

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held remotely on
Tuesday, 19 January 2021 commencing at 10:00 am**

Present:

Chair
Vice Chair

Councillor J H Evetts
Councillor R D East

and Councillors:

R A Bird, G F Blackwell, L A Gerrard, M A Gore, D J Harwood, M L Jordan, E J MacTiernan,
J R Mason, P W Ockelton, A S Reece, P E Smith, R J G Smith, P D Surman, R J E Vines,
M J Williams and P N Workman

PL.48 ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 48.1 The Chair advised that the meeting was being held under the emergency provisions of the Coronavirus Act 2020 and, specifically, The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020. The meeting was being broadcast live via the internet, it was not being recorded by the Council but, under the usual transparency rules, it may be being recorded by others.
- 48.2 The Chair outlined the procedure for the meeting, including public speaking.

PL.49 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

- 49.1 There were no apologies for absence.

PL.50 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 50.1 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.
- 50.2 As there had been a tendency at recent meetings for Members to declare that they were the Ward Member for a particular application the Chair reminded Members that ward membership was not in itself an interest that needed to be declared. It was only interests that arose under the Code of Members' Conduct or the Protocol for Councillors and Officers Involved in the Planning Process, that should be declared.

50.3 The following declarations were made:

Councillor	Application No./Agenda Item	Nature of Interest (where disclosed)	Declared Action in respect of Disclosure
G F Blackwell	Agenda Item 5(a) 20/00446/FUL- 51 Sandycroft Road, Churchdown. Agenda Item 5(b) 20/00993/FUL – 26 Winston Road, Churchdown.	Is a Member of Churchdown Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
M L Jordan	Agenda Item 5(a) 20/00446/FUL - 51 Sandycroft Road, Churchdown. Agenda Item 5(b) 20/00993/FUL – 26 Winston Road, Churchdown.	Is a Member of Churchdown Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
R J G Smith	Agenda Item 5(a) 20/00446/FUL – 51 Sandycroft Road, Churchdown. Agenda Item 5(b) 20/00993/FUL – 26 Winston Road, Churchdown.	Is a Member of Churchdown Parish Council but does not participate in planning matters.	Would speak and vote.
P D Surman	Agenda Item 5(e) 20/00107/FUL – Buckland Manor Farm, Buckland.	Had received a number of telephone calls from local residents but had not expressed an opinion.	Would speak and vote.

50.4 There were no further declarations made on this occasion.

PL.51 MINUTES

51.1 The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2020, copies of which had been circulated, were approved as a correct record.

PL.52 DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - APPLICATIONS TO THE BOROUGH COUNCIL

52.1 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.

20/00446/FUL - 51 Sandycroft Road, Churchdown

52.2 This application was for the erection of a single storey side and rear extensions.

52.3 In presenting the application the Planning Officer explained that a Committee decision was required as the Parish Council had objected on the grounds of overdevelopment and the detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the area and existing neighbours. The Planning Officer had noted the Parish Council's concerns however, in terms of overdevelopment, it was explained that there would be adequate garden area which was free from extensions and additions and there had been no previous extensions other than a rear conservatory which had been constructed under permitted development. With regards to visual amenity, the proposed extensions would be of a suitable size and design and constructed from matching materials. In addition, there were other similar sized extensions on the estate. In relation to the impact on immediate neighbours, given that the rear extensions would be single storey with a flat roof, it was not considered there would be an adverse impact. Overall, the proposal was considered to be of a suitable size and design and would be in keeping with the area and, as such, the recommendation was to permit.

52.4 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item and the Officer recommendation was to permit the application.

52.5 It was proposed and seconded and, upon being put to the vote, it was

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

20/00993/FUL - 26 Winston Road, Churchdown

52.6 This application was for the erection of a two-storey side extension.

52.7 The Planning Officer explained that this was a householder application to add a two storey side extension to the property where there was currently a single attached garage. The current property, which was semi-detached, was located on a cul-de-sac where there were dwellings of a similar style and a Committee decision was required as the Parish Council had objected on the grounds that the development would be large in size and out of keeping with the area. The Planning Officer had noted the Parish Council's concerns however, it was her view that the development would be of an appropriate scale and would not appear out of keeping with the area, particularly as many of the dwellings in the vicinity had similar extensions, including the adjoining property. In addition, the site was large enough to accommodate the extension, it would not cause any amenity issues and it was therefore recommended that the application be permitted.

52.8 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item and the Officer recommendation was to permit the application.

52.9 It was proposed and seconded and, upon being put to the vote, it was

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

20/00732/FUL - 3 Hertford Road, Bishops Cleeve

- 52.10 This application was for the erection of single storey side/rear extensions and front/rear dormer extensions.
- 52.11 The Planning Officer explained that a Committee decision was required on this application as the Parish Council had objected on the grounds that the proposed extensions would significantly increase the property's footprint and, with the dormers, would represent overdevelopment of the site. The Planning Officer had noted the Parish Council's concerns however, she felt the proposed side extension would be modest in size and would be set well back from the frontage with a lower roof height. The proposed dormer windows would be set back from the eaves and the windows on the proposed front dormer would sit over the ground floor windows meaning they would appear well balanced and proportionate in scale. The proposed rear extension would be flat roofed and not visible from the road and there would be an acceptable amount of garden space left which was free from extensions/additions; it was also noted that the property had not previously been extended. The Planning Officer showed the Committee a number of photographs highlighting other similar extensions along this road one of which was two doors away. Overall, she was of the view that, the proposal was of a suitable size and design and would be in-keeping with the area and, as such, her recommendation was to permit.
- 52.12 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item and the Officer recommendation was to permit the application.
- 52.13 In proposing the Officer recommendation, one of the local Member's expressed his support for the application as it was a similar size to other properties and gardens. The proposal was seconded and, upon being put to the vote, it was
- RESOLVED** That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

20/01006/FUL - 34 Rosefield Crescent, Newtown

- 52.14 This application was for the erection of a single storey rear extension.
- 52.15 The Planning Officer explained that this was a householder application in respect of a semi-detached property located on an estate in Newtown, Tewkesbury. The application was for the demolition of an existing conservatory and the addition of a single storey, brick built, rear extension in its place. The proposed extension would cover the same floor area as the existing conservatory and extend further into the garden. A Committee decision was required as the Town Council had objected on the grounds that the adjoining property would lose useful morning sunlight. The Planning Officer had noted the Town Council's concerns however, it was her view that any loss of morning sunlight over and above the existing situation would be less than harmful considering the orientation of the properties, both having south facing gardens, and the presence of an existing extension on the adjoining property. It was therefore her recommendation that the application be permitted.
- 52.16 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item and the Officer recommendation was to permit the application.
- 52.17 It was proposed and seconded and, upon being put to the vote, it was
- RESOLVED** That the application be **PERMITTED** in accordance with the Officer recommendation.

20/00107/FUL - Buckland Manor Farm, Buckland

- 52.18 This was an application for the demolition of an existing agricultural workers dwelling, the erection of an open market replacement dwelling of exceptional quality design and the erection of a barn incorporating a bat roost.
- 52.19 The Planning Officer advised that due to the visual nature of this proposal, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) context and the fact that it was not possible at the current time to conduct site visits, her presentation would be longer and more detailed to provide Members with a full appreciation of the site and the proposed development. The application related to an isolated farmstead in the open countryside of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it was located outside the village of Buckland and was accessed via a long driveway. The site was at the head of a localised valley and benefited from a good degree of visual containment due to local topography and vegetation. The dwelling dated from the 1970s and was subject to an agricultural tie. The Cotswold Way passed to the north and east of the site and the Winchcombe way to the south. The site and immediate residential curtilage comprised a farmhouse, converted ancillary accommodation, a swimming pool and a tennis court. Outside the residential curtilage, the landholding encompassed extensive formal and informal landscaped areas and fields beyond and included two large agricultural buildings. The application sought the demolition of the tied farmhouse and ancillary buildings and the erection of an open market replacement dwelling of exceptional quality and design; the existing agricultural barns would be retained and a new barn constructed adjacent which would incorporate a replacement bat roost. Integral to the scheme was an extensive landscape master plan which proposed landscape and biodiversity enhancements to integrate the site within the AONB setting. The applicant was proposing the new dwelling on the grounds that special circumstances existed to warrant the granting of planning permission under Paragraph 79(e) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which allowed for the development of isolated homes in the countryside. That policy required homes to be of exceptional quality in that they were truly outstanding or innovative, reflecting the highest standards of architecture and would help raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas and would significantly enhance the immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area. The key material issues for consideration were the principle of the development, including the removal of the agricultural tie and erection of a replacement dwelling of exceptional quality and truly outstanding or innovative design, and the impact on the landscape of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Planning Officer indicated that, in formulating a recommendation, the opinions of the Gloucestershire Design Review Panel and the Cotswolds Conservation Board had been sought and, on balance, Officers considered the proposed development was of exceptional quality and complied with the tests set out in Paragraph 79(e) of the National Planning Policy Framework in that it was truly outstanding, reflected the highest standards in architecture and would help raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas. It was also concluded that the proposal would not unduly impact the landscape character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that the proposed landscape enhancement measures would significantly enhance the immediate setting of the site and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. It was also concluded that it was not necessary to reimpose an agricultural tie on the dwelling as it would serve no agricultural purpose now or in the future. The late representations sheet referred to the receipt of a revised Ecological Appraisal Report which had been reviewed by the Council's Ecological Adviser who had confirmed no objection subject to conditions. As a consequence, Conditions 2 and 8 in the Officer report needed to be updated with details of the revised Ecological Appraisal report. On this basis the Officer recommendation in the report of delegated permit subject to the receipt of an updated Ecological report and any consequential updating of conditions had been

amended to permit subject to conditions.

52.20 The Chair invited the applicant to address the Committee. The applicant advised that he was delighted with the Officer's report which he felt was both comprehensive and very concise. The applicant had lived at the site for 26 years and, prior to that, his parents had lived there for 14 years meaning the family had a long association with the site and the village. He intended that the development would be his final home and, once completed, he would live there with his wife, with family members visiting on a regular basis. It had always been his ambition to develop a beautiful and sustainable house at the location and he considered himself both lucky and privileged to be living in one of the most stunning locations in Britain. He believed that the proposal before the Committee was a befitting and deserving development of the site which brought with it landscape enhancements and what he considered to be an incredible design. He was of the view that, not only would the house slip seamlessly onto the site, but it would help reduce his carbon footprint and allow a shift away from fossil fuels. The applicant indicated that he had been on an exciting journey with the application and had used a professional team which had guided him through every step but, to provide additional help, he had taken the design to the Gloucestershire Design Panel on two occasions to refine the proposal and get endorsement that it was a proposal of outstanding and innovative design that reflected the highest standards in architecture and would help raise the standards of design more generally in rural areas. The applicant advised that the team had been assembled for the construction stage and he was excited about the development and delivery of the new house which it was anticipated would be completed in about 18 months.

52.21 One of the local Ward Member's indicated that she would like the Committee to address the concerns raised by local residents and the Parish Council in relation to heavy construction traffic. From the proposal it looked like the construction traffic would access the site along the Winchcombe Way rather than the existing driveway to the property. She could see no reason why construction traffic could not use the existing driveway rather than use a route that would provide added danger to the public. The proposed route was used extensively by the public on a regular basis and she was of the view that construction traffic would pose a significant danger to the public and was unnecessary when there was a perfectly adequate driveway that could be used as an alternative route for construction vehicles. She referred to Condition No.13, on Page 76 of the Officer Report, and proposed that it be amended to ensure that the construction traffic route should be along the existing driveway, she was very keen for this to happen also to avoid a new temporary access being created. In addition, she asked that times for delivery and construction be stated in the condition to ensure that large lorries would not be coming through very small villages with single lanes at all hours of the day and during weekends; there were lots of public visiting the beautiful Cotswold villages in this area and it was important to ensure their protection. The local Member proposed that the application be permitted in accordance with the Officer recommendation subject to the amendment of Condition 13 to include reference to hours of construction and delivery of construction materials and the use of the existing driveway for construction traffic, the precise wording of which to be specified by the Officers. This motion was seconded. Another Member spoke in support of the motion advising that the area was rife with walkers not only accessing the Winchcombe Way but also the Cotswold Way which included a bridle path which was used by horse riders and off road cycle riders; he was of the view that there was the need for a sound transport plan in order to protect residents and visitors to the area. He maintained that Buckland was a beautiful village that was one of the gems of the Cotswold Escarpment and he did not wish to see heavy construction traffic ripping up verges and destroying the tranquillity of the village; it was essential that controls were put in place and checks carried out if this proposal was permitted. The Member referred also to the fact that the proposal was subject to a substantial objection from the

Cotswold Conservation Board and he questioned how the Officer recommendation to permit this application outweighed these concerns. Another Member questioned the reference in the papers to an “open market” replacement dwelling when the applicant had indicated that he intended to live in the property; this was not her understanding of an open market dwelling, she also questioned what the current property on the site would be used for. Another Member asked how the agricultural tie could be removed when previously a High Court Judge had indicated that it should remain; he queried whether this was simply overcome by demolishing the agricultural workers dwelling. This view was supported by another Member of the Committee who spoke about how difficult it was to get agricultural dwellings built for farmers children and in this instance it was being lost in favour of a very expensive new build. It was also queried as to what would happen to the bats during the 18 month construction period which had been mentioned by the applicant in his presentation.

52.22 The Planning Officer indicated that the AONB Board had raised objections which included the large scale of the proposed development, impact on the AONB, local distinctiveness and tranquillity, the latter relating to things like glint and glare from materials and light spill during the evening. These had been carefully considered by the applicant who had produced a robust note addressing the issues raised. In addition, the Council's Landscape Advisor had been asked to review the landscape and visual impact assessment from which it was very clear that the dwelling was self-contained and there were very few views of it in the local landscape. Notwithstanding this the dwelling itself had been designed to a very high standard; it was a contemporary design and the AONB Board would much prefer to see something more traditional with traditional architectural features incorporated into it. This was not a requirement of the NPPF which in fact suggested that Planning Authorities should be looking for very good, high quality, innovative designs that take account of local setting and characteristics. Accordingly, the architectural practice that designed this dwelling did a very robust analysis of all the local characteristics of the AONB in terms of the form of the landscape the colours and the pallets of the landscape and local materials and whilst they had produced a contemporary design they felt the proposal before Members responded in a very localised way to the application site to the extent that it would not be a dwelling which could be built anywhere else in the Cotswolds. It had been designed specifically for this site taking into account and responding to the landscape characteristics. Officers considered very carefully the Applicant's response to the concerns raised by the AONB Board and on balance it was felt that the quality of the design did respond to the landscape as required under Paragraph 79(e) of the NPPF and was of such high quality to override the concerns of the AONB Board in this instance. Members would be aware of other contemporary designs in the AONB and other protected landscapes with particular reference being made in the Officer Report to the Leaf House which the Committee had previously approved therefore contemporary designs in such locations were not unusual but clearly needed to be of a very high quality and respond to the landscape context in which they were set which the Planning Officer felt was the case in this instance. The Development Manager responded to some of the other questions that had been raised indicating that the existing property on the site would be demolished as part of the proposal and that the reference to “open market” was simply to demonstrate that the property would not be subject to an agricultural tie and whilst it was clearly the Applicant's intention to live in the property there would be nothing to stop him selling it on the open market. In terms of the agricultural tie, the court case was about five or six years ago and followed the refusal of a Certificate of Lawfulness Application in 2013 as referenced in Section 2 on Page 59 of the Officer Report. Application 12/00915/CLE for the continued residential use of the dwelling without complying with an agricultural occupancy condition was refused and dismissed on appeal, the applicants had challenged the appeal decision based on a specific argument as to whether they met the terms of this condition. The applicants claimed that they had

lived in the property for more than 10 years without meeting the condition but the Council and the Planning Inspector took the view that the condition had been met as one of the residents was a farmer; the Judge ruled that this specific argument did not hold legal sway and the applicants had lost the case. In respect of this application, the agricultural tie was being considered in the context of planning policy and in the general round of the proposal rather than that specific legal argument. A pragmatic view had been taken as to whether the property, as it currently stood, would be available to an agricultural worker on an agricultural wage and it was the opinion of the Planning Officer that an agricultural worker would not be able to afford to live in the property or to purchase it; on this basis the requirements of the Council's Policy had been met. There was an argument to insist that the Applicant should go through the process of applying to remove the condition and proving that he had unsuccessfully marketed the property but Officers had taken the view that the outcome would be no different that no one who met the condition would be in a position to purchase the property and meet the requirements. The Development Manager then referred to the motion and amendments to Condition 13, he indicated that an addition could be made to point 6 to include a requirement to specify the intended hours of construction and deliveries. A new bullet point could be added to Condition 13 requiring construction vehicles to use the access that the local Member had mentioned but it would be necessary to consider carefully the wording and may require the addition of a plan to the Decision Notice to clarify exactly the route to be taken. However, he did think Members should be aware that this matter had been discussed with County Highways and Officers did not necessarily agree that this condition would be necessary or meet the required tests for planning conditions. Nevertheless, from the discussion that had taken place so far it was clear that Members thought it was necessary taking on board their local knowledge and the views of the residents who had commented on the application. At the end of the day it was a matter of judgement taking account of the fact that such a condition was not supported by County Highways as the Council's specialist advisor in this area. The Planning Officer went on to address the question concerning the bats; she indicated that there were bats in the main house and other buildings on the site and this matter had been carefully considered by the Ecological Appraisal Report and the Council's Ecological Adviser. The main issue related to the demolition of the main house and the proposal was for mitigation and compensation to overcome this. The proposal would be carried out under a licence from Natural England which would provide another level of protection over the process and involved the construction of a new bat barn adjacent to the existing barns on the site with a bat roost in the void above it; the timing of the construction of that roost, together with the timing of the demolition of the main house, was key and would be undertaken to ensure that there was no adverse impact on the bats.

- 52.23 A discussion ensued on the agricultural tie, the Council's policy in this respect, the lack of reference to the impact on the Cotswold Vernacular, the size of the proposal and it being out of keeping with the area and future precedent. The local Member who had proposed the motion under discussion indicated that she was happy with the suggested amendments to Condition 13 by the Development Manager, she was sure that the Applicant would be happy to accept these taking into account the views of local residents and being a resident of the area himself for over 10 years. She felt that the additions were really important to avoid a conflict with the local residents, visitors, walkers and riders making use of the beautiful area surrounding the site of this application. In relation to the concerns expressed about precedent and size, the Development Manager stressed that each application must be considered on its own merits and in respect of the Cotswold vernacular he indicated that from a design point of view reflecting did not necessarily mean mimicking and sometimes the quality of design, the use of materials, the way it fitted into the landscape, as was the case with this proposal, reflected the vernacular rather than

necessarily mimicking it.

52.24 Upon the motion being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED That the application be **PERMITTED** with an addition to the conditions requiring construction traffic to use the existing driveway, the condition on specifying construction times being amended to include deliveries and the revision of Conditions 2 and 8 to reflect receipt and details of the revised Ecological Appraisal Report.

20/00240/FUL - Copper Close, Bushcombe Lane, Woodmancote

52.25 This was a Section 73 application for the variation of conditions 3,4,5,7 and 8 of planning permission 12/01190/FUL to allow changes to the boundary treatments and to the design and footprint of plot 1.

52.26 The Planning Officer explained that the site was on the corner of Bushcombe Lane and Aesop's Orchard in Woodmancote and currently had planning permission for two dwellings, one of which had already been constructed; plot 2. The current application was for the variation of approved plans for amendments to the design of plot 1 – not yet commenced – and amendments to the approved boundary treatments for the site. The design alteration to plot 1 was for a slight increase to the footprint of the dwelling and proposed an additional gable to the rear elevation, nearest to the boundary with plot 2, which would add a further bedroom and result in a five bedroomed dwelling. Alterations to the approved boundary treatment were retrospective in part as the approved Cotswold Stone wall with a boundary fence was difficult to implement due to the difference in ground levels so, to provide privacy and security for plot 2, Portuguese Laurels had been planted between the Cotswold Stone wall and the footpath of Aesop's Orchard. The stone wall was more visible on the corner of Aesop's Orchard and Bushcombe Lane. A solid brick wall was proposed between plots 1 and 2 instead of a wooden fence and the brick wall had been implemented in part. The rear boundary between plot 1 and the property at the rear was a post and rail fence and Portuguese Laurels had been planted. A block and section plan had been submitted to clarify the exact location of the proposed and implemented boundary treatment. It was considered that the amended design and boundary treatment would not result in substantial or demonstrable harm to the streetscene and character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal provided adequate access and parking arrangement which would not unduly affect the residential amenity of neighbouring properties or the setting of nearby listed buildings and on this basis the recommendation was to permit subject to conditions.

52.27 The Chair indicated that there were no public speakers for this item and the Officer recommendation was to permit the application.

52.28 In proposing that the application be permitted, a Member indicated that thanks to the Planning Officer the concerns of the Parish Council in relation to the wall and Portuguese Laurel hedge had been overcome. The motion to permit was seconded and, upon being put to the vote, it was

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

PL.53 CURRENT APPEALS AND APPEAL DECISIONS UPDATE

- 53.1 Attention was drawn to the current appeals and appeal decisions update, circulated at Pages No.95-99. Members were asked to consider the current planning and enforcement appeals received and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government appeal decisions issued.
- 53.2 A Member referred to the enforcement case at Severnside Farm, Walham, shown at the top of Page 99, and asked that his thanks be recorded to the Case Officer who had, in his view, gone above and beyond in dealing with this matter.
- 53.3 After consideration it was

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

The meeting closed at 11:30 am

Agenda 5
Planning Committee

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS SHEET

Date: 19th January 2021

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.

Item No	
5e	<p>20/00107/FUL</p> <p>Buckland Manor Farm, Buckland, Broadway, Worcestershire, WR12 7LY</p> <p>Officer Update</p> <p>Ecology</p> <p>Since writing the Committee report the applicant has submitted a revised Ecological Appraisal Report (dated January 2021) in response to the Ecological Adviser's comments that details of supervision of the demolition of one of the buildings should be incorporated into the report. The Ecological Adviser has reviewed the revised report and confirms no objection, subject to conditions, which are set out on the Agenda.</p> <p>Condition Update</p> <p>As a consequence of the submission of the revised report Conditions 2 and 8 on the Agenda need to be updated with the details of the revised Ecological Appraisal report.</p> <p>Recommendation Update</p> <p>The recommendation on the Agenda is for a Delegated Permit subject to the receipt of an updated Ecological Report and any consequential updating of conditions. As this has now been resolved (as set out above) it is suggested that the Recommendation be amended to Permit, subject to conditions.</p>
5f	<p>20/00240/FUL</p> <p>Copper Close, Bushcombe Lane, Woodmancote, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, GL52 9QJ</p> <p>An additional plan was submitted on the 6th January 2021 to show the location of the Cotswold stone wall as built and the Portuguese Laurel hedge planted adjacent to footpath of Aesops Orchard. Condition 2 to be amended to include the additional plan.</p> <p>Amendment to the Officer's Report</p> <p>Point 1.2 to be amended to the following:</p> <p>Planning permission 12/01190/FUL was granted for 2 two storey dwellings on the site, plot 2 has been constructed.</p>

	<p>Additional comments received from the Parish Council on 18th January 2021.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to make further representations from Woodmancote Parish Council.</p> <p>The Planning Officer has stated the position of Woodmancote Parish Council very well. We also recognise the reasoning for the officer's recommendation to permit although it is important for the committee to appreciate that this applicant originally applied for a dwelling of this size in 2012 and this was refused because it was too big and the adverse impact on the street scene and neighbouring listed buildings. After amending the plans to reduce the size, the revised 2012 proposal was permitted. Therefore, the proposal in front of the committee now is a request to grant permission for a dwelling that is very similar in size to the one refused in 2012 ie oversized and too close to neighbouring properties and inappropriate for its location. We trust the planning committee to consider this history before voting on the matter.</p> <p>The Tree officer recommended that a strategically placed tree between the 2 properties at the front would mitigate the harm to the street scene by breaking up the pattern. If the committee are minded to permit - we agree to this suggested planning condition which should be added to Condition 9 of the officers recommendation. In fact, if the Committee are so minded, we would like to see another small tree located behind the front wall closer to Half Acre for similar reasons.</p>
--	--