

**TO EACH MEMBER OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

14 August 2023

Dear Councillor

**PLANNING COMMITTEE- TUESDAY 15 AUGUST 2023**

Further to the Agenda and papers for the above meeting, previously circulated, please find attached the Additional Representations Sheet.

Should you have any queries regarding the above please contact Democratic Services on  
Tel: 01684 272021

## ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS SHEET

Date: 15 August 2023

The following is a list of the additional representations received since the Planning Committee Agenda was published 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.

Agenda Item No.	
6a	<p><b>22/01104/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Elms Farm, Main Road, Minsterworth</b></p> <p><b><i>Member of Public:</i></b></p> <p>Roadside plots still too close to the main road where noise would still be an issue.</p> <p>Too many dwellings will cause traffic problems.</p> <p><b><i>Harvey Community Centre:</i></b></p> <p>Not opposed to development and welcome new homes and families.</p> <p>The Centre has ambitious plans to extend community services.</p> <p>Current access has poor visibility and width.</p> <p>Proposed housing will limit options to improve access.</p> <p>Concerns raised about design and layout and suggest amendment to land outside the curtilage of any proposed building to be utilised to improve access to centre.</p> <p>Three options suggested - an improved access point to the Harvey Centre as part of the planning consent; defer to allow safeguarding future use or incorporation of access to the Centre; lowering of speed limit.</p> <p><b><i>Applicant's Response to above:</i></b></p> <p>Supports the aims and objectives of the Harvey Centre to reinvigorate into a multi-purpose community facility.</p> <p>Co-existence of both proposed uses would be mutually beneficial and glad that the Centre supports the principle of residential development.</p> <p>Whilst a trustee of the Harvey Centre discussed some matters in May, the application was well advanced for any significant changes and submitted for 7 months at this point.</p> <p>There was a site meeting with representatives of the Harvey Centre at the point of submission in October 2022, principally to discuss boundary treatments between the two sites and no mention was regarding access across the boundary.</p> <p>The Highways consultant has reviewed the current Harvey Centre access onto the A48 and notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- that the proposed community use of the site has a far lesser trip generation than the extant planning use of the site for a school;</li> </ul>

	<p>- the proposed vehicular access arrangements onto the A48 do not preclude or impinge on the current Harvey Centre access from the A48 being used for a community facility; and</p> <p>- the layout and design of our scheme does not preclude the ability to form a vehicular access into the Harvey Centre site in the future across the shared boundary.</p>
<b>6b</b>	<p><b>22/01374/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Land At Linton Court Farm, Highnam</b></p> <p>An updated consultation response has been received from the Environmental Health Officer who considers that the submitted noise assessment is robust and represents a worst case, and the actual noise impact should be less than the predictions.</p> <p>In addition, a post completion noise testing condition has been recommended to ensure that noise levels are in line with the predictions and, if not, additional noise mitigation could be employed if necessary. Noise from road traffic would still be dominate the sound climate in the area.</p>
<b>6e</b>	<p><b>22/01318/PIP</b></p> <p><b>Land At Greenacre And Mount View, Ash Lane, Down Hatherley</b></p> <p>An update to Paragraph 5.2 of the Committee report is required to confirm that 10 communications of support for the application were also received, as summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The development would provide homes with generous sized gardens and good parking.</li> <li>- The development would provide homes for local people.</li> <li>- Endorse the application which is similar to other developments in the area.</li> <li>- Provides local builders with opportunities to construct dwellings on smaller sites.</li> <li>- Adequate access can be provided.</li> <li>- Good quality homes beneficial for the area.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the applicant's agent notes the comment by Severn Trent that there is a pumping station close to the site is erroneous. Nevertheless, Officers note the general requirement from Severn Trent to keep access clear to any pumping station is relevant. The agent has also submitted, at the client's request, images showing that the hedge opposite the site has become overgrown encroaching on the road, a matter referred to in communications from third parties objecting to the proposal.</p>
<b>6f</b>	<p><b>22/01320/OUT</b></p> <p><b>Parcel 5558, Road From Natton To Homedowns, Ashchurch</b></p> <p>HIGHWAY MATTERS</p> <p>Please note that there is an error in the Committee report at Paragraphs 8.32 and 8.78. The requirement for a Traffic Regulation Order to restrict parking on Fiddington Lane would not be the subject of a S106 legal agreement as this would be dealt with via a separate process under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended).</p> <p>To address local concerns regarding traffic speeds on Fiddington Lane, the applicant has also recently confirmed in writing that they would be willing to consider funding a</p>

Traffic Regulation Order to this effect.

#### NETWORK RAIL

A further communication has been received from Network Rail clarifying the status of the railway crossing described at Paragraph 2.3 of the Committee report, which is summarised as follows.

Network Rail confirm that the level crossing provides access for pedestrians (not cyclists) and access for the vehicles of authorised users and does not specifically provide access to the 'Gloucestershire Way'. It states the level crossing forms part of the public rights of way network despite not being shown on the Definitive Map and Statement held by the County Council as a public right of way. Historically, papers dating back to 1836 indicate the level crossing formed part of a public road, but in 1967 (under the British Railways Act) the status was downgraded to its current status described above.

However, it should be noted (at Paragraphs 2.3 and 8.34 of the Committee report) that the Public Rights of Way Officer at Gloucestershire County Council has confirmed to Officers that the Gloucestershire Way immediately either side of the level crossing does not form part of the public rights of way network as defined on the Definitive Map. For clarity, the Definitive Map is the legal record of public rights of way in England and Wales.

#### HERITAGE ADVICE - Ridge and Furrow

As a result of a Member enquiry at the site visit regarding the occurrence of ridge and furrow earthworks present within the red line area of the site, the County Archaeologist and Heritage leader at Gloucestershire County Council has provided the following update:

They confirm they have examined the site and surrounding area on successive google earth images and DEFRA 1m Lidar composite data. They have some experience of the subject, having managed a review of the most significant ridge and furrow nationally for Historic England ten years ago. That project included 43 townships previously identified as having the best preserved ridge and furrow in central England (including some in Gloucestershire). They would generally advise preservation of ridge and furrow, wherever possible, which has been identified as being of national importance.

Although Ashchurch Rural civil parish does not include any of the townships identified as of national importance, it was included in an English Heritage National Mapping Programme Project (NMP) in 2007. That project recorded archaeological and historical features visible on all aerial photographs in national and Cambridge University collections, including the mapping of all ridge and furrow present. The photographs generally date from the 1940s onwards. The mapping produced indicated the directions of furrows, and also the extent of plots and any intervening headlands. It also indicates whether the ridge and furrow was extant or had been removed on the most recent photographs available in 2007. The vast majority of agricultural land in all directions (and for some distance from the site) was covered in ridge and furrow in the 1940s, with the main exception being the already existing army vehicle depot at Ashchurch. A visual estimate suggests that 50% of the ridge and furrow locally had been removed by the time that the last photograph available in 2007 was taken. Comparison of the 2007 mapping and very recent lidar imagery suggests that a further 50% the ridge and furrow extant in 2007 has been removed by modern agricultural activity.

The significance of ridge and furrow is generally assessed by the level of preservation and completeness of the field system. Their initial rapid assessment of the ridge and furrow present in the red line is that it is fairly well preserved but clearly the field system represented has mostly been removed. A combination of lidar and NMP mapping indicates that the individual blocks of ridge and furrow in this area are mostly very small and mostly in accordance with parliamentary enclosure field boundaries. Whilst some fields nearby have (or had) ridge and furrow suggestive of preserved medieval ridge

	<p>and furrow, that within the area to be developed is remarkably short and straight and may well be the result of 19th century ploughing post-dating the enclosures.</p> <p>Finally, whilst this area of earthworks would be removed by development, it is equally vulnerable to modern farming, which has resulted in a loss of ridge and furrow many times greater than that lost to development.</p> <p>The County Archaeologist's advice concludes that it would be difficult to argue for any more than low local significance of the ridge and furrow present in the red line area. A decision to refuse on the basis of its preservation may be difficult to support at appeal.</p> <p><b>THIRD PARTY COMMUNICATIONS</b></p> <p>A third party communication from a local resident objects to houses at the application site, alleging the dwellings are unnecessary and loss of green field.</p>
<p><b>6g</b></p>	<p><b>23/00015/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Chargrove Paddock, Main Road, Shurdington</b></p> <p>The applicant has sought legal advice on the Council's assessment of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Officers generally agree with the application of the policies within the legal advice from the applicant, and the correct approach to the application of policy to this site is reflected in the Committee report.</p> <p>Officers do not agree with the planning judgement element regarding the impact of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The legal advice provided by the applicant fails to address the specific issues of concern in this case, such as the question of whether the site falls within a village for the purposes of the application of policy. There is also no sufficiently reasoned or justified case regarding the impacts of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt</p>
<p><b>6i</b></p>	<p><b>23/00524/FUL</b></p> <p><b>50 Goodmoor Crescent, Churchdown</b></p> <p>A revised site plan has been received reference 23-012-F-SP01 Rev A. This revised drawing details the front section of the existing garage is to be demolished to allow space for the proposed side and rear extensions. The remainder of the proposal on this plan remains unaltered. This plan was received on 02.08.2023, after the Committee report was finalised and is to be included as a late representation to supersede 23-012-F-SP01 (Proposed Site Plan).</p> <p>The recommendation remains the same subject to the revision of Condition 2 which reads as follows:</p> <p>2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drawing numbers 23-012-E-SLP01 (Site Location Plan), 23-012-P-GF01 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan), 23-012-P-FF-01 (Proposed First Floor Plan) and 23-012-P-SF01 (Proposed Second Floor Plan) received by the Local Planning Authority on 02.06.2023.</li> <li>- Drawing number 23-012-P-E01 Rev A (Proposed Elevations) received by the Local Planning Authority on 28.07.2023.</li> <li>- Drawing number 23-012-F-SP01 Rev A (Proposed Site Plan) received by the Local Planning Authority on 02.08.2023.</li> </ul>

	<p>Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.</p>
--	---