

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held at the Council Offices,
Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury on Tuesday, 20 November 2018 commencing
at 10:00 am**

Present:

Chair
Vice Chair

Councillor J H Evetts
Councillor R D East

and Councillors:

R E Allen, P W Awford, R A Bird (Substitute for P D Surman), D M M Davies, D T Foyle, M A Gore, J Greening, R M Hatton, A Hollaway, E J MacTiernan, J R Mason, A S Reece, T A Spencer, P E Stokes, H A E Turbyfield, R J E Vines and P N Workman

PL.43 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 43.1 The evacuation procedure, as noted on the Agenda, was advised to those present.
- 43.2 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.44 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 44.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P D Surman. Councillor R A Bird would be acting as a substitute for the meeting.

PL.45 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 45.1 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.
- 45.2 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Agenda Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
P W Awford	18/00543/FUL Staverton Connection, Gloucester Road, Staverton.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor for the area.	Would speak and vote.

P W Awford	17/01268/FUL Greenacres, Main Road, Minsterworth.	Is a Borough Councillor for the area. Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor for the area.	Would speak and vote.
A Hollaway	18/00726/FUL Hill Top, Cleeve Hill, Southam. 18/00851/FUL Rose Cottage, School Lane, Southam.	Is a Borough Councillor for the area. Is a Member of Southam Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
J R Mason	17/01164/OUT Former Poultry Farm, Littleworth, Winchcombe.	Is a Member of Winchcombe Town Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
P E Stokes	17/01356/OUT 48 Brookfield Road, Churchdown.	Is a Member of Churchdown Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
R J E Vines	18/00816/FUL Highfield, Leckhampton Hill, Leckhampton.	Is a Gloucestershire County Councillor for the area.	Would speak and vote.

45.3 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

PL.46 MINUTES

46.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 23 October 2018, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

PL.47 DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - APPLICATIONS TO THE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Schedule

47.1 The Technical Planning 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.

17/01164/OUT – Former Poultry Farm, Littleworth, Winchcombe

- 47.2 This was an outline application for the erection of 24 dwellings (13 affordable and 11 market dwellings) including formation of new access. The Committee had visited the application site on Friday 16 November 2018.
- 47.3 The Planning Officer advised that concerns had been raised by the Town Council and local residents regarding the absence of a pedestrian footway between the site and the nearest services and facilities, particularly as the section of the road was unlit, with steep banks and verges alongside it and pedestrians would have to step off the carriageway out into the path of oncoming traffic. County Highways had raised no objection to the proposal and considered it would be unreasonable to require the applicant to provide a pedestrian footway to link to the existing footway; however, Officers had some sympathy with the local community and had requested a view from County Highways on this specific matter. The Officer report stated that an update would be provided at Committee but this information had not yet come forward. There was an additional update in respect of contributions which superseded the information set out on the Additional Representations Sheet, attached at Appendix 1. Members were advised no library contribution was required; the number of primary school places required would equate to a contribution of £92,424 and the number of secondary school places required would equate to a contribution of £67,604. The Community Development Officer had indicated this would be the maximum amount payable - it would be weighed in the balance of the overall viability of the scheme so it could potentially be a lesser figure. The Technical Planning Manager went on to advise that the applicant's agent had raised concern regarding the consistency of the Council's approach to dealing with rural exception sites. He explained that a viability appraisal had been undertaken on the basis of the current application and the cross-subsidy element put forward as part of the scheme. The Council's Viability Consultant had assessed whether the number of market units proposed was appropriate and took into account that the Council had advised the applicant that the site was unacceptable as an exception scheme in establishing the benchmark land value, based on the existing agricultural use and a premium for the land owner in accordance with government guidance. The applicant's agent had cited two other cases where it was felt the Council had taken a different approach – one proposal for 24 houses at Norton, which had been permitted, and another for 16 houses at Sandhurst, which had been refused. In both instances, the sites were considered to be well-related to the existing settlements they were intended to serve, had therefore been considered to comply in principle with the affordable housing exceptions policy, and that had informed the Council's Viability Consultant's consideration of those cases.
- 47.4 The Chair invited the applicant's agent to address the Committee. The applicant's agent explained that the proposal had been submitted in response to a parish-wide Housing Needs Survey which had confirmed an unmet need of 67 dwellings; this proposal would address some of that unmet need. To encourage landowners to release land for development, it was an established valuation principle that the landowner would require a value premium in addition to the existing land value. The landowner had confirmed that he would release the site for the proposed development for a land value return of £490,000 – this was significantly less than the value of a comparable site with a policy compliant open market development. This valuation approach was entirely consistent with that used elsewhere in the borough. He made specific reference to a greenfield rural exception site in Norton which had coincidentally also generated a land value of around £500,000. Whilst it was true that planning merits were site-specific, valuation principles should be consistent throughout the borough. The district valuers' assertion that the development would be viable if 22 affordable housing units were provided did not stand scrutiny and was entirely inconsistent with principles accepted by the Council and planning approvals granted elsewhere in the borough. With regard to other matters, it was normal for rural exception housing schemes to serve the parish as a whole; this site fell within

the parish of Winchcombe and therefore it was appropriate that the development serve the needs of that parish as a whole. Contrary to the Town Council's objections, there were no available or deliverable sites within the parish to meet the required unmet need. He indicated that exception sites were, by their very nature, exceptions to policies which would otherwise restrict development. Policy SD12 supported provision of affordable housing, including cross-subsidy, upon rural exception sites. With regard to housing mix, he reminded the Committee that this was an outline application with all matters reserved except for access, therefore this was a matter for further consideration. In respect of drainage, this site formed part of a much larger field and there was ample space within the wider site to provide an appropriately designed sustainable urban drainage scheme; this could be delivered via a suitably worded planning condition. In conclusion, he urged the Committee to support the proposal and assist in the delivery of much needed affordable housing to serve the parish.

- 47.5 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. The proposer of the motion was concerned about the absence of a pedestrian footway along a major road which was very fast and narrow. In terms of housing need, this would be addressed through the Tewkesbury Borough Plan which was currently being consulted upon, therefore he fully endorsed the Officer recommendation to refuse the application. Upon being taken to the vote, it was

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

17/00791/FUL – Manor Farmhouse, Gretton Road, Gretton

- 47.6 This application was an amended proposal for various works including a new pool building with store, potting shed and reinstatement of boundary wall adjoining Manor Farm; and, new barn, stable block, access track and ménage within proposed paddock to rear. The Committee had visited the application site on Friday 16 November 2018.
- 47.7 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation had been amended to delegate authority to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application, subject to the resolution of any highway conditions, and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that authority be delegated to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application in accordance with the Officer recommendation. The proposer of the motion understood that considerable work had been done by the applicant and Officers to get this scheme right and he believed that had been achieved. A Member indicated that he had attended a Parish Council meeting the previous week where concerns had been raised about the proposed silage clamp and the risk of contamination to the stream. He understood that the applicant had stated that the area labelled 'silage clamp' on the proposed site plan would actually be used as a dry grain store and he questioned why this had been incorrectly referenced in the Committee papers if that was the case. The Parish Council's concern was that the stream could become polluted and run into the playing field below the site which would be unsafe for the children who used it and the Member proposed that the application be deferred in order for this matter to be explored further. In response, the Planning Officer clarified that there would be no silage clamp; the area marked as such would be used to collect and store manure and it was unfortunate it had been labelled incorrectly. Should Members be minded to delegate authority to permit the application, part of the delegation would be to ensure the area was correctly labelled for manure collection. In response to a query, the Planning Officer explained that an area had been marked as a 'muck heap' in the original application but, in response to local residents' concerns about its proximity to their gardens, Officers had suggested this area would be better placed with the barns and stable

and had sought clarification of the location on the drawings; unfortunately, the revised versions had been incorrectly annotated as a silage store as opposed to a place to store manure. The proposer of the motion to defer the application indicated that he was still concerned about the possibility of the stream becoming polluted and felt that more time was needed to ensure the Parish Council's concerns were adequately addressed in this regard; however, there was no seconder for the proposal to defer. A Member pointed out that the structure marked as a silage clamp was too small to be one and another Member felt any muck heap on the site would not be very big. The Chair reverted to the original proposal to delegate authority to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application, subject to the resolution of any highway conditions, and the correction of the plan labelling in respect of the manure store, which had been duly proposed and seconded, and, upon being taken to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That authority be **DELEGATED** to the Technical Planning Manager to **PERMIT** the application, subject to the resolution of any highway conditions and the correction to the plan labelling in respect of the manure store.

18/00368/OUT – Brockridge Park, Brockridge Road, Twyning

- 47.8 This was an outline application for the construction of 4,533sqm of Class B1, B2 and B8 development, together with associated highways, drainage infrastructure and landscaping; details of access submitted for approval with other matters (layout, scale, appearance and landscaping) reserved for later approval. The Committee had visited the application site on Friday 16 November 2018.
- 47.9 The Technical Planning Manager advised that it had been brought to Officers' attention that, due to the scale of the proposed development, it would be necessary to consult with the Secretary of State to see if he wished to call in the application for his determination; should Members be minded to delegate authority for the application to be permitted, this would be done as part of that delegation. The recommendation was therefore now a delegated permit.
- 47.10 The Chair invited the representative from Twyning Parish Council to address the Committee. The Parish Council representative advised that the Parish Council and 80 local residents had formally objected to this planning application and he pointed out that the Planning Officer had identified there was a clear conflict with the development plan. Current and emerging strategies and plans, including the National Planning Policy Framework, stipulated that development was sensitive to its surroundings and did not have an unacceptable impact on roads. Far too much weight was currently given to the perceived benefits of this large scale development without considering the impact on local needs, community amenity and the rural environment. Twyning Parish Council would welcome development of an appropriate scale and design but a 183% increase in floorspace and up to 29,000 sq. ft. of unfettered B2 and B8 use would be a step change for this part of Tewkesbury Borough, something which had been reinforced by an appeal in relation to nearby Duddage Business Park - even the Tewkesbury Employment Land Review had not recommended any B8 space at Brockridge Park. The transport statement completely underestimated the impact of a new warehouse and failed to mention any heavy goods vehicle traffic generation but did confirm that 16.5m articulated lorries could enter the site. The applicant had raised a number of operational restrictions but none were included in the 24 recommended conditions beyond the construction phase - this was extremely worrying for local residents who may be faced with a scenario of a large single letting of 30,000sq.ft of B8 warehouse space with no restrictions to ensure the scale and nature of the development remained appropriate in its rural location; larger warehouse buildings which could potentially launch Brockridge Park as a strategic logistics location; a fleet of vans and heavy goods vehicles operating 24 hours per day, seven days per week; and limited noise and light control. On a policy level Members were being asked to go

against the Joint Core Strategy, Tewkesbury Borough Plan and Twyning Neighbourhood Development Plan which, if bypassed, brought into question the integrity of the whole process. On a practical level, if there was an overwhelming need for large scale development at all costs, the Parish Council would urge Members to think carefully about the conditions and controls that must be included to ensure that local residents, local roads and local jobs were protected.

- 47.11 The Chair invited a local resident to speak in objection to the proposal. The local resident did not wish to dwell on the detrimental effects the proposed development would have on those living in the immediate vicinity in terms of noise, light intrusion and exhaust emissions, but she asked Members to consider this proposal in relation to Twyning Village in general terms. The village had taken a large amount of development in the recent past - with all this entailed in relation to construction vehicles - and the former character of Bockeridge Road and Bockeridge Common had been lost. The road was obviously busier and much faster; horse-riding, dog walking and rambling were now historical. She indicated that the cattle grid junction was used by an increasing number of vehicles, with barely sufficient room for two large cars to pass at this point. With the unspecified number of large vehicles using this route into Twyning each day, she could only imagine the tailback onto the M50 should large vehicles have issues negotiating the tight turning in and out of the junction. As well as these large vehicles, the proposal included 180 new parking spaces for employees which would create additional vehicle movements. She noted there was no provision for lorry parking in the plan and that was a matter of deep concern. The existing development at Bockeridge Business Park was well-designed and pleasing to the eye and the Twyning Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy E1- Principles of Employment Development supported new development involving the conversion of existing buildings or the small scale expansion of existing premises, providing it did not result in an adverse impact upon the landscape and was of an appropriate scale to the locality. Small scale employment that was demonstrated to improve local employment opportunities would be permitted within, or adjacent to, Twyning Village and outlying settlements, providing they were of a scale, form and function which represented the existing character of that particular settlement. Having regard to the emerging Tewkesbury Borough Plan Policy EMP2, reference was made to proposals for B Class employment development on the site being acceptable, providing it was of an appropriate scale and design, having regard to existing buildings on the site and the rural landscape of the area. This application proposed 4,553sqm of new employment floor space and represented a 183% increase in the existing floor space. She indicated that the planning application made no reference to employment opportunities and no definitive answer had been forthcoming in relation to hours of trading which needed to be clearly defined. Surface water run-off and provision of adequate sewerage for the proposed development was also questionable and this would add to the problems of an already flawed situation with regard to sewerage in Twyning.
- 47.12 The Chair invited the applicant's agent to address the Committee. In response to the comments made by the local resident, the applicant's agent clarified that the applicant was happy with a condition to restrict the hours of operation and he confirmed there was no parking for lorries as it was not a distribution point. In addition to this, he wished to raise four brief points to supplement the detailed Officer report. Firstly, he recognised that traffic and access was a concern for the Parish Council but one of the reasons Bockeridge Park had been chosen for the development was its convenient and easy access to the M50 and M5 without traffic congestion. He was keen to protect that, so the cattle grid access had been assessed very carefully and it had been concluded that there was ample capacity for the proposal. Traffic modelling indicated that only 10-16 lorry movements would arise from the development per day; County Highways and Highways England had undertaken their own assessments and arrived at similar conclusions. Secondly, with regard to drainage, Bockeridge Park had successfully utilised a sustainable

drainage solution, with the large pond providing more than adequate storm water storage with appropriate discharge rates – those successful principles would be adopted in this phase of development. Thirdly, in respect of design, the applicant was the investor, developer and owner of the business park and took great pride in delivering a quality environment with attractive buildings within a landscaped setting; that quality and landscaping was something which this application would continue to reserved matters submission. His final point related to job creation and the need for employment development. This proposal had come forward due to strong market demand and existing tenants had voiced interest in taking additional space due to their success at this location. Furthermore, discussions had been held with several businesses interested in occupying the proposed buildings. For example, a firm trading in cosmetics wanted to locate to Brockridge Park given the quality of accommodation proposed and its accessibility to the motorway – that business alone would bring between 40-50 jobs to the borough and the scheme could provide approximately 200 jobs in total. There were very few locations within the borough with such good accessibility and where new employment development could come forward without being hindered by substantial infrastructure constraints. This was a sustainable development and he respectfully requested that Members support the Officer recommendation.

- 47.13 A Member sought further clarification as to why the application had been identified for call-in by the Secretary of State and what the possible outcome might be. As he understood, this location was within the designated area for a rural business centre within the draft Tewkesbury Borough Plan. The Technical Planning Manager advised that there was a direction that required consultation with the Secretary of State in respect of developments of a certain scale if the Council was minded to permit the application; in terms of the possible outcome, if the Secretary of State did wish to determine the application, it would essentially result in a public inquiry where the Inspector would hear from all parties. He confirmed that the site did fall within the draft allocation in the Tewkesbury Borough Plan; however, as set out in the Officer report, the plan could only be given very limited weight as it had just gone out to consultation.
- 47.14 In response to a query regarding trading hours, the Planning Officer confirmed that this could be controlled by condition. A Member questioned whether a condition could also be included to prevent overnight parking – she was concerned that if trading hours were restricted, lorries may want to wait on site overnight. In addition, she noted that a condition had been recommended by Officers in respect of foul sewerage and she sought clarification as to whether this would feed into the existing foul sewerage system in Twyning - if so, she would be keen to ensure the existing problems were addressed prior to that. In terms of the trading hours, another Member queried whether existing businesses in the area were subject to restrictions as it may otherwise be unfair to impose them on new businesses. The Planning Officer indicated that he did not have information about the existing businesses to hand but advised they were likely to be different from the proposed B8 use where there may be pressure to take deliveries out of certain hours. The Technical Planning Manager felt that it would be unreasonable to impose a condition to prevent parking on site given the nature of the business and its reliance on vehicles; notwithstanding this, the issue raised by Members related to the coming and going of vehicles associated with deliveries and that could certainly be controlled by condition. With regard to drainage, Members were informed that Severn Trent Water was satisfied the development would not have an adverse impact on the drainage system in the village where considerable work was being undertaken to address the issues there. The Member felt it was important to ensure that any planning permission included a condition to ensure that the existing drainage problems had been resolved prior to the development coming into use.

- 47.15 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to delegate authority to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application, subject to consultation with the Secretary of State to see if he wished to determine the application, and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of its size and scale, adverse landscape impact and inadequate access. The proposer of the motion to refuse the application indicated that there had been a number of different proposals for the site dating back to 2006. He had visited the site in recent months at the request of local residents and, whilst he had been very concerned about the state of the ground and the way it looked, he had felt there was some scope for development, particularly given the need for additional employment opportunities within the borough. Notwithstanding this, he felt that the proposed development was far too big, particularly when the existing development had been sympathetically and respectfully installed. He considered the proposed access to be unsatisfactory and was of the view that the cattle grid needed to be removed in order to improve the access. For these reasons, he did not feel that the application should be supported in its current form. The seconder of the motion indicated that the proposal conflicted with the adopted Twyning Neighbourhood Development Plan and he felt that ought to be given more weight. He reiterated that the Parish Council was not against development *per se*, but this proposal was significantly different from what was currently at the site and he felt the applicant needed to come back with something more in line with the Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 47.16 A Member indicated that he would not be supporting the proposal to refuse the application. The site had been offered up in the draft Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan as a rural business centre for employment land following a significant amount of research to identify sensible employment strategies for the area. Members would be aware of the need for employment sites, specifically small and rural business sites, and from his perspective this was exactly the type of development that would help to ensure the success and prosperity of the area. There would always be concerns about the impact of additional building in an area but, to his mind, this was an appropriate design and careful consideration had been given to the physical impact of the actual building on the area. With regard to traffic and access, he accepted that the cattle grid was a problem and there were concerns about traffic movements; however, there was no fundamental practical objection from County Highways and, in practice, traffic would be taken straight off the motorway and into a business park, away from residential areas, which was exactly what should happen. In his view, the proposal had many obvious benefits and it was well-related to what Tewkesbury Borough Council was trying to achieve as an authority in terms of its duty to provide employment land. He considered it to be a sound proposal which should be accepted.
- 47.17 A Member felt that, one way or another, the application would be determined in another forum – if the Committee refused the application it was likely to go to appeal and if the Committee delegated authority to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application it would probably be called-in by the Secretary of State for determination. If it went to appeal, the local community would have another opportunity to input to the process.
- 47.18 The Technical Planning Manager clarified that the Twyning Neighbourhood Development Plan had been adopted and was part of the development plan; however, as he had already mentioned, the Tewkesbury Borough Plan was emerging, so it could only be given limited weight. In terms of highways, both Highways England and County Highways had been consulted and had raised no objection to the proposal so Members would need to be very specific about the harms that would be caused if this was to be used as a refusal reason against the advice of those specialist consultees.

- 47.19 A Member indicated that she was in favour of the proposal as the area was desperate for rural employment and this site was an ideal location given its access to the M50/M5. The seconder of the motion to refuse the application reiterated his previous concerns and stressed that the Parish Council was not against development in this area but felt it should be smaller and more in keeping with what was already there. He felt more weight needed to be given to what the local community had come up with in the Neighbourhood Development Plan which had received significant support at referendum. The proposer of the motion stood by his proposal and the reasons he had put forward and, upon being taken to the vote, the motion to refuse the application was lost. It was subsequently proposed and seconded that authority be delegated to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application in accordance with the Officer recommendation, subject to the inclusion of a condition to restrict trading hours and further consideration being given to the lighting issues. Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That authority be **DELEGATED** to the Technical Planning Manager to **PERMIT** the application, subject to the inclusion of a condition to restrict trading hours and further consideration being given to the lighting issues, and consultation with the Secretary of State to see if he wished to call-in the application for his determination.

18/00856/FUL – 12 High Street, Stanton

- 47.20 This application was for variation of condition 2 (drawing schedule) and 3 (walling samples) to application 17/00897/FUL to allow for alterations to the length, height, width and detailing of the boundary wall.
- 47.21 The Chair invited the representative from Stanton Parish Council to address the Committee. The Parish Council representative indicated that the Council's Conservation Officer had previously framed his comments in relation to No. 12 High Street, Stanton stating that heritage assets were a finite, irreplaceable resource which must be managed accordingly; in the case of Stanton, this could be applied not just to No. 12 but to the village as a whole. Stanton as an exceptional heritage asset was not just significant locally, but nationally - it had been afforded an Article 4 direction for both the village and the surrounding area and had previously been given protection under Policy SA1 which had limited new residential development. As an exceptional conservation asset, Stanton brought considerable value to the area as a significant visitor attraction. Stanton Parish Council felt a responsibility to protect what could be seen today for future generations and it was only by managing the detail of developments that the bigger picture could be preserved. In that context, it should be appreciated that No. 12 occupied a central and prominent location in the village; the proposed wall was on the High Street and would become a defining feature of the streetscene. He went on to advise that the proposed wall was not a new wall, but a replacement wall; the original wall was traditional drystone construction of mixed stone size and coursing; arguably the most appropriate construction for any replacement would be similar to what was already there. The existing wall had a maximum height of 1.35m and this remained the Parish Council's preference. A replacement wall might be alternatively constructed in other styles, taking the existing walling in the village as a lead. In this instance, best practice would be to follow the most appropriate walling styles in the village rather than the least appropriate examples. What was now proposed was of a style and construction which would be alien to the Stanton streetscene, due principally to the poor choice of materials and proposed execution. Whilst the drawings

accompanying the application illustrated a wall with reducing courses from the ground to the top, the photographs submitted for approval showed stone work of regular and relatively narrow coursing, with no reduction from the base to the top – there were no examples of similar walling in any boundary wall within the village.

- 47.22 The Chair invited a local resident speaking in objection to the proposal to address the Committee. The local resident indicated that this development was originally for a traditional drystone wall of an agreed height and without gate piers. The garden wall was sited directly to the edge of the public highway; as there was no verge, the frontages of the Grade II listed cottages No. 12 and No. 15 were built right next to the highway. It was the narrowest point of the High Street therefore the wall was in an extremely prominent position and had a very important impact on the streetscene. A drystone wall was considered in keeping – being natural – not overly straight and providing a degree of contouring at the edge of the highway and the driveway of No. 13, with the old stone blending well into the historic architecture. Previously there had been a very low old drystone wall and she was unhappy that the original approved plans for a replacement wall of the same construction had not been followed - work had been stopped by Tewkesbury Borough Council after a breeze block core had been laid and three to four courses of new Cotswold stone facing had been built using mortar. At the vehicular entrance to the High Street was a hard-angled corner which, unfortunately, was the first part of the wall to be seen as you ascended the High Street. This type of construction was common to new build properties but totally out of keeping in this location and would have a hugely detrimental effect on the uniquely conserved traditional scene. Over the 34 years she had lived in Stanton, the frontages of both the High Street and Stanway Road had been carefully conserved with the support of the majority of residents as reflected in a previous Parish Plan. This had not excluded upgrading, small visible extensions and alterations to the rear of properties – it was not a case of wishing to preserve the village in aspic. She urged the Committee to consider this application with care, bearing in mind the strength of feeling and despite the unfortunate recommendation to permit a wrongly amended design to an already wrongly part-built wall. Her view was that this was not the right decision from a planning or conservation standpoint. She hoped that Members would take into account the views of the Parish Council and not only refuse this amendment but insist that a proper drystone wall be constructed in accordance with the previously submitted plans which were rightly permitted by Tewkesbury Borough Council, thus retaining the valuable historic integrity of the High Street.
- 47.23 The Chair indicated that the Officer recommendation was to permit the application; however, he was the Ward Councillor for the area and had a great deal of sympathy with the issues raised by the public speakers. He felt strongly that the biggest problem was that the proposed wall did not follow the contours of the ground which would look unsightly. He suggested that it may be beneficial for the Committee to visit the application site to assess this for themselves in the context of the village. The Chair sought a motion from the floor and it was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for a Committee Site Visit. The proposer of the motion indicated that he had been surprised by the Officer recommendation to permit the application in a typical Cotswold village where a drystone wall would be more in keeping. The seconder of the motion agreed that it was important to take a look at the potential impact of the proposal. Another Member was unsure what would be gained from visiting the site and expressed the view that the application should be refused.
- 47.24 Upon being taken to the vote, it was
- RESOLVED** That the application be **DEFERRED** for a Committee Site Visit.

15/00859/ADV – Buckland Court, Buckland

- 47.25 This application was for the erection of a 2.4m by 1.5m solid oak advertisement to replace existing.
- 47.26 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.

18/00543/FUL – Staverton Connection, Gloucester Road, Staverton

- 47.27 This application was for redevelopment of existing vehicle storage compound to provide a new infill commercial aerospace building comprising Class B1 (light industry) and B2 (general industry) uses, including associated parking and landscaping. The Committee had visited the application site on Friday 16 November 2018.
- 47.28 The Chair invited the applicant's agent to address the Committee. The applicant's agent indicated that he strongly disagreed with the Officer recommendation to refuse the application on Green Belt and design grounds. The Green Belt argument hinged on whether a case could be made for 'very special circumstances' and Members would have seen on the site visit that the site was bounded on all sides by buildings, furthermore, the Council's own Green Belt assessment had concluded that it was low-value Green Belt. Page No. 352, Paragraph 5.5 of the Officer report gave a sense of the economic argument for the proposal and encouraged success and prosperity of the borough and the proposal was supported by GFirst Local Enterprise Partnership and a key potential customer. The applicant had worked with the Council's Urban Design Officer to address the concerns raised in relation to design and there had been no objections to the revised scheme. On that basis, he respectfully requested that the Committee disregard the Officer recommendation and permit the application.
- 47.29 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 permitted as the economic benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt and character and appearance of the area. The proposer of the motion expressed the view that, whilst the application site was technically within the Green Belt, it was not an area of open countryside and the proposal would be amongst other buildings therefore would not be inappropriate. Furthermore, he did not feel that the design of the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would allow a successful business to increase its floorspace and make land available for additional buildings in order to expand. He raised concern that refusing this application would send a message that Tewkesbury Borough Council was anti-business and sought to prevent economic growth. The seconder of the proposal agreed that the economic benefits of the proposal outweighed any potential harms. The area was not indicative of Green Belt in her view and was very much a development for commercial businesses. Her only suggestion would be that the footpath at the front of the site be continued into the area proposed for landscaping. The Technical Planning Manager advised that, should Members be minded to accept that amendment to the proposal, he would suggest a delegated permit in order to secure an amended plan to show the replacement of the landscaping strip with a footpath. Both the proposer and seconder of the motion indicated they were happy to amend the motion on that basis. A Member queried whether there were adequate parking spaces as there could be problems with on-street parking in the future. In response, the Planning Officer confirmed that County Highways had raised no objection to the proposal so the parking provision was considered to be acceptable. The Planning

Officer went on to advise that, should Members be minded to grant a delegated permission, she would recommend a number of conditions in relation to the implementation of the proposal within five years; approved drawing numbers; highways; and contaminated land.

47.30 Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That authority be **DELEGATED** to the Technical Planning Manager to **PERMIT** the application, subject to conditions in relation to implementation of the proposal within five years, approved drawing numbers, highways and contaminated land, and to secure an amended plan to show the replacement of the landscaping strip with a footpath.

18/00816/FUL – Highfield, Leckhampton Hill, Leckhampton

47.31 This was an application for construction of a replacement dwelling involving the demolition of existing dwelling and ancillary outbuildings/garage (revised scheme to 17/01057/FUL). The Committee had visited the application site on Friday 16 November 2018.

47.32 The Chair invited the applicant to address the Committee. The applicant indicated that, although the house was habitable, it was in drastic need of replacement in order to make it into an energy efficient lifetime home. She noted that the Officer report suggested the proposal would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and she indicated that there were two simple tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of Green Belt, either of which could be applied to this application: the replacement building should not be materially larger than the one it replaced - case law stated that could include existing outbuildings - and the proposed development should not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. She explained that the proposed plan dramatically reduced the overall site coverage, it had a smaller floor area than the existing buildings combined and she confirmed that it was proposed to remove all outbuildings - including those at a higher level - and some of the smaller floor area was partially contained within a basement level so could not be perceived in relation to the openness of the Green Belt. Significant revisions had been made to the proposal since the previous application; Officers had advised them to lower the impact on the valley-facing elevations and that was precisely what had been done. No elevation would be perceived as full two-storey, most were single storey and even the tallest wall was partially underground, utilising the fall in land levels. The Officer report compared this to the existing property, but she pointed out that the application included plans which showed that an extension could be added to existing property to make it into a five bed property with a very large three room outbuilding. In relation to the general impact on the landscape, the Officer report advised that the proposal would be viewed as substantial from the west; however, there were no public vantage points from the west where the site could be seen. Any views that did exist would be so distant that the low nature of the proposal, with its darker and more natural building materials, would ensure that the proposal would blend into the landscape. In contrast, the existing buildings were all above existing ground level, they imposed on the landscape with artificial retaining walls, were sited on two levels and were painted stark white. In summary, the proposed application had a smaller floor area than the existing area combined with that which would be allowed under permitted development rights; would have a lesser impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; and had been designed to minimise landscape impact. The applicant indicated that all consultees, including the Parish Council, fully supported the application and there had been no objections from neighbours. This was the perfect solution for this secluded, stunning site and she urged Members to support the application.

- 47.33 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 permitted as the applicant had come up with a well-planned proposal which would be in keeping with the surroundings and he did not agree that it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt given that it was for a replacement dwelling. He was confused by the second recommended refusal reason which set out that the proposal would be “harmful to the dark skies and tranquillity” and indicated that some of the building would be below the ground and therefore would be no higher than the existing building. He could see no real reason to refuse the application. The seconder of the motion noted that the following item on the Schedule of Planning Applications was very similar to this one and yet was recommended for permission. Having been on the site visit, she felt that, although it was within the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the design of the proposal would actually be a vast improvement on what was already there.
- 47.34 The Technical Planning Manager recognised that some Members may not agree with the Green Belt policy; however, this site was within the Green Belt therefore that policy did apply and the Officers’ judgement had been that the proposal amounted to inappropriate development in accordance with that policy. The seconder of the motion had made reference to the next item on the Schedule of Planning Applications and he reminded Members that each application must be considered on its own merits; the crucial difference was that this application was in the Green Belt and the other application was not, therefore the context of the site was different. He understood that Members may wish to take the view that the replacement dwelling would not be materially larger than the existing building, and that was a reasonable judgement to make. In terms of the second refusal reason and the reference to “dark skies”, he explained that one of the policies within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan aimed to limit the amount of light spillage. In terms of this proposal, it was considered that the way the elevations were set out would lead to greater light spillage from the glazing element and a judgement had to be made as to whether that was acceptable in the landscape. The Planning Officer advised that, if Members were minded to permit the application, he recommended the inclusion of conditions in relation to the implementation of the proposal within five years; material samples; levels; removal of existing buildings on site and improvement of the parking area prior to implementation to ensure space for vehicular turning; and removal of permitted development rights.
- 47.35 A Member sought clarification as to why removal of permitted development rights was recommended given that there were already restrictions in terms of what could be done in the Green Belt. The Technical Planning Manager explained that this proposal relied upon the removal of existing outbuildings to justify the increased floorspace; furthermore, it was a very bespoke design which Officers would want to be able to control in the setting of an Area of Outstanding Beauty. Without a condition to remove the permitted development rights there would be no restrictions in terms of what could be done in either of those regards. The Member raised concern that removal of permitted development rights would be imposing austere restrictions on an individual and their ability to make sensible adjustments to their property. In this instance, he felt it would be imposing the restrictions of the Green Belt which would apply anyway so he would not support the inclusion of such a condition in any planning permission granted.
- 47.36 During the debate which ensued, the seconder of the motion to permit the application expressed the opinion that a condition should be imposed to ensure the removal of permitted development rights given that the existing outbuildings had been included in the calculations to make the replacement building acceptable. The proposer of the motion took a different view and felt that imposing that condition would be a step too far. The Chair clarified that the proposal to permit the application was based on the replacement dwelling not being materially larger than the one it replaced, and that this would not have a detrimental impact on the

character and appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, so it was a question of whether Members would be happy if the replacement dwelling could subsequently be made materially larger under permitted development rights. As had been mentioned, the existing outbuildings were within the area proposed for the replacement dwelling, as such, it would seem contradictory not to remove permitted development rights to prevent further outbuildings from being erected. The seconder of the motion to permit the application proposed an amendment to the motion to add a condition to remove permitted development rights. This was seconded accordingly and, upon being put to the vote, the amendment was carried. The substantive motion to permit the application - with the condition to remove the permitted development rights and all other conditions put forward - was subsequently put to the vote and it was

RESOLVED That the application be **PERMITTED** with conditions in relation to the implementation of the proposal within five years; material samples; levels; removal of existing buildings on site and improvement of the parking area prior to implementation to ensure space for vehicular turning; and removal of permitted development rights.

18/00726/FUL – Hill Top, Cleeve Hill, Southam

- 47.37 This application was for demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage building and construction of a replacement dwelling and integral garage. The Committee had visited the application site on Friday 16 November 2018.
- 47.38 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 refused as the scale and design of the proposal would have an adverse impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposer of the motion advised that, whilst no letters of objection had been received, local residents were unhappy with the proposal which was considered to be a carbuncle in an area of beautiful countryside. The seconder of the motion queried why there was no reference to “dark skies and tranquillity” as there had been in the previous application given that the site was located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In response, the Technical Planning Manager reiterated that each application was considered on its own merits and that was a policy within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan which had been approved by Council and was a material planning consideration in determining applications; notwithstanding this, it was not possible to specifically reference every policy in every report and this site had a different context to the previous item on the Schedule of Planning Applications. A Member sought further clarification as to whether the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan was a Council policy, given that it had been approved by Council, and the Legal Adviser explained that, whilst it was not a policy of the Council as such, it related specifically to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and therefore it was a material consideration in decision-making.
- 47.39 A Member was of the view that it would be difficult to defend a refusal on appeal given that the proposal was similar in design to the site next door and would be lower to the ground when viewed from the Apple Tree Car Park. The proposer of the motion to refuse the application drew attention to Page No. 366, Paragraph 5.4 of the Officer report, which stated that the replacement dwelling should be of a similar size and scale to the existing dwelling, should respect the scale and character of existing property in the area and have no adverse impact on the landscape, and, within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, strict design controls would be applied given the priority afforded to the protection of the landscape. The proposal included large glass windows designed to maximise views of the surrounding landscape and, at night, the dwelling would be visually more prominent than the existing dwelling. Page No. 367, Paragraph 5.5 of the Officer report, set

out that the replacement dwelling would have a much larger footprint and floor space than the existing dwelling and she questioned why Paragraph 5.16 went on to state that this was reasonable. The report also made reference to the modern and contemporary dwellings in the immediate area – most notably No. 1-4 The View – but she was of the opinion that four wrongs did not make a right.

- 47.40 A Member noted that Cleeve Hill was notorious for slippage and work had been carried out to “sure up” the road beneath the development. With this in mind, he questioned whether it was possible to condition the planning permission to ensure that the foundations of the replacement dwelling were sufficient and that there was no detrimental effect on land in the area. The Technical Planning Manager advised that this had been raised previously by Members but it was a matter for structural engineers and building control; it was not for the Planning Committee to impose any conditions in this regard.
- 47.41 A Member indicated that there was already a dwelling on the site therefore it was a question of whether the proposed replacement dwelling fitted with the Council’s policies in terms of size; on that basis, he could see no reason to refuse the application. Upon being put to the vote, the proposal to refuse the application was lost. It was subsequently proposed and seconded that the application be permitted in accordance with the Officer recommendation. A Member drew attention to the Conservation Officer’s concerns regarding the proposed white render finish for the west facing elevation and she asked that a condition be included to ensure a softer and subtler finish and to ensure that as many bushes and trees as possible remain in place in order to give stability to the subsoil and prevent erosion of the garden and slope below. The Planning Officer confirmed that there was no intention to remove any trees and a condition was recommended to ensure that a specification of materials and finishes for the external walls, doors, windows and roofing proposed be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation.
- 47.42 Upon being put to the vote, it was
RESOLVED That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.
- 18/00851/FUL – Rose Cottage, School Lane, Southam**
- 47.43 This application was for the demolition and replacement of existing detached garage.
- 47.44 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. The proposer of the motion advised that the Parish Council had raised concern about the doors and the colour of the proposed garage but she noted that these matters were covered by conditions. Upon being put to the vote, it was
RESOLVED That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.
- 17/01268/FUL – Greenacres, Main Road, Minsterworth**
- 47.45 This application was for the removal of existing barns and stables, change of use from ancillary equestrian use to residential use and erection of seven new dwellings.
- 47.46 The Planning Officer explained that the Officer recommendation on the Committee papers was to delegate authority to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application, subject to completion of a legal agreement to secure on-site affordable housing and no adverse comments being received from County Highways. These comments had now been received and County Highways considered that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the impact could be effectively mitigated and the development would therefore have an unacceptable impact on highway

safety. The Officer recommendation had subsequently been changed from delegated permit to defer in order to allow the applicant time to submit information to address the issues raised by County Highways. In response to a query, the Planning Officer clarified that the comments had been made in response to the findings of the transport statement.

47.47 A Member indicated that the Parish Council was happy with the proposal and County Highways had not raised any concerns when a similar application had recently been permitted in this area. He was disappointed that County Highways had waited until this late stage to make these comments and questioned whether a deferral was really necessary. The Chair sought a view from Officers as to whether the Council would be putting itself at risk if it did not take County Highway's comments on board. The Legal Adviser indicated that, in this instance, the Council had been given very strong advice that the impact on the junction would be unacceptable; the difference between the recently permitted application and this one was that the former had a fallback position whereas this one did not. With regard to that application, the Technical Planning Manager explained that Members had been concerned with the junction but, in that case, the proposed development would result in less vehicle movements than the previous use so that was a very different situation to this where the applicant had no control over comings and goings on the neighbouring site which could still be lawfully used as a public house. He felt deferral would be a sensible way forward; however, he would also be comfortable with a delegated permission if Members would prefer to let Officers resolve the outstanding highways issues. He reiterated that, although it was unfortunate this had arisen at such a late stage, there was a real concern about the junction and Members would be well advised to heed that concern.

47.48 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation was to defer the application in order to allow the applicant to submit information to overcome the concerns raised by County Highways and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that authority be delegated to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application, subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure on-site affordable housing and suitable information being received from the applicant to overcome the concerns raised by County Highways. Upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That authority be **DELEGATED** to the Technical Planning Manager to **PERMIT** the application, subject to completion of a legal agreement to secure on-site affordable housing and suitable information being received from the applicant to overcome the concerns raised by County Highways.

17/01356/OUT – 48 Brookfield Road, Churchdown

47.49 This was an outline application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and replacement with two new dwellings with access, layout and scale for approval.

47.50 The Planning Officer explained that the Officer recommendation on the Committee papers was to delegate authority to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application, subject to a number of recommended conditions and no adverse comments being received from County Highways. Since the publication of the Committee papers, comments had been received from County Highways raising concern with the current layout on the grounds that the northern access failed to demonstrate adequate visibility to vehicles on Brookfield Road and pedestrians on the footway. As such, the Officer recommendation had been changed to defer in order to allow the applicant to amend the layout to address these comments and to re-advertise the application, should it be necessary. It was noted that there were existing accesses but County Highways was concerned about their intensification and visibility.

47.51 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item. The Officer recommendation was to defer the application in order to allow the applicant to amend the layout to address the concerns raised by County Highways, and to re-advertise the application, should it be necessary, and he sought a motion from the floor. It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred in accordance with the Officer recommendation and, upon being taken to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That the application be **DEFERRED** to allow the applicant to amend the layout to address the concerns raised by County Highways, and to re-advertise the application, should it be necessary.

PL.48 CURRENT APPEALS AND APPEAL DECISIONS UPDATE

48.1 Attention was drawn to the current appeals and appeal decisions update, circulated at Pages No. 12-18. Members were asked to consider the current planning and enforcement appeals received and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government appeal decisions issued.

48.2 With regard to the appeal in relation to the felling of a Perry Pear tree in Stoke Orchard which had been dismissed, a Member felt that the site needed to be monitored as the developers had not yet removed the building equipment and she was concerned that the tree could become damaged. She asked that Enforcement Officers ensure the area was totally cleared and that the grass was cut.

48.3 It was

RESOLVED That the current appeals and appeal decisions update be **NOTED**.

The meeting closed at 12:40 pm

Appendix 1**SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**
ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

Date: 20 November 2018

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.

Page No	Item No	
306	1	<p>17/01164/OUT</p> <p>Former Poultry Farm, Littleworth, Winchcombe</p> <p>The following contributions would be required in respect of the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dog fouling signage - 2nos. signs - £100 in total - The number of proposed dwellings does not require contributions towards dog bins - Library contributions - £4,704 - Contributions towards school places - £75,392
322	2	<p>17/00791/FUL</p> <p>Manor Farmhouse, Gretton Road, Gretton</p> <p>Further Representations</p> <p>The Parish Council has raised further objections set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The proposed silage store and ménage are higher than, and will overflow into, an adjacent natural stream (not a ditch), which borders a public open space used by children and the local community on the other side. b) The area proposed for a ménage and silage store are mapped by the Environment Agency as liable to flooding, so exacerbating the risk to adjacent public and private space from animal and other waste. c) Conformity with the visibility splay diagram (posted on 6 November) requires the destruction of an existing stone wall which is an important part of the character of the village and the Conservation Area, with no information about the proposed outcome. d) The acceptance of the changed splay lines by the Highways Authority on 13 November pays no regard to the visual and aesthetic effect on the Conservation Area. <p>The applicant's response to the Parish Council objections is set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The barn will be used for storage of hay and straw, which is a dry product with no leakage or residue - it is not a silage storage. The ménage will have its own soak away for surface water, there will be plenty of drainage. b) The area in question does not flood and never has done in the nine years we have lived there. It simply cannot flood as the fall is too great and I dug the ditch out some years ago, so the water flow is good. The ditch in

		<p>question is approx. 7 inches deep and around 8 inches wide.</p> <p>c) Animal waste - There will be two ponies, four goats and five sheep on site so animal waste will be very minimal.</p> <p>d) Second entrance sight line. The entrance in question is an existing entrance and we still use it to take cattle and sheep in and out of the field, by 4x4 car and trailer. I will move part of the wall to make the entrance easier to use. This wall be rebuilt using the same existing original stone and will be in keeping with the remaining wall, as only part of the existing wall needs to be moved.</p> <p>The County Highways Officer has raised no objections to the re-use of the field access. Conditions to secure the appropriate visibility splays are being discussed.</p> <p>Revised Recommendation</p> <p>It is recommended that authority be delegated to the Technical Planning Manager to permit the application, subject to resolving any highways conditions.</p>
329	3	<p>18/00368/OUT</p> <p>Brockridge Park, Brockridge Road, Twyning</p> <p>A local Ward Member has raised concerns with regards to highway safety, in particular the slip-road from the motorway and the cattle grid.</p> <p>The recommendation to permit remains unchanged.</p>
341	4	<p>18/00856/FUL</p> <p>12 High Street, Stanton</p> <p>Additional Representations Received</p> <p>In addition to the Parish Council's original letter of objection, two further letters of objection have been received - one from the Parish Council and one from a Parish Councillor both of which are attached in full.</p> <p>Summarised points are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not a traditional Cotswold drystone wall. - It will have a detrimental effect on the High Street. - The partly built wall is at least 15 inches over the highway, which is understood to be Gloucestershire County Council land. - To allow the wall to be constructed out of coursed walling stone will damage the special nature of this Conservation Area. - The wall should be constructed as a drystone wall using field Cotswold stone. <p>Notwithstanding this, the recommendation remains unchanged.</p>
349	6	<p>18/00543/FUL</p> <p>Staverton Connection, Gloucester Road, Staverton</p> <p><u>Consultations and Representations</u></p> <p>Following the publication of the report, the County Highway Authority has commented on the application. No highway objection is raised subject to compliance with a number of recommended conditions.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant's agent has submitted a letter providing comments on the Officer report. The letter is attached in full.</p>

365	8	<p>18/00726/FUL</p> <p>Hill Top, Cleeve Hill, Southam</p> <p>It is recommended that the following informative note is included:</p> <p><i>For the avoidance of doubt, the permission hereby granted does not authorize any works on the public highway.</i></p>
372	9	<p>18/00851/FUL</p> <p>Rose Cottage, School Lane, Southam</p> <p>Revised plans were received on 12 November 2018 showing a timber garage door (see attached). The plans also confirm that the garage would be rendered in an off-white colour.</p> <p>The proposed conditions shall therefore be altered as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) The proposed garage doors shall be timber as shown on the plans dated 12th November 2018. 3) The garage shall be rendered in an off white colour as shown on the plans dated 12th November 2018 unless a suitable alternative is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 4) The development/works hereby permitted shall only be implemented in accordance with the plans as set out in the plans list below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing elevations and existing floor plans received on 20 August 2018. - Site location plan and proposed block plan received on 17 September 2018. - Proposed elevations and proposed floor plans received on 12 November 2018.
375	10	<p>17/01268/FUL</p> <p>Greenacres, Main Road, Minsterworth</p> <p>It is recommended that the following informative note is included:</p> <p><i>In accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Pre-commencement Conditions) Regulations 2018, the applicant has agreed to pre-commencement condition 7 requiring details of the proposed drainage works prior to the commencement of development and condition 8 requiring the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation prior to the commencement of development.</i></p> <p>Condition Updates</p> <p>The applicant has submitted an additional site plan which demonstrates which plots would be affordable housing units - drawing no. 939,81-29F. It is proposed to add this drawing to the list of approved plans in Condition 2.</p>

ITEM 4 – 18/00856/FUL - Representation Letter No 1 – Page 1 of 2

Dear James,

The Parish Council made clear its objection to the removal of the conditions relating to the construction of the wall.

The original application was to build a dry stone wall and that is what Tewkesbury has approved.

The current application which Julian Bagg describes as "alien " should not proceed as it is clearly not a traditional Cotswold drystone wall.

Furthermore it will have a detrimental effect on the High Street and presumably this was the reason the Enforcement Officer ordered the work to cease.

The partly built wall is at least 15" over the highway, which I understand Gloucestershire County Council will need to sanction.

This part of the roadway is much narrower than the rest of the High Street and the eroding of the carriage way makes things much worse, evidenced by the removal of half of the width of the verges along the The Old School & Little Warrens.

Yours sincerely

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.

ITEM 4 – 18/00856/FUL -Additional Information from Parish Council – Page 2 of 2

The Stanton Parish Council was disappointed by the decision of the Officer to recommend that this application, in its modified form, be permitted. The position of this wall on the High Street in Stanton is very important and will have a major visual impact. To allow the wall to be constructed out of coursed walling stone which is of a regular cut is wrong for the village and will damage the special nature of this conservation area. There may be other examples of regular cut stone being used in the past and in different, less prominent locations, but these are few and that is no reason to perpetuate this error. The wall should be constructed as a dry- stone wall using field Cotswold stone. If the Committee wish to help preserve a part of the English heritage then this wall should be built properly with the correct material, as was originally required when planning permission was first granted.

Stanton Parish Council

ITEM 6 – 18/00543/FUL - Additional Information from Agent



T19 Promenade t 01242 895 008
 Cheltenham w www.mplanning.co.uk
 GL50 1NW

MP Ref: NM/0427
 Email: nathan.mcloughlin@mplanning.co.uk

16 November 18

Planning Committee Members
 Tewkesbury Borough Council
VIA EMAIL ONLY

Dear Councillor

Planning Committee Item 6 - Staverton Connection, Staverton – 18/00543/FUL - Application for the redevelopment of existing vehicle storage compound to provide a new infill commercial aerospace building for Pennant International.

I refer to the above planning application, which will be determined by the Planning Committee on the 20th November 2018.

Having now had the opportunity to review the committee report, I have a number of concerns over some of the report and consider it important to make the committee aware. These concerns can be summarised as follows:

1. Paragraph 5.13 and 5.14 sets out that the proposal site plays an important role in contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. This contradicts the Council's own Green Belt Review evidence base, that concludes that Staverton Connection has a "LOW" rating. The Green Belt Review concludes that the site no longer contributes to the 5 purposes for including land within Green Belt. As a result, we question how the site can contribute to the openness of the Green Belt.
2. Paragraph 5.15 of the report sets out the 'Applicant's Very Special Circumstances' to warrant the granting of planning permission. However, the report has failed to correctly set out the 7 given reasons, as follows;
 - a. Reason 2 should set out that the approval of this building would provide **£25-£30 million** worth of new contracts.
 - b. Reason 4 should read that the failure to grant permission **will** result in the loss of the business from the Borough to off-shore.
 - c. Reason 6 should set out that **all** of Pennant's operations need to be pre-approved by the Police and the Home Office, with it important to key clients that the business operates from Staverton.

The above highlights the proposal represents substantial economic gains for the Borough, with the retention of 125 jobs and the creation of 40 FTE permanent jobs.

3. Paragraph 5.20 concludes that the Very Special Circumstance could be used for any existing business who wishes to expand in the Borough. This fails to recognise the individual circumstances of the site (see point 1).
4. Paragraph 5.23 – 5.27 sets out the Council's concerns regarding design. This is considered at odds with the work undertaken in addressing the comments of the Urban Design Officer, who **no longer** has an objection to the revised proposal.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. If you have any queries in relation to this planning application ahead of its determination at Committee, please contact me.

Yours sincerely

Nathan McLoughlin BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Managing Director



ITEM 9 – 18/00851/FUL - Revised Plan

PROPOSED GARAGE

CONSTRUCTION:
SINGLE SHED ROOF CONSTRUCTION WITH GFT WHITE BENDERS TO EXTERNAL WALLS
FOUNDATIONS TIED WITH BUILDING BUT TO BE SUITABLE FOR STRUCTURE.

ROOF:
FLAT TIMBER ROOF WITH SUITABLE MEMBRANE COVERING, 100MM DGP TO BEAL, SAME AS EXISTING.

DRAINAGE:
USING EXISTING DRAINAGE AND ROUTING BUT NEW MATERIALS

WOODEN GARAGE DOOR (DRAWING SHOWS APPROX LOCATION) LIGHT ON FRONT OF BUILDING (AS PER EXISTING).

PROJECT:
ROSE COTTAGE
SCHOOL LANE
SCOTTHAM
GERRINHAM
G52 2AN

DRAWING NO. 1

DRAWINGS TO SCALE WITH THESELETS. ALL MEASUREMENTS MUST BE CHECKED ON SITE AND NOT SOLED FROM THIS DRAWING.

SCALE 1:50