

27 January 2016

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Development Control Committee will be held on **TUESDAY, 09 FEBRUARY 2016** in the Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Ebley Wharf, Stroud at **18:00**.



David Hagg
Chief Executive

Please Note:

- i This meeting will be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site (www.stroud.gov.uk). By entering the Council Chamber you are consenting to being filmed. The whole of the meeting will be filmed except where there are confidential or exempt items, which may need to be considered in the absence of the press and public.
- ii The procedure for public speaking which applies to Development Control Committees is set out on the page immediately preceding the Planning Schedule.

AGENDA

- 1 **APOLOGIES**
To receive apologies of absence.
- 2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
To receive declarations of interest.
- 3 **MINUTES - 12 JANUARY 2016**
To approve and sign as a correct record the minutes of Development Control Committee held on 12 January 2016.
- 4 **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - PLANNING SCHEDULE**
(NOTE: For access to information purposes the background papers for the applications listed on the above schedule are the application itself and subsequent papers as listed in the relevant file.)
 - 4.1 **THE FULL MOON, MOUNT PLEASANT, WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE (S.14/2430/FUL)**
Proposed demolition of existing public house and erection of 11 new dwellings with access and parking.

4.2 **TOWNSEND FARM, THE STREET, STINCHCOMBE (S.15/2704/HHOLD)**
Erection of extensions.

Members of Development Control Committee

Councillor Stephen Moore (Chair)
Councillor John Marjoram (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Liz Ashton
Councillor Dorcas Binns
Councillor Rowland Blackwell
Councillor Nigel Cooper

Councillor Paul Hemming
Councillor Haydn Jones
Councillor Dave Mossman
Councillor Steve Robinson
Councillor Emma Sims
Councillor Tom Williams

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

12 January 2016

10.00 am – 10.03 pm
Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Stroud**3****Minutes****Membership:**

Councillor Stephen Moore**	P	Councillor Paul Hemming	P
Councillor John Marjoram *	P	Councillor Haydn Jones	P
Councillor Liz Ashton	P	Councillor David Mossman	P
Councillor Dorcas Binns	A	Councillor Steve Robinson	P
Councillor Rowland Blackwell	A	Councillor Emma Sims	P
Councillor Nigel Cooper	P	Councillor Tom Williams	P

** = Chair * = Vice Chair

P = Present A = Absent

Officers in Attendance

Planning Manager	Solicitors
Team Manager	Policy Implementation Manager
Principal Planning Officers	Democratic Services Officer
Senior Planning Officer	

Other Members in Attendance

Councillors Chris Brine, Nick Hurst, John Jones, Gary Powell, Mattie Ross, Geoff Wheeler and Martin Whiteside.

DC.064 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dorcas Binns and Rowland Blackwell.

DC.065 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Haydn Jones declared a personal interest in schedule item 4.6, Mistle House, Framilode, Gloucester (S.15/2418/HHOLD).

DC.066 MINUTES**RESOLVED** That the Minutes of the Development Control Committee meeting held on 8 December 2015 are accepted as a correct record.

DC.067 **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANNING SCHEDULE**

Representations were received and taken into account by the Committee in respect of the following applications.

1.	S.15/1227/OUT	2.	S.15/1832/FUL	3.	S.12/1587/FUL
4.	S.15/2313/FUL	5.	S.15/1250/FUL	6.	S.15/2418/HHOLD
7.	S.14/0810/OUT	8.	S.13/2668/OUT		

DC.068 **SOUTH VIEW, STONEHOUSE, GLOUCESTERSHIRE – ERECTION OF 3 NO. DWELLINGS WITH WORKSPACE AND 3 NO. AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS (S.15/1227/OUT)**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the above application. Councillor Haydn Jones read out a statement from Councillor Stephen Davies, Ward Member, who was unable to be at the meeting. Councillor Davies objected to the application raising concerns about the justification for affordable housing in this area.

Jennie Corrie, Eastington Parish Council outlined reasons why the Council objected to the application, quoting policy 55 of the NPPF and CP3 of the Local Plan and the sustainability of the site.

Andrew Lazenbury spoke in objection to the application, on behalf of residents of Nupend quoting the Neighbour Development Plan policies EP5 and 6 and the sustainability of the site.

Matthew Blaken, the agent spoke on behalf of the applicants quoting the NPPF and the recently adopted Local Plan. He commented that the development is not in open countryside and the S106 would secure the affordable dwellings; there would be an improved access to the site. He urged Members to accept the recommendation of officers.

The Policy Implementation Manager explained that 3 of the properties were intended to be for affordable rent and this would be set at 80% of the local market rent.

In response to Member's questions the following was clarified:

- The application is an exception site and the housing needs survey of Eastington demonstrates a need for 2-3 bed housing in the area.
- The majority of a copse of trees would be retained.

Councillor Haydn Jones proposed a motion which was seconded by Councillor Nigel Cooper to **REFUSE** the application, against officers' recommendation, as it does not meet the exception site policy HC4 and is not sustainable.

The motion was debated by Members.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried by 5 votes for, 4 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED To REFUSE application S.15/1227/OUT as set out in these minutes.

DC.069 THE LAMMASTIDE INN, NEW BROOKEND, BERKELEY – CONSTRUCTION OF ANNEXE TO PROVIDE 6 NO. HOLIDAY LETS FOR USE WITH THE LAMMASTIDE INN (S.15/1832/FUL)

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the application updating Members on late pages.

Rachel Melhuish spoke in opposition to the application stating that the parking is a concern and the overbearing nature of the proposed building and the loss of privacy in the overlooking aspect to her garden.

The applicant spoke stating that the proposed development would be a benefit to the community and he had received many enquiries for holiday lets, it provides opportunities for local employment and would seek to allay any concerns raised by the neighbour.

In response to Member's questions the following was clarified:

- The scheme proposed would be a 2 storey building.
- There has not been any information received from the tourist board to be able to evaluate whether there is a need for this proposal.

Councillor David Mossman proposed a motion to ACCEPT officer's recommendation, to refuse permission for the reasons set out in the officer's report; this was seconded by Councillor John Marjoram.

Members debated the application.

A motion to **REFUSE** was put to the vote and carried unanimously.

RESOLVED To REFUSE application S.15/1832/FUL in accordance with the officer's recommendations.

DC.070 BENCOMBE BARNS, LAMPERN HILL, ULEY – CONVERSION OF 3 BARNS TO A LIVE/WORK UNIT (S.15/1587/FUL)

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the above application. The barns had been built to a high quality, although this application needed to be considered on its own merits.

Mrs Janet Wood of Uley Parish Council spoke in opposition to the application quoting policy CP15 of the Local Plan. The site is unsustainable and as the barns are now no longer used for agricultural use they should be demolished in accordance with previous conditions.

Thoss Shearer and Juliet Browne spoke in opposition to the application, stating that the proposed development and access would have an impact on the Grade II listed building, neighbouring the property. The purpose of the building was for agriculture, if it is no longer needed for this reason it should be demolished.

The Agent, Mr Tim Roberts spoke in support of the application stating that the building complies with policies in the Local Plan and NPPF, neighbours would see little change after the conversion takes place and the building would not generate any increase in noise.

In response to Members' questions the following was clarified:

- Since the barns were given planning permission in 2009, there have been changes in planning policy, the Council has a recently adopted Local Plan and since 2012 the NPPF has to be taken into consideration.
- Control of development of the barns from becoming wholly residential would be achieved by conditions restricting the use of one of the buildings to B1a office.
- Sustainability would be a concern if there were no buildings on the site.
- Members needed to be mindful of the NPPF and CP15 of the Local Plan.

Councillor Nigel Cooper proposed a motion to ACCEPT officer's recommendation, this was seconded by Councillor Steve Robinson.

Members debated this motion and on being put to the vote it was rejected, 4 for the motion and 6 against.

The meeting adjourned at 12.10 pm and reconvened at 12.20 pm.

Councillor Haydn Jones proposed a motion to **REFUSE** the application against officers' recommendation. He referred to the criteria set out in Policy CP15 for supporting an application of this nature and expressed the view that the application did not meet any of those criteria; this was seconded by Councillor John Marjoram.

The motion was put to the vote and was carried by 6 votes for, 2 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED To REFUSE application S.15/1587/FUL as set out in these minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 12.35 pm and reconvened at 2.00 pm.

**DC.071 79 REGENT STREET, STONEHOUSE, GLOUCESTERSHIRE –
ERECTION OF A NEW DWELLING (S.15/2313/FUL)**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the above application drawing members' attention to the revised block plan that had been circulated in late pages and clarified the elevations of the building.

Councillors Mattie Ross and Chris Brine, Ward Members for Stonehouse raised concerns regarding the lack of amenity land, access and parking, removal of mature trees; agreeing that the application was not suitable for this site.

Town Councillor Carol Kambites outlined the reasons why Stonehouse Town Council had objected to the application which included overdevelopment of the site, problems with the access and parking, the loss of privacy for neighbours, the loss of trees, a concentration of HMOs in the area and the application was not suitable for the site.

Stefanie Scott spoke on behalf of herself and other neighbouring property owners who opposed the application for reasons stated above. Also the property would be on 3 floors with 10 windows overlooking her property.

In response to members' questions the following points were clarified:-

- The 2 new houses had separate accesses and were not accessed through the doctor's car park.

- The original application had fewer windows facing the 2 new houses on Bristol Road. The original and new applications were compared and the amount of windows had doubled.
- Two parking spaces were required for each new property, in accordance with the adopted Local Plan.
- The applicant had a right of access across the doctors car park, which was a not a matter for consideration by committee.
- The property would accommodate no more than 6 people.
- The footprint was 3ft larger than the original application.
- The nearest dwelling would be approximately 10m away.
- The ridge height was 0.1m lower than had previously been approved.

Councillor Emma Sims proposed a motion to ACCEPT the officer's recommendation to grant planning permission which was not seconded.

Councillor Liz Ashton proposed a motion to REFUSE the application because the site would have an adverse affect on the amenity of neighbouring properties (CP14) and also the site would be overdeveloped and overlook neighbouring properties (policy ES3). This was seconded by Councillor John Marjoram.

The motion was debated by members. The motion was put to the vote and was carried by 6 votes for, 1 against and 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED To REFUSE application S.15/2313/FUL, as set out in the minutes.

DC.072 DOVE COTTAGE, 5 CRAWLEY HILL, ULEY – PROPOSED NEW DWELLING (S.15/1250/FUL)

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the above application and also referred to the updated plan showing the correct location of the site in late pages.

Mrs Elliot represented 3 generations, spanning a period of 50 years who had occupied Devonia Farm. Her primary concern was the single track lane which did not have any scope for turning or passing.

The Agent, Mr Simon Littlewood, confirmed the proposed new dwelling was for the occupants of Dove Cottage. The new development was an infill site, would benefit the community, was sustainable and amenities were within walking distance. A passing space would be provided.

In reply to members' questions the following points were clarified:-

- The lane had been adopted by Gloucestershire County Council.
- The other properties had been built in the 1960's/70's.
- The dwelling would be set into a slope and the responsibility for the engineering of the site would be responsibility of the applicant.

Councillor Haydn Jones proposed a motion to support the officer's recommendation to GRANT PERMISSION, subject to delegating authority to officers to negotiate a Section 106 Agreement for the provision of a passing bay and its maintenance in perpetuity. The motion was seconded by Councillor Nigel Cooper.

Members debated the motion and agreed that the site was sustainable.

On being put to the vote the Motion was carried; 8 votes for, 0 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED To GRANT PERMISSION for application S.15/1250/FUL, in accordance with the officer's report and as set out in the minutes.

Councillor Haydn Jones left the Council Chamber for the duration of the next item.

DC.073 MISTLE HOUSE, FRAMILODE, GLOUCESTER – ERECTION OF GARDEN ROOM AND UTILITY TO REAR OF DWELLING (S.15/2418/HHOLD)

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the above application.

The Ward Member, Councillor John Jones confirmed that there were already a variety of extensions which did not match their dwellings in the vicinity and the application, if granted, would blend in with the existing dwelling and requested Committee to grant permission.

Mrs A Lever, the householder confirmed that the property dated back to the 1790's and had been sympathetically restored and her family now required more downstairs accommodation.

Councillor Dave Mossman proposed a motion to grant the application, contrary to the officer's recommendation, with officers adding conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Emma Simms.

During debate Members agreed that the design of the extension was sympathetic to the building and agreed permission should be granted.

On being put to the vote the Motion was carried; 8 votes for, 0 against and 1 abstention (Councillor John Marjoram had not visited the site).

RESOLVED To PERMIT application S.15/2418/HHOLD, subject to officers adding conditions which they consider appropriate.

The meeting adjourned at 3.20 pm and reconvened at 5.30 pm.

DC.074 LAND WEST OF STONEHOUSE, NASTEND LANE, NASTEND – A MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING UP TO 1,350 DWELLINGS AND 9.3 HECTARES OF EMPLOYMENT LAND FOR USE CLASSES B1, B2 AND B8; A MIXED USE LOCAL CENTRE COMPRISING USE CLASSES A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1, D2 AND B1; PRIMARY SCHOOL, OPEN SPACE AND LANDSCAPING, PARKING AND SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND UTILITIES; AND THE CREATION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESSES FROM GROVE LANE, OLDENDS LANE AND BRUNEL WAY (S.14/0810/OUT)

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the application and indicated on a plan the different land uses for parcels of land. He reminded members that the application site was identical to that referred to in the adopted Local Plan, which had also complied with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

On 11 January 2016 Eastington Parish Council had submitted their neighbourhood development plan which did not, as yet, comply with regulation 15 of the NPPF. Until the plan had been adopted it would hold little weight.

The Team Manager outlined the documents that had been emailed to members as late pages on Friday and also the later pages that had been circulated to members prior to the meeting. He also highlighted a further condition 43 which required submission of area master plans prior to reserved matters. This was an additional stage, if the principal was accepted, for an extra layer to allow for consideration of the application before looking at the details.

Enquiries had been made with Network Rail who had confirmed that they had no plans to re-open Stonehouse Station and they considered the level crossing safe for use for pedestrians and vehicles.

Councillor John Jones, whose ward adjoined the site expressed concern over the impact that the development would have on the main access road from Grove Lane crossroads at Whitminster and requested that a “no right turn” be implemented on this highway.

County Councillor Lesley Williams requested that the application was deferred to enable more time to be spent on creating links with Stonehouse.

Councillor Jennie Corrie, Vice-Chair of Eastington Parish also requested committee to defer the application to enable a development brief to be submitted and also a meeting to take place with local residents and the developer.

The Team Manager read out a prepared statement from Councillor Stephen Davies who could not attend the meeting setting out his concerns.

Mr D James from ‘Do Not Strangle Stroud’ requested that the decision be delayed for a couple of months to allow more engagement with the local community and also because of the absence of a development brief; citing paragraph 69 of the NPPF.

Councillors Chris Brine, Mattie Ross and Gary Powell, Ward Members for Stonehouse were all very supportive of new housing but had concerns about the affect the development would have on the outlying villages and on its connectivity with Stonehouse. A lot more detail was required. Councillor Powell requested committee to defer their decision to enable more discussions to take place.

Parish Councillor Carol Kambites spoke on behalf of Stonehouse Town Council requesting that a feasibility study was undertaken with Network Rail regarding the future re-opening of the railway station requesting committee to either defer or refuse the application.

Mr Ken Burgin the Chief Executive of Cotswold Canal Trust was concerned over the figure given by volunteers to upgrade the tow path and suggested that it was inadequate and should be recalculated.

Mr Phil Hardwick, Head of Planning at Robert Hitchins Ltd confirmed their commitment to building high quality dwellings and their intention to work with the local community in the future.

In reply to questions officers’ confirmed the following:-

- 30% of the dwellings would be affordable housing which was in a Section 106 Agreement.
- A doctors surgery was in the master plan but funding would rest with the NHS. Discussions had already commenced.
- Improvements would be made along the A419 corridor. The traffic model was based on 1,500 dwellings not 1,350. The traffic that would be generated from developments in The Stanleys had been taken into consideration.
- The vision for the different parcels of land upon the site is to respect the topography, the surrounding countryside, each particular phase of the development would be carefully considered before approval of reserved matters was sought. This would be subject to local consultation.
- Poor designs would be rejected in accordance with paragraph 56 and section 7 of the NPPF.
- The triggers contained within the Section 106 Agreements, as specified within the officer's report were reiterated regarding the construction of the school and delivery of employment.
- The Council is the first council within the county to have an adopted Local Plan that has a 5 year land supply. The Council would be controlling the development in stages.
- A deferral of the application could potentially undermine the adopted Local Plan and also jeopardise the 5 year land supply and delivery of 200 new homes per annum.
- Members were reminded that save in respect of access points they were only looking at the principal and not the detail.
- All planning applications coming forward in future upon the site could come before committee for their consideration.
- The mixed use development upon the site is currently based on assumptions and will become apparent in the fullness of time.
- The Gloucestershire County Council have confirmed that the school is acceptable and is the subject of Section 106 Agreements.
- The cost of the works to the towpath would be revisited on the basis of volunteers not undertaking these works.
- The Eastington Neighbourhood Development Plan did not comply with regulation 15 of the NDF regulations, and its weight would be significantly limited.
- The design strategy would be looking at Landscape Area Masterplans, which would include eg boundaries, hedges, trees in avenues, topography, landscaping and building frontages in much more detail.
- Robert Hitchins would control the management until the scheme in its entirety was completed, then control would rest with a properly constituted management company.
- The school did have a playingfield.
- The developer is fully aware of the Council's aspirations for the site.
- An extra informative could be added to the decision to pursue the possibility of a railway foot bridge and its funding with Network Rail.
- The sum of £4m had been obtained to deliver improvements along the A419 corridor before 2021, otherwise funding would be affected.
- In his report the Local Plan Inspector was aware of the public transport and its constraints. Paragraph 101 was read out describing the site as "sustainable urban extension". Based on the evidence before him the Inspector found the development proposal now contained in the application before committee acceptable.
- Concerns regarding flooding issues were allayed.

The meeting adjourned at 8.20 pm and reconvened at 8.35 pm.

During debate Councillor Nigel Cooper raised his concerns about future discussions being undertaken between officers and Network Rail regarding the footbridge. This was seconded by Councillor Dave Mossman and officers agreed to attach an Informative to the application that officers ensure that they use their best endeavours to talk to Network Rail regarding the footbridge.

Members had agreed unanimously at Council on 19 November 2015 to adopt the Local Plan, which had this site allocated. If this application was not agreed then this would put the 5 year land supply in jeopardy. Concerns had been addressed by officers. Members had their differing views and 2 thought the scheme was not feasible because it was too close to Stonehouse, yet not big enough to stand alone and should be deferred or refused.

Councillor Nigel Cooper proposed a motion to support the officer's recommendations to grant planning permission, subject to the satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreements, amended conditions, the informative regarding access across the railway line, contribution for the canal to be revisited so that the figure for work along the canal was done by non-volunteer labour, the new masterplan condition requiring pre-commencement approval on each residential phase before each reserved matters stage. The motion was seconded by Councillor Dave Mossman.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried; 8 votes for, 2 against and 0 abstentions.

RESOLVED To GRANT PERMISSION, subject to the conditions and other matters referred to in the officer's recommendations and as set out in the minutes.

DC.075 WIMBERLEY MILL, KNAPP LANE, BRIMSCOMBE – DEMOLITION AND CLEARANCE OF THE EXISTING BUILDINGS AND HARDSTANDING, RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 104 DWELLINGS, VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS, INTERNAL ACCESS ROADS, CAR PARKING, SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE AND RELATED WORKS, VARIOUS ENGINEERING OPERATIONS INCLUDING CHANGES TO SITE LEVELS, DE-CULVERTING THE RIVER FROME AND WORKS TO CREATE NEW FLOW AND FLOOD CHANNELS, ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING INCLUDING A PLAY AREA (S.13/2668/OUT)

The Principal Planning Officer advised members of the contents of the late pages and the later pages that had been circulated at the meeting. A further letter of objection was reported. She recommended an extra condition (recommended by highways, as set out on late pages) and referred to an amendment to the article 35(2) statement, to acknowledge that officers have worked with the agent and applicant to provide an acceptable scheme. If these amendments were acceptable to Committee she asked that they and other slight amendments were delegated to Officers. The main concerns had been the access to the site using Knapp Lane.

Jamie Mattock from County Highways confirmed that to alleviate flooding, discussions had taken place with the Environment Agency to open up the river bed, in accordance with the Local Plan.

Because the scheme was currently only just viable there was no provision for 30% of the properties to be affordable housing, but the S106 agreement would include an overage clause such that if the financial position altered and profits for the development are

greater than expected then a financial contribution would be required to provide affordable housing on another site.

Councillor Nick Hurst, represented both his Ward and Minchinhampton Parish Council and raised concerns regarding the highways in the vicinity and also requested that a financial contribution towards controlling the pollution down stream be investigated.

Councillor Martin Whiteside, Ward Member of the adjoining ward requested that the traffic problems needed resolving and suggested other sites could be considered.

Trisha Kallow a local resident objected strongly to the application because of the increase in traffic on already very busy roads and suggested that signage is put on Knapp Lane restricting it for access only.

Mr Hutchinson, the Agent spoke in favour of the application outlining the measures that had been taken to address the various concerns of interested parties.

In reply to members' questions Jamie Mattock confirmed that she had fact based evidence recording the traffic flows and had carried out transport assessments and a trip survey on the site, in accordance with the planning practice guidance. The proposed development would generate less traffic but an increase in pedestrians. The average recorded speed was under 20 mph.

The Principal Planning Officer offered to write to GCC requesting that the area under the bridge was made a 20 mph zone.

Councillor Emma Sims proposed a motion to support the officer's recommendations, together with the additional conditions and to delegate authority to officers to deal with matters as outlined above. The motion was seconded by Councillor Dave Mossman.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried; 9 votes for, 1 against and 0 abstention.

RESOLVED To grant planning permission for application S.13/2668/OUT in accordance with the officer's recommendations and as set out within the minutes.

Meeting ended at 10.03 pm.

Chair

**Amendments for Development Control Committee
12 January 2016**

Item 1 S.15./1227/OUT South View

Refusal.

The site is outside a settlement and in a hamlet with no facilities. The proposed 6 dwellings would therefore be car dependent for their needs. Adequate land for housing has been identified in sustainable locations with facilities and there is no overriding need for such development in unsustainable locations, even for affordable housing. The proposal is therefore contrary to the key principles of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, particularly Policies SO1, CP3, CP9 and HC4.

Item 2 S.15/1832/FUL The Lammastide Inn

Refusal as Officer recommendation.

Item 3 S.15/1587/FUL Bencombe Barns

Overtaken – Refusal.

The site is located outside identified settlement development limits and with no rural justification, community need or other exception being provided the proposal is not imperative or essential in this countryside location. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CP15 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2015.

Item 4 S.15/2313/FUL 79 Regent Street

Refusal on policy ES3 and CP14 – unacceptable impact on amenity of occupiers of nearby properties, overlooking and overdevelopment.

Reasons:

- 1) The proposed new dwelling by means of its scale, height, fenestration and proximity to adjacent dwellings would result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of amenity to occupiers of adjacent residential properties, contrary to policies ES3 and CP14 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, Nov 2015.
- 2) The proposed dwelling due to its footprint and scale would be an overdevelopment of the constrained application site and would be out of keeping with the character of the area contrary to policy CP14 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan 2105.

Item 5 S.15/1250/FUL Dove Cottage

Resolve to grant (as per officer recommendation) subject to a Section 106 agreement on provision, retention and maintenance of passing bay.

Item 6 S.15/2418/HHOLD Mistle House

Permission. Delegated authority to officers to attach appropriate conditions.

(For information conditions will be: 1) standard time limit; 2) approved plans; 3) materials to match existing).

Item 7 S.14/0810/OUT West of Stonehouse

Additional condition (from late late pages but with density included).

Amend conditions as per late late pages.

Additional informative on railway crossing.

Consideration shall be given to any opportunities for the improvements to improve pedestrian and cycling movements.

Item 8 S.13/2668/OUT Wimberley Mill

Late pages and later pages.

One further objection letter was reported – impact of traffic on Knapp Lane; site is dark and damp and better suited to light industrial use. If permission is granted there should be a traffic regulation order to limit use of Knapp Lane to residents only.

Resolve to grant permission subject to S106 agreement relating to the matters set out in the report.

Additional condition as set out on late pages.

Delegated authority to officers to amend wording of conditions (particularly 13 and 20).

Officers to write to Highways Authority asking for a 20mph speed limit (not the 30mph as proposed).



Stroud District Council

Planning Schedule

9th February 2016

In cases where a Site Inspection has taken place, this is because Members felt they would be better informed to make a decision on the application at the next Committee. Accordingly the view expressed by the Site Panel is a factor to be taken into consideration on the application and a final decision is only made after Members have fully debated the issues arising.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Procedure for Public Speaking

The Council have agreed to introduce public speaking at meetings of the Development Control Committee.

Public speaking is only permitted on those items contained within the schedule of applications. It is not permitted on any other items on the Agenda. The purpose of public speaking is to emphasise comments and evidence already submitted through the planning system. Speakers should refrain from bringing photographs or other documents as it is not an opportunity to introduce new evidence.

The Chair will ask for those wishing to speak to identify themselves by name at the beginning of proceedings. There are four available slots for each schedule item:-

Ward Councillor(s)
Town or Parish representative
Spokesperson against the scheme and
Spokesperson for the scheme.

Each slot (with the exception of Ward Councillors who are covered by the Council's Constitution) will not exceed 3 minutes in duration. If there is more than one person who wishes to speak in the same slot, they will need either to appoint a spokesperson to speak for all, or share the slot equally. Speakers should restrict their statement to issues already in the public arena. Please note that statements will be recorded and broadcast over the internet as part of the Council's webcasting of its meetings; they may also be used for subsequent proceedings such as an appeal. Names may be recorded in the Committee Minutes.

The order for each item on the schedule is

1. Introduction of item by the Chair
2. Brief update by the planning officer.
3. Public Speaking
 - a. Ward Member(s)
 - b. Parish Council
 - c. Those who oppose
 - d. Those who support
4. Member questions of officers
5. Motion
6. Debate
7. Vote

A copy of the Scheme for Public Speaking at Development Control Committee meetings is available at the meeting.

Parish	Application	Page No.	Item
Wotton Under Edge Town Council	<p>The Full Moon , Mount Pleasant, Wotton-Under-Edge.</p> <p>S.14/2430/FUL - Proposed demolition of existing public house and erection of 11 new dwellings with access and parking.</p> <p>http://www.stroud.gov.uk/docs/planning/planning_application_detail.asp?AppRef=S.14/2430/FUL</p>	18	01
Stinchcombe Parish Council	<p>Townsend Farm, The Street, Stinchcombe.</p> <p>S.15/2704/HHOLD - Erection of extensions. (Updated drawings received 21.1.16)</p> <p>http://www.stroud.gov.uk/docs/planning/planning_application_detail.asp?AppRef=S.15/2704/HHOLD</p>	27	02

Item No:	01
Application No.	S.14/2430/FUL
Site No.	PP-03748937
Site Address	The Full Moon , Mount Pleasant, Wotton-Under-Edge, Gloucestershire
Town/Parish	Wotton Under Edge Town Council
Grid Reference	376285,193211
Application Type	Full Planning Permission
Proposal	Proposed demolition of existing public house and erection of 11 new dwellings with access and parking.



Applicant's Details	Woodbourne Homes Limited 16 Vernon Road, Birmingham, B16 9SH, ,
Agent's Details	Bailey Design Limited 43A Mitchells Court, Lower Gungate, Tamworth, Staffordshire, B79 7AS
Case Officer	John Longmuir
Application	23.10.2014

Validated	
	RECOMMENDATION
Recommended Decision	Resolve to Grant Permission
Subject to the following conditions:	Conditions to form part of late papers.
	CONSULTEES
Comments Received	Development Coordination (E)
Not Yet Received	Cotswolds Conservation Board (E)
	CONTRIBUTORS
Letters of Objection	<p>S. Swindon, Wiltshire, T Collins, 14 Hentley Tor, Wotton Under Edge L And C Harrell, 7 The Green, Synwell, Synwell Action Group Mr And Mrs Harrell, 7 The Green, Synwell, Wotton Under Edge R Davis, 33 Parklands, Wotton-under-Edge N F Todd, 9 The Green, Synwell R And D Saley, 24 Fountain Crescent, Wotton-Under-Edge P Luther, 4 Cherry Orchard, Wotton-Under-Edge Mr And Mrs Armor, 14 Cherry Orchard, Wotton-Under-Edge Dr J Cordwell, 13 Haw Street, Wotton-under-Edge Mr And Mrs K Browning, Victorianna, Coombe D Hedges, 39 Cotswold Gardens, Synwell J Hobson, Bramble Cottage, The Street S Young, 23 Cotswold Gardens Wotton Under Edge, Mr T Luker, 2 The Green, Synwell S Hedges, 9 Fishers Road, Berkeley, N Clement, 17 Synwell Lane, Synwell</p>
Letters of Support	<p>J Motton, 5 Hentley View, Knapp Road, Wotton-Under-Edge L And C Harrell, 7 The Green, Synwell, Wotton Under Edge, Glos.</p>
Letters of Comment	<p>S. Swindon, P Shanes, 43 Knapp Road, Synwell P Barton, 38mount Pleasant, K Dulay, 16 Vernon Road, Edgbaston J Motton, 5 Hentley View, Synwell S Young, 23 Cotswold Gardens Wotton Under Edge, Mr Collins, 14 Hentley Tor, Wotton Under Edge</p>
	OFFICER'S REPORT

UPDATE FOR FEBRUARY DCC

This application was considered at the DCC meeting on 14/8/15. The proposal involves the demolition of the Full Moon pub and its replacement with housing. In response to concern about the loss of the pub, Members resolved to defer the application to allow for the opportunity of a bid from the community to take it over. Members also had concerns about the overbearing implications of the new houses on the two nearest neighbours.

To date officers are unaware of any firm offer to take over the pub. Given that six months have now passed, it is felt reasonable to reconsider the application. Officers have written to the owner advising about the concerns of the overbearing implications from the new houses. Any update will be given on late pages and/or at the meeting.

REPORT TO AUGUST DCC

The site and surroundings

The site is a prominent corner formed by the junction of several roads. It largely consists of the vacant Full Moon pub, which has 281sqm floorspace and a 35 space car park. There are several important trees on the edge of the site. To the north is a small public open space, to the south are a row of garages. There are several dwellings close to the eastern boundary.

The proposal

Demolition of the pub. Originally 12 houses were proposed, however this has been reduced in the revised plans to 11 houses in various groups. An open space would be left around the trees, with the potential to plant a new hedge along the north western boundary. An access road and turning area would be provided in the centre of the site.

Consultees

Town Council: Object: Overdevelopment, too dense housing, lack of amenity space, visual impact of parking, question impact on tree roots, houses have no chimneys and are out of keeping, lack of affordable housing.

2 letters of support: Would make use of site, good design, parking levels welcome, welcome small houses

Objections (including Synwell Community Association): Loss of the pub, important community facility and accessible.

County Highways: Not yet received.

Policy Implementation Manager (affordable housing): No objection

SDC Arboriculture officer: No objection subject to conditions

Planning History

The pub was nominated as an asset of community value on 10-6-13.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Local Plan Policies

POLICY GE1: Permission will not be granted to any development that would be likely to lead to an unacceptable level of noise, general disturbance, smell, fumes, loss of daylight or sunlight, loss of privacy or have an overbearing effect.

POLICY GE5: Permission will not be granted for any development that would be likely to be detrimental to the highway safety of any user of any highway or public right of way.

POLICY NE6: In development proposals, important landscape features such as trees, hedges, shrubs, vegetation, green lanes, walls, woodland and unimproved pasture should be retained and managed to conserve and enhance biodiversity. The impact of development on such features should be minimised and will be controlled through the use of conditions and planning obligations.

POLICY NE8: Within the Cotswolds AONB, priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape over other considerations, whilst also having regard to the economic and social well-being of the AONB. Development within, or affecting the setting of the AONB, will only be permitted if all the following criteria are met:

1. The nature, siting and scale are sympathetic to the landscape;
2. The design and materials complement the character of the area; and
3. Important landscape features and trees are retained and appropriate landscaping measures are undertaken. Major development will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated to be in the national interest and that there is a lack of alternative sites.

POLICY HN8

Within settlement boundaries permission will be granted for residential development or redevelopment, provided all the following criteria are met:

1. the proposed housing is of a scale, layout and design compatible with the part of the settlement in which it would be located, and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of that part of the settlement;
2. the density proposed is at as high a level as is acceptable in townscape and amenity terms;
3. the development includes dwellings of various sizes, both in respect of physical size and type;
4. it would not result in development between the settlement boundary and the existing built form of the settlement where this would appear as an intrusion into the countryside;

5. it would not cause the loss of, or damage to, any open space which is important to the character of the settlement;

6. any natural or built features on the site and worthy of retention have been incorporated into the scheme; and

7. where dwelling houses are proposed, an appropriate area of private amenity space is provided for the occupiers of each dwelling house. Where other types of residential accommodation are proposed, an appropriate level of amenity space to serve the scheme as a whole is provided.

Policy SH15 Retention of Community Facilities

Development which involves the loss of individual shops, public houses, village halls and other community facilities will only be permitted where:

There is no prospect of a continued community use

There are adequate alternative facilities in the locality which cater for the needs of the local population.

The current and previous use is no longer viable.

Emerging Local Plan Policies:

Delivery Policy ES7. Within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), or on land that may affect its setting, priority will be given to the conservation and enhancement of the natural and scenic beauty of the landscape whilst taking account of the biodiversity interest and the historic and cultural heritage. Major development will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated to be in the national interest and that there is a lack of alternative sustainable development sites.

In all locations development proposals should conserve or enhance the special features and diversity of the different landscape character types found within the District. Priority will be given to the protection of the quality and diversity of the landscape character. Development will only be permitted if all the following criteria are met:

1. The location, materials, scale and use are sympathetic and complement the landscape character; and

2. Natural features including trees, hedgerows and water features that contribute to the landscape character and setting of the development should be both retained and managed appropriately in the future.

Opportunities for appropriate landscaping will be sought alongside all new development, such that landscape type key characteristics are strengthened.

The Stroud District Landscape Assessment will be used when determining applications for development within rural areas.

Delivery Policy ES3. Permission will not be granted to any development which would be likely to lead to, or result in an unacceptable level of:

1. Noise, general disturbance, smell, fumes, loss of daylight or sunlight, loss of privacy or an overbearing effect

2. Environmental pollution to water, land or air and an unacceptable risk to the quality and quantity of a water body or water bodies
3. Noise sensitive development in locations where it would be subject to unacceptable noise levels
4. Increased risk of flooding on or off the site, and no inclusion of measures to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding
5. A detrimental impact on highway safety
6. An adverse effect on contaminated land where there is a risk to human health or the environment.

Delivery Policy HC1. Within defined settlement development limits, permission with be granted for residential development or redevelopment, providing all the following criteria are met:

1. The proposed housing is of a scale, density, layout and design that is compatible with the character, appearance and amenity of the part of the settlement in which it would be located and the density proposed is at as high a level as is acceptable, in terms of townscape, street scene and amenity.
2. where appropriate schemes should include a variety of dwelling types and sizes, which meet identified local needs.
3. On edge of settlement sites, the proposal would not appear as an intrusion into the countryside and would retain a sense of transition between the open countryside and the existing settlement's core.
4. It would not cause the loss of, or damage to, any open space which is important to the character of the settlement.
5. it would not result in the loss of locally valued habitat which supports wildlife.
6. any natural or built features on the site that are worthy of retention are incorporated into the scheme.
7. an appropriate area of private amenity space is provided for the occupiers of each dwelling house. Where other types of residential accommodation are proposed, an appropriate level of amenity space to serve the scheme as a whole is provided.
8. It is not subject to any other over-riding environmental or other material planning constraint.
9. have a layout, access and parking appropriate to the site and its surroundings.

Delivery Policy E16: Protecting individual and village shops, public houses and other community facilities:

Where planning permission is required, development which involves the loss of individual shops, public houses, village halls and other community facilities will be supported where all the criteria below are satisfied:

- 1 there is no prospect of a contained community use (which is evidenced)
- 2 There are adequate similar use facilities either within that settlement or adjoining countryside and is accessible by walking or cycling- a distance of 800m.
- 3 The current or previous use is no longer viable, demonstrated by audited financial and marketing evidence over an agreed period.

National Planning Policy Framework

Requiring Good Design: Para 61: Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment.

Conserving and enhancing the Natural Environment -

Para 109 relates to protecting valued landscapes and minimizing adverse impact on biodiversity Para 115 Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The principle of residential development

The site is within the settlement boundary which indicates that it is in a sustainable location without any landscape impact.

The proposal does involve the loss of the pub, which has been the feature of most of the objections. Some of the responses question the viability of the pub and express a desire to take it over. Such attachment was also reflected in the nomination for a community asset. It is within an extensive residential area and the nearest alternatives are in the town centre, approximately 2 miles away. It has been vacant for several years.

The applicant submitted a viability report to indicate that the pub was uneconomic. The Council commissioned Bruton Knowles to give independent expert advice. Their report is attached as an appendix to the DCC papers. The report confirms that the pub is not viable. There are 4 other pubs within 800m. There is also the Pavilion Sport and Social Club 350m away. Whilst the feelings of the community for their "local" are understandable, it is not felt to be viable and the principle of residential development meets the Policy tests.

Some of the responses question the viability of the pub and express a desire to take it over. The register of the Community Value does not prevent the determination of the application. Merely it prevents the sale of the site for a 6 month period.

Tree implications

There are three trees on or by the edge of the site, which are protected. A silver birch 17m high and a beech tree 16m are on the north and a Norway Maple are on the southern edge. The birch and beech are extremely prominent and form the focus for views particularly from the west. The original plans placed houses, hard surfaces and cars very close to the trees which would have jeopardised their future. The revised proposals show the birch and beech trees in an area of dedicated open space away from intrusion. Conditions will still be required to ensure that their roots are still undisturbed and that the construction process is appropriately managed.

The Norway Maple is shown for removal and is not felt to overly significant.

Design and appearance

The layout provides some open space on the site which would compliment the adjacent open space. It maintains an element of openness, which it is important to keep the prominence of the trees. A new boundary hedge would offer a soft complementary edge.

The layout shows the housing fragmented into small groups which would not appear dominate and create an informal appearance. Similarly they are only two storey and modest gable width.

The houses themselves have a simple, low key appearance in keeping with the character of the area.

Whilst the site is within the AONB, its relationship with the countryside is limited due to the intervening substantial housing. Development would be visible from distant viewpoints but would be seen in conjunction with other houses. The layout does allow for outward views.

Parking and highway access.

Access would be from the west which has good visibility bearing in mind likely traffic speed. Turning for cars has been provided on the site itself.

2 parking spaces are proposed per plot. These would be a mixture of on plot and communal. Whilst Wotton does have an acknowledged parking shortage, this is felt to be adequate to meet the needs of this particular development.

Amenity

There are neighbouring houses to the east. The revised designs show elevations with only obscure glazing on the facing side elevations. There is adequate separation to avoid significant shadowing and overbearing problems too. Houses on other sides of the development are further away and segregated by public roads and consequently should not their amenity should not be unduly impaired.

The new dwellings would all have gardens. A couple of the dwellings do not have ideal window to window separation but there is an element of "buyer beware".

Affordable housing

The threshold for contributions normally arises at 10 houses. However the Vacant Buildings Credit in NPPG paragraph 22 gives an allowance for an existing footprint to offset affordable housing requirements. This applies on brownfield land, where the building is vacant. The pub has an extensive size, and it is not felt that an affordable contribution is therefore justifiable.

Hydrology

The houses are outside an area of flood risk. The site is largely hard surfaced and some of this would be replaced by gardens, which would be advantageous for surface water run-off.

Ecology

The site is dominated by a car park and pub, within a suburban area. Consequently there is little likelihood of use by important species, except from the trees. The creation of gardens should offer some bio-diversity improvement.

Conclusion

Resolve to grant subject to Section 106 agreement on recreation contributions. Conditions will be required on tree protection measures, landscaping, materials, obscure glazing and the construction process.

ARTICLE 35 (2) STATEMENT

There has been some discussion on this project, which led to changes to the scheme.

HUMAN RIGHTS

In compiling this recommendation we have given full consideration to all aspects of the Human Rights Act 1998 in relation to the applicant and/or the occupiers of any neighbouring or affected properties. In particular regard has been had to Article 8 of the ECHR (Right to Respect for private and family life) and the requirement to ensure that any interference with the right in this Article is both permissible and proportionate. On analysing the issues raised by the application.

Item No:	02
Application No.	S.15/2704/HHOLD
Site No.	PP-04644408
Site Address	Townsend Farm, The Street, Stinchcombe, Dursley
Town/Parish	Stinchcombe Parish Council
Grid Reference	373413,198959
Application Type	Householder Application
Proposal	Erection of extensions. (Updated drawings received 21.1.16)



Applicant's Details	Mr & Mrs J Luck Townsend Farm, The Street, Stinchcombe, Dursley, Gloucestershire GL11 6AP
Agent's Details	Mark Snook Planning The Pike House, Kingshill Road, Dursley, Gloucestershire, GL11 4BJ
Case Officer	Gemma Davis
Application Validated	19.11.2015

	RECOMMENDATION
Recommended Decision	Permission
Subject to the following conditions:	<p>1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects in strict accordance with the approved plans LUC/865/PL/11/15/002/H received 21.1.16.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.</p> <p>3. No development shall take place until details of the fenestration material and colour have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Development shall then only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.</p> <p>4. The stone to be used shall be of the same type, colour and coursing as that of the existing building.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.</p>
	CONSULTEES
Comments Received	Conservation South Team
Not Yet Received	Parish / Town Cotswolds Conservation Board (E)
	CONTRIBUTORS
Letters of Objection	MH-MG, Overend House, J Carbone, Piers Court, Stinchcombe G Hillman, Townsend Barn, The Street Stinchcombe Parish Council (2), Hill House, Wick Lane, D Leggate, Church Farm House, Stinchcombe.
Letters of Support	
Letters of Comment	

OFFICER'S REPORT

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises a detached property constructed out of a mixture of stone and render under a stone tiled roof with timber fenestration. The property is positioned above road level with an entrance via a gateway in the stone wall facing the roadside. The property benefits from a parking and turning area to the side elevation of the host property and a single storey shared car port to the side of the property outside of the main domestic curtilage. The property is located within a fairly large plot that is bound by a mixture of walling, fencing and hedging.

The site is located within the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Conservation Area.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for the erection of two extensions.

Some of the works proposed are permitted development and therefore do not require planning permission. These include:

- o Alterations to the existing fenestration
- o The insertion of conservation roof lights to the rear.
- o The removal of dormer windows - the dormer windows are not a historical feature of the property as planning permission was granted for them in 2006 under planning reference S.06/1809/FUL.
- o The removal of a chimney stack does not require consent as the building is not listed. In addition to this, its removal would not consist of more than 50% of the original building.
- o The removal of render
- o Internal alterations

REVISED DETAILS

None

MATERIALS

Walls: To match existing

Roof: To match existing

Fenestration: Aluminium

REPRESENTATIONS

Statutory Consultees:

The Conservation Team acknowledges that the extensions are large and will exacerbate the linear form of the building, however consider that they will not detract from the established character of the building or be harmful to the setting of the adjacent farm group or be harmful to the character or appearance of the wider conservation area.

Stinchcombe Parish Council objects to the proposed scheme on the following basis:

- o Lack of a Conservation Area Appraisal
- o Loss of feature building
- o Impact on the character of the Conservation Area.
- o Incongruous feature
- o Extensions out of scale with the host building
- o Architectural features missing from the drawings
- o Drawings unsupportive of relationship between application property and farm buildings within the complex
- o Lack of regard to the Old Farmhouse
- o Unsympathetic form of development

A copy of full correspondence can be obtained in full on the Councils website.

Public:

Four letters of objection received raising the following concerns:

- o Out of keeping
- o Impact on Conservation Area and 'The Street'
- o Scale out of context
- o Proposals undermine host property
- o Impact on spacing of properties along 'The Street'
- o Alteration to the historic fabric of the village
- o Overbearing effect on neighbours

A copy of full correspondence can be obtained in full on the Councils website.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS - NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2015 is the development plan for Stroud District. Due weight should be given to policies in this plan according to the degree of consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions. The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012.

Full details of the NPPF is available to view at:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>

For the full content of the Stroud District Local Plan policies above together with the preamble text and associated supplementary planning documents are available to view on the Council's website

http://www.stroud.gov.uk/info/plan_strat/newlocalplan/PLAIN_TEXT_Local%20Plan_Adopted_November_2015.pdf

Local Plan policies considered for this application include:

HC8 - Extensions to dwellings.

ES3 - Maintaining quality of life within our environmental limits.

- ES6 - Providing for biodiversity and geodiversity.
- ES7 - Landscape character.
- ES10 - Valuing our historic environment and assets.
- ES12 - Better design of places.

DESIGN/APPEARANCE/IMPACT ON THE AREA

Townsend Farm sits within a complex of former farm buildings that have been converted into residential use. Townsend Farm, is an old Farmhouse that is positioned above road level and is slightly set back from the main highway known as The Street. The property sits within a relatively large plot that can easily accommodate the proposed extensions whilst ensuring an adequate area of garden is retained together with a visual gap between the dwelling and site boundaries, therefore ensuring that the site will not appear cramped or overdeveloped. Furthermore, following construction of the proposed development, sufficient space would remain between the host property and neighbouring properties fronting 'The Street', therefore the existing open character of the street scene would not be eroded.

The extensions proposed are to each gable end of the host dwelling. The extension proposed to the north comprises a two storey addition to accommodate a garage at ground floor and a bedroom with en-suite at first floor. The extension proposed measures approximately 6m by 6.4m and 7.8m in height. The extension proposed to the south comprises a single storey addition to accommodate a larger living area. The extension measures approximately 6.3m by 6.3m and 5.7m in height. The extension is located approximately 6.5m away from the boundary with the neighbouring properties known as Eaves Barn and Eaves Cottage.

The proposed extensions would be of a scale proportionate to the main dwelling and finished in materials that would compliment those already present. A clear break in the ridgeline from the main house would also be retained, aiding subservience and ensuring that the development would not appear out of place in the street scene. Furthermore, the low height and simple design of the extensions ensures that they would appear as subservient additions to the house and not detract from its character and appearance. Whilst the extensions would result in an increase in the building line, the extensions are slightly stepped back, again aiding subservience, this coupled with the subservient height and design would ensure a balanced appearance would be maintained and there would be no adverse effect on the character of the original dwelling or significant impact on the street scene and Conservation Area Designation.

The proposals do not harm the character of the landscape because the extensions are contained within the existing domestic curtilage and will not be seen as an intrusion into the countryside. Furthermore the appropriate design and scale of the extension and the materials proposed ensures the development will not harm the character of the area or the landscape within this part of the AONB.

CONSERVATION IMPACT

The site is located within Stinchcombe Conservation Area. As noted by the Councils Conservation specialist, whilst the extensions proposed are large and will exacerbate the linear form of the building, the extensions will not detract from the established

character of the main building or be harmful to the setting of the adjacent farm group or be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.

The historic context of the site relates to an agricultural holding. The barns have all fairly recently benefitted from planning permission to change their use to residential; the context and historic significance of the site has therefore already altered. The farmhouse is the only original building used as originally intended and the proposed alterations will be read in conjunction with the residential and domestic use and nature of the building and its curtilage.

Moreover, on balance the overall character of the building and its setting is considered to be maintained and the proposed extensions and alterations are in keeping with the building and its wider setting in the Conservation Area.

The comments of the Parish Council have been duly noted. However, as noted in the description of the proposal, many of the components objected to do not require express consent and can be undertaken under permitted development rights.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Due to the position, height and design of the proposed extensions in relation to the neighbouring dwellings there would be no unacceptable overbearing effect, impact on light levels or loss of privacy arising from the development as the proposals are to the north of the closest neighbour. Any damage to the boundary wall would be a civil matter; it is not subject to this application.

The proposed extension on the southern elevation proposes a single window at ground floor level. The closest property (Eaves Cottage) is located to the south. The application site is positioned at an elevated position to this neighbouring property, however, due to the degree of separation between the buildings and existing boundary treatment, it is considered that any impact would not be significant and would not warrant refusal.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

The existing vehicular access would be unaffected by this proposal. The proposed garage will provide additional parking provision. The extensions would be used ancillary to the existing use of the site and would not be likely to result in any significant increase in vehicular movements. The development would not be detrimental to highway safety.

RECOMMENDATION

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposal complies with the policies outlined and is therefore recommended for permission.

ARTICLE 35 (2) STATEMENT

Whilst there was little if any pre-application discussion on this project, it was found to be self contained and required no further dialogue with the applicant.

HUMAN RIGHTS

In compiling this recommendation we have given full consideration to all aspects of the Human Rights Act 1998 in relation to the applicant and/or the occupiers of any

neighbouring or affected properties. In particular regard has been had to Article 8 of the ECHR (Right to Respect for private and family life) and the requirement to ensure that any interference with the right in this Article is both permissible and proportionate. On analysing the issues raised by the application no particular matters, other than those referred to in this report, warranted any different action to that recommended.