as self-build within two years and she sought clarification as to whether this was feasible. The Development Manager explained that this had been mentioned in one of the emails set out in the Additional Representations Sheet, attached at Appendix 1. It was not something which had been considered in detail but it would be necessary to look at whether there was a particular need and if this was an acceptable location for affordable housing. The Legal Adviser indicated that the application had been put forward on the basis of being self-build and not as an affordable housing site. If they could not be sold as self-build plots, the rationale for the proposal being granted due to it being self-build was no longer plausible. Self-build was not speculative and if there was nobody who wished to take up the option to self-build it would be inappropriate for the plots to be offered as non self-build affordable housing. She had looked at the Section 106 Agreement in respect of the Warminster appeal and there had been no such cascade.
- 25.17 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to refuse the application and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that authority be delegated to the Development Manager to permit the application, subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure the dwellings as self-build, and appropriate planning conditions. The proposer of the motion indicated that he had seconded the motion to permit the application at last month's Committee largely on the basis of the need to provide self-build dwellings in the borough. The appeal decision in relation to Warminster had been an interesting read and he agreed that it was very different from this modest proposal for four dwellings which would sit on the end of the existing ribbon development. He understood that the applicant had owned the land since the 1960s so the site had not been purchased in a speculative way. In terms of the second recommended refusal reason he did not agree that the development would result in an unwarranted intrusion into the rural landscape, given its small scale, nor would it have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the locality. He reiterated that the scheme would fulfil some of the borough's self-build requirements and its modest nature meant that any harm would be limited. He did not dispute that the proposal was in conflict with HOU4 but, as with most applications, it was a question of balance and he felt that the application should be permitted.
- 25.18 A Member raised concern that permitting this application would have a knock on effect given that it would be contrary to the Council's own policies. Another Member pointed out that all applications should be considered on their own merits so the decision in respect of this proposal should not necessarily have an impact on any future applications. In terms of recommended refusal reason 4, which stated that residents of the proposed development would be heavily reliant on the use of the private motor car, the Member indicated that there were already houses in that location and, as set out in the agent's letter included in the Additional Representations Sheet, they were well served by local facilities including a café; shop; public house; takeaway; hotel complex with gym, swimming pool and golf course; car repair garage; church; and a bus for Tewkesbury School. In addition, a Member had noted on the Committee Site Visit the previous month the blue sign which denoted that the site was on a cycle route. The Development Manager acknowledged that there were facilities in the area, as there were in all rural areas, but this did not overcome the fact that future residents would be likely to be highly reliant on the private car to meet their day to day needs. In terms of cycling, Members would recall that it had been referenced in consideration of the Mythe application that walking and cycling was not an attractive proposition because of the



topography of the route between Tewkesbury Town and the application site and safety concerns in the winter months. With regard to the knock-on effects of permitting this application, he reiterated that each application should be determined on its own merits but it should be borne in mind that, if an application was received for residential development in an adjoining field, one of the merits of that proposal would be the fact that planning permission had been granted for housing in the field next door. If Members were minded to grant delegated permission, he suggested that conditions would need to be included in respect of landscaping, design, levels, drainage, parking and manoeuvring and access. In addition, it would be necessary to ensure that the size of the development was below the threshold for affordable housing i.e. not exceeding 1,000sqm, either by condition or through the Section 106 Agreement.

25.19 A Member expressed the view that this proposal went against the Council's policies and he did not feel that Members should pick and choose when they applied in order to suit particular proposals. The proposer of the motion pointed out that the Committee was entitled to take an alternative view to that put forward by Officers and this had happened the previous month when an application for housing in Minsterworth had been permitted despite being recommended for refusal. He went on to indicate that he would not be seeking permission had the application been for a greater number of houses on the opposite side of the road, however, the proposal was modest and would fit in well with the existing ribbon development. The Development Manager clarified that the justification for permitting the application referenced by the proposer of the motion was largely due to the fact that Minsterworth was a service village in the Joint Core Strategy and had been identified as capable of some residential development.

25.20 Upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That authority be **DELEGATED** to the Development Manager to **PERMIT** the application, subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure the dwellings as self-build, and appropriate planning conditions.

**16/01152/FUL – Stratford Bridge Garage, Stratford Bridge, Ripple**

25.21 This application was for demolition of existing automotive repair premises and bungalow and erection of three detached residential dwellings; change of use of site from part commercial/part residential to wholly residential.

25.22 The Planning Officer advised that, as set out at Page No. 233, Paragraphs 5.1-5.4 of the Officer report, the site lay outside of a recognised settlement boundary and was subject to Policy HOU4 which set out that new residential development would only be permitted where such dwellings were essential to the efficient operation of agriculture or forestry or the provision of affordable housing. Consequently, the application was in conflict with Policy HOU4 and planning permission should be refused unless material circumstances indicated otherwise. The Council was able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land and therefore the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework, did not apply. In this specific case, it was felt that removal of the existing intensive and unneighbourly car repair business on the site and replacement with small-scale residential development would, on balance, outweigh the conflict with the development plan and it was recommended that planning permission be granted on that basis.

25.23 A Member queried whether the closure of the existing car repair business had been taken into account and was advised that this was a matter for the individual applicant who had decided they wished to remove the business from this plot; the closure in itself was not a concern in this case. A Member indicated that there had been situations in the past when sites had been left in disrepair to improve the chances of obtaining planning permission and he questioned whether this was a factor in this case. The Development Manager clarified that the condition of the site was not the issue here; rather it was the nature of the use of the site which would inevitably have an impact on the appearance of the area. On balance, it was felt that the proposed use would be an

improvement to the local area, although this was a matter of judgement. A Member questioned whether the Conservation Officer had any comments on the current scheme having raised objection to the original scheme. The Planning Officer clarified that there was a listed building to the rear of the site and the Conservation Officer had no objections to the impact on this heritage asset. Notwithstanding this, they had raised concerns in respect of the design, although they did feel that the proposal before Members was an improvement on the original.

- 25.24 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation was to permit the application and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that the application be permitted in accordance with the Officer recommendation. A Member raised concern that the Conservation Officer had seemed to suggest that the design of the scheme could be further improved. In response, the Development Manager advised that, whilst it was not considered to be exemplar, a lot of work had been done to improve the proposal and both the Conservation Officer and Planning Officer felt that it was an acceptable scheme for the site. In his view, any further improvement would mean a reduction in the number of units on the site which had been suggested to the applicant throughout the process but was not something they wished to do. It was a matter of judgement for Members as to whether the material planning considerations outweighed the conflict with Policy HOU4. A Member indicated that she was not happy to support the motion at this stage when it seemed so finely balanced on comparing what was currently there against a scheme that was thought could be better and she proposed that the application be deferred for a Committee Site Visit to assess the impact of the existing building on the character and appearance of the area. This proposal was seconded and, upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That the application be **DEFERRED** for a Committee Site Visit by the Sites Inspection Panel to assess the impact of the existing building on the character and appearance of the area.

**17/00718/CLP – 58 Courtney Close, Tewkesbury**

- 25.25 This application was for a certificate of lawful proposed development for construction of a single storey side extension.

- 25.26 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation was to grant the certificate and he invited a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that the certificate be granted in accordance with the Officer recommendation and, upon being taken to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That the application be **GRANTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

**17/00201/FUL – Green Lea, Green Street, Brockworth**

- 25.27 This application was for the erection of a tool shed and garden room and siting of air source heat pump for the main house heating; design and finish matching the main house.

- 25.28 The Chair invited a local resident to address the Committee. She explained that the application was the third in a series of applications designed to secure a large house on the site. Planning permission for a new dwelling had been granted in August 2016 after it had been made smaller and moved away from her property, and yet a subsequent application to increase its height and length, and to rotate the dwelling so that the sitting room would be next to the proposed garden room, had been granted in March 2017. In her view, it was clearly intended that it would form part of a larger house in the future, as such, it was important that Members considered the impact of the development as a whole on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Green Street and her property. She went on to indicate that there would be no visual separation from her property as the gap between her house and the new dwelling would be considerably reduced. She objected to the fact that the garden room was proposed to be so close to

her garage in order for the wall and floor levels to line up with the previously approved dwelling; she was in no doubt that the applicant intended to submit another application to join-up the room in the future. She went on to explain that, in order to reduce visibility, the proposal would be built at a lower level which would involve digging down to three metres; she was extremely concerned about the impact on the stability of her dwelling, which was very old and had no foundations, as many old houses in the area had slipped. The proposal would be half hidden behind her garage which would have a detrimental impact on its appearance and would be out of keeping with the area. She understood that it would be necessary to divert the footpath which ran through the site and she felt that this could threaten security. The existing trees which currently had a screening effect would be destroyed with no space to replace them and of particular concern was the cast iron water main beneath the site which was still in use.

- 25.29 In response to a Member query, the Development Manager clarified that the photograph displayed to the Committee showed the existing site. The new dwelling had not yet been built and this proposal was for a garden room to go alongside that, as well as a small amendment to the new dwelling to accommodate an air source heat pump. The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to permit the application and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for a Committee Site Visit in order to assess the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. A Member indicated that if the motion failed he would be suggesting that the application be refused as the new building had not yet been built and the application should be submitted once it had been. Upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That the application be **DEFERRED** for a Committee Site Visit to assess the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the residential amenity of the neighbouring property.

**17/00448/OUT – Deepfurrow House, Main Road, Minsterworth**

- 25.30 This was an outline application for the erection of a four bedroom, two-storey dwelling adjacent to Deepfurrow House.
- 25.31 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation was to permit the application and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that the application be permitted in accordance with the Officer recommendation and, upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

**17/00550/FUL – 11 Kaybourne Crescent, Churchdown**

- 25.32 This application was for the construction of a two bedroom bungalow.
- 25.33 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation was to permit the application and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that the application be permitted in accordance with the Officer recommendation and, upon being taken to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

**17/00104/OUT – Land Adjacent to Rosedale House, Main Road, Minsterworth**

- 25.34 This was an outline application for the erection of five dwellings with access and layout

for approval.

- 25.35 The Chair invited the applicant's agent to address the Committee. He explained that the proposal was a product of very positive consultation and he was grateful to Officers for their time and effort. The Officer report provided a comprehensive assessment of the scheme against relevant policies and guidance, concluding that the proposals represented sustainable development and recommending delegated permission be granted, subject to the resolution of highway matters. It was important to note that County Highways had raised no objection to the proposals. This response followed extensive discussions regarding access into the site and the submission of an access design that included a right turn lane into both the application site and the site across the road which had recently been approved for six dwellings. The Officer report confirmed that the proposed access arrangement was safe and suitable and it was understood that the only highways matter outstanding related to the application across the road, which Officers were working to resolve. There had been no objections from statutory consultees and the application was supported by Minsterworth Parish Council. Only two objections had been received from members of the public, one of which raised concern regarding the position of two visitor parking bays that had since been removed from the proposals, whilst the other raised design concerns that were effectively dealt with in the Officer report. Officers had concluded that the density of the proposal, at 12.5 dwellings per hectare, was appropriate and that the layout had been positively designed with regard to locating dwellings in line with Rosedale House and the Rookery. In terms of the principle of the proposed development, Minsterworth was identified as a service village in the Joint Core Strategy i.e. it could accommodate development proportional to its size and function and reflecting its proximity to either Cheltenham or Gloucester. The relatively small scale of the proposals clearly reflected the size and function of Minsterworth as a service village; furthermore, the site was located just three miles west of Gloucester, 20 metres from a bus stop with services to the city every 30 minutes, and just 5-10 minutes' walk from Minsterworth Primary School and Village Hall. It was clear that the site was sustainably located with respect to the facilities on offer in the village and that the design of the proposals was appropriate for the site and its surroundings. The site represented a suitable and sustainable source of housing in an identified service village and he respectfully requested that the Committee permit the application.
- 25.36 A Member noted that Minsterworth was a service village and she questioned what percentage of housing had already been committed over and above the existing housing in the village. Another Member questioned whether Officers were happy with the proposed layout given that a linear style was often favoured for new developments where the existing development was linear. The Development Manager advised that he did not have the information to hand in respect of the amount of development that had been permitted in the area. He drew attention to the plan at Page No. 268/B of the Officer report and explained that, whilst the new dwellings would be in front of the existing linear development, because of the particular site layout, with the Eame Hill farmstead behind and the staggered siting of both Rosedale House and The Rookery, adding depth was something which could be achieved without harm to the local area in this particular case. A Member sought clarification as to whether an affordable housing contribution was required and was advised that the threshold for affordable housing was 11 dwellings or above, or a total floorspace not exceeding 1,000sqm; whilst this development was for five dwellings, it was unclear at this stage what the total floorspace would be but assurance was provided that the development could be controlled by condition to ensure it stayed within the threshold.
- 25.37 A Member sought confirmation that no objection had been raised by County Highways, given that this was the fastest section of the A48 in both directions. The Development Manager reiterated that County Highways raised no objection to the proposal in

principle; however, this was dependent on the outcome of the ongoing discussions in relation to the access for the site opposite. Officers were in discussion with the developers of that site in order to understand where the access would be located and resolve the matter. If Members were minded to delegate authority to the Development Manager to permit this application and the issues could not be resolved to the satisfaction of County Highways, it would be brought back to the Committee. It was unfortunate that these circumstances were out of the applicant's control but, nevertheless, it was an issue which needed to be resolved. The Member reiterated that he had real concerns about the speed of vehicles travelling along the road and visibility splays and safe access would be crucial.

- 25.38 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to delegate authority to the Development Manager to permit the application, subject to the resolution of the highway matters, and he invited a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that authority be delegated to the Development Manager to permit the application in accordance with the Officer recommendation. Upon being put to the vote, it was

**RESOLVED** That authority be **DELEGATED** to the Development Manager to **PERMIT** the application, subject to the resolution of the highway matters.

**PL.26 DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - APPLICATIONS TO THE COUNTY COUNCIL**

- 26.1 The following decisions of Gloucestershire County Council were **NOTED**:

<b>Site/Development</b>	<b>Decision</b>
17/00559/CM Gloucester North Community Fire Station Cheltenham Road East Churchdown	Application <b>PERMITTED</b> subject to conditions relating to the commencement of the development and scope of the development.
Variation of Condition 2 – Scope of Development on Planning Consent 15/0098/TWREG3 [Erection of a training tower], dated 22/12/2016 in order to relocate the training tower.	
17/00036/LA3 Woodmancote Primary School Station Road Bishop's Cleeve	Application <b>PERMITTED</b> subject to conditions relating to the scope of the development; soft landscaping; lighting; and tree works.
Variation of condition 3 (revision to elevation drawing from the previously submitted drawing 5092-P-600 with drawing number 5092-W-701G) relating to planning consent 15/0069/TWREG3 dated 04/09/2015.	
17/00228/CM Long Meadow Farm Stoke Road Stoke Orchard	Application <b>PERMITTED</b> subject to conditions relating to the commencement of the development; scope of the development; permitted development; hours of working;

Retrospective change of use of an agricultural barn (part of) to a waste transfer operation (sui generis). vehicular access and highway safety; waste management; and drainage.

**PL.27 CURRENT APPEALS AND APPEAL DECISIONS UPDATE**

- 27.1 Attention was drawn to the current appeals and appeal decisions update, circulated at Pages No. 17-24. Members were asked to consider the current planning and enforcement appeals received and the Department for Communities and Local Government appeal decisions issued.
- 27.2 A Member was comforted to see that the appeal in respect of outline application 16/00539/OUT for up to 75 dwellings Truman's Farm, Manor Lane, Gotherington had been dismissed with the Inspector taking into account the impact on social cohesion and the detrimental effect the development would have on the village; she hoped this could be used as an argument in the forthcoming appeal in relation to Gotherington. In addition, the Inspector had given substantial weight to Policy HOU4 which may help to prevent service villages being further flooded with development in future. A Member questioned whether the Council would be challenging the decision in relation to 16/00860/FUL Land at Hillview Stables, Bushcombe Lane, Woodmancote where a single dwelling had been allowed on appeal. The Development Manager advised that the Council had six weeks from the date of the decision to submit a challenge and consideration was currently being given as to whether this would be appropriate. Members would be notified of the decision in due course.
- 27.3 Having considered the information provided, it was  
**RESOLVED** That the current appeals and appeal decisions update be **NOTED**.

The meeting closed at 10:45 am

## Appendix 1

**SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**  
**ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS**

Date: 31 August 2017

The following is a list of the additional representations received since the schedule of applications was prepared and includes background papers received up to and including the Monday before the Meeting.

A general indication of the content is given but it may be necessary to elaborate at the Meeting.

<b>Page No</b>	<b>Item No</b>	
216	3	<p><b>17/00424/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Land at Consell Green, Tewkesbury Road, Toddington</b></p> <p>This application has now been formally WITHDRAWN by the applicant.</p>
222	4	<p><b>17/00452/OUT</b></p> <p><b>Land to the North of Shuthonger Garage, A38 Pages Lane to Church End Lane, Shuthonger, Tewkesbury.</b></p> <p>Paragraph 7.14 of the Officer report refers to a further representation in respect of this application and the Warminster appeal, this is set out below:</p> <p>From: Mark Godson</p> <p>Sent: 09 August 2017 14:06</p> <p>To: Bob Ristic</p> <p>Subject: Land at Shuthonger</p> <p>Hi Bob</p> <p>Many thanks for the opportunity to provide our perspective, that is very much appreciated.</p> <p>'From the applicant's perspective, the SoS appeal decision in Wiltshire can lead to a number of conclusions which would allow the Council to approve this application. The appeal decision confirms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the provision of self-build homes is a matter capable of being given significant weight in the decision making process, and so significant that a positive decision can be made in conflict with a Local Plan. This was also confirmed by the appeal decision in Reading supplied with our Planning Statement. Housing delivery in Tewkesbury has been dominated by volume home builders under the old established 'predict and provide' model of speculative housing delivery. This is only going to be reinforced by the strategic allocations of the JCS all of which are promoted by national providers. This application offers a unique opportunity to provide a genuinely different non-speculative model of housing delivery providing a self-build exemplar in Tewkesbury.</li> <li>2. The SoS recognised that self-build is a type of home that is receiving significant Government support, for which there is an evidence based need in Wiltshire. There is also an evidence-based need in Tewkesbury as set out on the self-build</li> </ol>

register. The majority of the need of the self-build register is for countryside or edge of settlement locations such as the location at Shuthonger. Such locations can only come forward through sites that are contrary to Local Plan Policy HOU4, and there is a legal duty to meet that demand. At least three entries on the register are not only seeking this type of location, but the specific part of the Borough in which the application site is located.

3. Although the SoS decision includes affordable housing as an additional benefit, this does not diminish the contribution that self-build made to the determination despite Wiltshire Council having a much more recent (NPPF compliant) Local Plan, and a 5 year supply of housing. Tewkesbury Borough Council's Local Plan was adopted approximately 10 years before the Wiltshire Plan, and the Tewkesbury Local Plan was recently found to be out of date with regard to the supply of housing in an appeal decision at Woodmancote, and regardless of the veracity of the Woodmancote decision, the Local Plan certainly doesn't cater for self-build. In addition, the S106 legal agreement would also allow Housing Associations first refusal on the site (to take it on as an affordable housing site) if they are not first sold as self-build plots.
4. Although the appeal site is closer to Warminster than Shuthonger is to Tewkesbury, the appeal site was still outside a development boundary in a linear village called Bishopstrow. However, the SoS confirmed that the appeal site was in a sufficiently accessible location with regard to non-car access, principally because bus stops within walking distance of the appeal site are serviced by a bus approximately once every hour. Exactly the same level of public transport service applies at Shuthonger; i.e. a bus approximately once every hour. Shuthonger is also within walking distance (with dedicated footways) of a café, a shop, a public house, a takeaway, a hotel complex with gym, swimming pool, and golf course, a car repair garage, a church, and is also served by a bus for Tewkesbury School. Applications on the same stretch of A38 have also been found to be sufficiently sustainable by TBC in the recent past.
5. Despite the appeal site being in a linear settlement, the non-linear scheme proposed through the appeal was found to have no landscape impact in a non-designated area. The proposal at Shuthonger proposes a linear development, in character with its surroundings in a non-designated area.
6. The SoS found that a S106 agreement or unilateral undertaking is more than capable of controlling the dwellings as self-build. Detailed terms in this regard have been supplied by the applicant for Shuthonger.
7. Although the appeal site will provide more houses than is being proposed at Shuthonger, it is significant to note that at the time the appeal was submitted there were only 19 entries on the self-build register in Wiltshire. The proposal at Shuthonger is proportionate to the character of the locality, and there is greater demand on the Tewkesbury register (currently 28).
8. The SoS confirms that the five year housing supply is a minimum and not a cap.
9. Unlike the appeal scheme in Wiltshire, there is no substantive objection from third parties. There were 52 objections to the appeal scheme at the application stage.

These are all therefore material considerations that are capable of allowing for a positive recommendation to be made despite the conflict with Policy HOU4.'



I look forward to the inclusion of this text in the report. As requested, I have related this text to the appeal decision only. There are wider points that we have made but I have tried to keep it as compact as possible.

Best regards

Mark

Mark Godson MRTPI

Since the report was drafted, a further email has been received from the applicant and is set out below:

From: Mark Godson

Sent: 29 August 2017 12:40

To: Councillor Blackwell; Councillor Davies; Councillor Dean; Councillor East; Councillor Evetts; Councillor Foyle; Councillor Furolo; Councillor Gore; Councillor Greening; Councillor Hatton; Councillor Hollaway; Councillor MacTiernan; Councillor Mason; Councillor Reece; Councillor Spencer; Councillor Stokes; Councillor Surman; Councillor Waters; Councillor Workman

Cc: Bob Ristic

Subject: Item 4 at Planning Committee this week

Dear Councillors

I write in relation to agenda item 4 - Land to the north of Shuthonger Garage. You will be aware that this is a deferred item, with the resolution from the previous meeting being as follows:

"That the application be DEFERRED in order to allow Officers to properly digest the information received from the applicant's agent and to consider ways in which permission could be conditioned to restrict the houses to self-build dwellings only"

Hopefully, you will have now received additional documentation setting out the Applicant's position regarding the Wiltshire case (as mentioned at paragraph 7.14 of the updated report) so I will not repeat that here.

The other reason for deferment was to investigate mechanisms to control the self-build element of the scheme. Unfortunately, the updated report at agenda item 4 does not make any reference to this so we felt it necessary to ensure that you were aware of the applicant's position in this regard.

Please therefore be aware that the applicant submitted draft heads of terms for a legal agreement to the Council on the date of submission of this application. These can be found at appendix D of the originally submitted Planning Statement, and this is attached to this email for your convenience.

The proposed use of a legal agreement is entirely appropriate and enforceable. This was the case in the Wiltshire appeal and the example at Appendix F to the Planning Statement, an earlier similar case to the Wiltshire example. I have also attached a further recent example of a legal agreement linked to a permission from Central Bedfordshire.

		<p>We were incredibly disappointed with the officer comments at the previous meeting regarding the applicant's alleged future intentions, particularly given the detail already in the application with regard to the suggested legal agreement. We therefore trust that this email now provides you with the confidence that the type of homes to be provided are entirely controllable, and will meet the locational needs of those on the self-build register.</p> <p>I trust that the above provides a useful summary of our position in this regard.</p> <p>Thank you for your time on this matter.</p> <p>Best regards</p> <p>Mark</p> <p>Mark Godson MRTPI</p> <p>SF Planning Limited</p>
243	7	<p><b>17/00201/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Green Lea, Green Street, Brockworth.</b></p> <p><b>Consultations &amp; Representations:</b></p> <p>Further objections received from owners of Hermit Cottage, <b>see attached in full below.</b></p>

**Item 7 – 17/00201/FUL**

(Page 1 of 6)

TO THE MEMBERS OF TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE 31 AUGUST 2017

ITEM 17/00201/FUL GREEN LEA, GREEN STREET, BROCKWORTH

Dear Councillor

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED ERECTION OF 'GARDEN ROOM'

We are so concerned about this proposal that I have come back from my holiday in Devon to speak to you today.

This is the third of a series of applications designed to get a large house on this site. It is submitted by Sherry Moore's brother who does not live there but has a financial interest. In January 2016 they applied for a large house partly tucked behind our garage, this had to be substantially reduced in size and moved away before permission was granted in August 2016. In March 2017 they gained permission without our knowledge for it to be made longer, higher and turned round so that the sitting room would be next to the proposed 'garden room'. This current application is called a 'garden room' but is clearly intended to form part of a larger house in the future, which has already been applied for and rejected.

We object to its location right up against and below our garage in order to line up its walls and floor level exactly with the dwelling approved last year. There is no other reason for putting it there and that position will create many problems.

Hermit Cottage is a beautiful 400 year-old cottage, typical of the original cottages of Green Street. It is part of the character of the area ie semi rural and well spaced out. The proposal would crowd it and would make the area look a cluttered mess. It was a key principle of the permission for the new dwelling that it should be visually separate from Hermit Cottage – it was moved further away for that reason. This proposal would destroy that principle because even though at the moment there is a small parallel gap between its walls and the new dwelling, when viewed from any other angle than head on, it would look like one mass merging with our garage. The gap between the new house and this proposal is so small that it's meaningless.

Spoiling the appearance of Hermit Cottage hugely affects our amenity – it is deeply upsetting because we have taken great care to replace windows etc in character. We have not done any extensions ourselves because we felt it would damage the character. Creating a large property half hiding behind our garage would destroy that because being able to see space either side as you can with all the other nearby properties is essential to the character of the street and how Hermit Cottage in particular is viewed.

**Item 7 – 17/00201/FUL**  
(Page 2 of 6)



**Hermit Cottage and garage**

The ground here is unstable. Our garage would be de-stabilised by digging down 3m at a distance of less than 2m from it. We are very concerned this will have a knock on impact on Hermit Cottage which has no foundations - once it is destabilised as many nearby cottages have been - it is too late. This very serious issue can only be addressed by moving the proposal further away.

Our security would be threatened by moving footpath as would be necessary, it would become a dark and dangerous passage allowing concealed access over the fence to our outhouse and back garden. This is a real concern to us given the recent attempted break-ins to our and neighbouring homes. GCC has said that an application must be made to TBC for the footpath to be diverted (see attached e-mail). This has not been done.

The current screen of trees will need to be destroyed and there will be no space to replace it if the garden room were to be so close. This would affect our privacy as people would be able to look over the fence into our back garden.

Noise from the heat pump is a significant concern to us and to other neighbours. These pumps are known to be noisy, operate at night and get worse with age. The application can't be approved until the noise data is submitted. It has not been, there is no specification.



**Item 7 – 17/00201/FUL**

(Page 3 of 6)

Unfortunately, you can't rely on the facts given in this application – there are several incorrect statements ie that the footpath won't need to be diverted, that there will be screening and that there isn't a water main underneath the site. All are contrary to the facts including evidence provided by Severn Trent Development Services (see enclosed map). Be in no doubt that they intend to submit another application to join up this 'room'. This is why we have no confidence in what is said and we are very worried about where this will stop. Therefore we ask the Planning Committee to look at the impact of this development as a whole. Although you are just considering the garden room today the overall impact has to be important to your judgement about whether to accept it. For this reason we consider it is essential that you make a site visit before making your decision.

If this is not intended to be an extension then why put it there? It would be much easier to build and more appropriate further down the garden. Please refuse the application because the only way of dealing with all the above issues is to move it further away from Hermit Cottage.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth and Geoff Cave

Appendix 1

E-mail from Gloucestershire Highways Department

**From:** "Tyler, Martine" <Martine.Tyler@amey.co.uk>

**Date:** 15 June 2017 at 13:04:32 BST

**To:** Geoff Cave [REDACTED]

**Cc:** "Soule, Ian" <Ian.Soule@amey.co.uk>

**Subject:** RE: Footpath - proposed change of route Green Street Brockworth GL3 4RT : Ref. 11142860

Dear Geoff

I had a query a couple of months ago about this one and as I recall it will be dealt with by Tewkesbury Borough Council under the Town and country Planning Act 1990 S257. I have had a look at the application on the Tewkesbury planning website and it is interesting that in the application the box for whether or not a public right of way is affected has been ticked as no, but the plan clearly shows the path diverted against the fence. I have not received any notification from Tewkesbury Borough Council that the owners have applied to divert the path.

I have just spoken with the planning officer at TBC, Fiona Martin, and advised her that the owners of Greenlea will need to apply to them as the Planning Authority to have this path diverted. When this is at the "made order" stage you will then have an opportunity to make a formal objection.

**Item 7 – 17/00201/FUL**

(Page 4 of 6)

Kind regards.

Martine Tyler

-----Original Message-----

From: Geoff Cave [REDACTED]

Sent: 15 June 2017 11:10

To: Tyler, Martine

Subject: Footpath - proposed change of route Green Street Brockworth GL3

4RT : Ref. 11142860

Dear Martine

Ian Souel referred me to you about the proposed re routing of a footpath that leads from Green Street through the garden of Green Lea, which is next to our property Hermit Cottage.

The owners of Green Lea propose to change the footpath so that it follows our boundary in order that they can enlarge their proposed development.

We strongly object to this change of the footpath. It will have to go down a steep slope, turn through two sharp right angle corners tight against the rear wall of our garage. The path will be elevated above the new development, it's construction will undermine our garage potentially creating a hazardous situation. It will also remove the current trees that form a screen between our property and Green Lea. The path will be hidden from the road, with a high fence, create a dark passage, it can present an unsafe and insecure situation for people and property. These issues could discourage the usage of the path. There have been several thefts and attempted break ins from the rear of our property and properties in our immediate vicinity.

Please contact me on [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] to discuss our objections and advise how we formalise them they have been given to Tewkesbury Planning.

Regards  
Geoff Cave



