

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

9 February 2016

6.00 pm – 8.40 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	P	Councillor Steve Robinson	P
Councillor Rowland Blackwell	P	Councillor Emma Sims	P
Councillor Nigel Cooper	A	Councillor Tom Williams	P

** = Chair * = Vice Chair P = Present A = Absent

Officers in Attendance

Planning Manager	Team Manager
Planning Officer	Solicitors
Democratic Services Officer	

Other Members in Attendance

Councillor Ken Tucker for application S.14/2430/FUL
 Councillor Penny Wride

DC.076 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Nigel Cooper.

DC.077 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

DC.078 MINUTES

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Development Control Committee meeting held on 12 January 2016 are accepted as a correct record.

DC.079 **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANNING SCHEDULE**

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

1	S.14/2430/FUL	2	S.15/2704/HHOLD		
---	---------------	---	-----------------	--	--

DC.080 **THE FULL MOON, MOUNT PLEASANT, WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE**
(S.14/2430/FUL)

The Team Manager outlined the above application highlighting the changes to policy following the adoption of the Local Plan, also mentioning late pages including letters from Bruton Knowles, Synwell Community Action Group and an objector. A statement from the applicant was also read out.

Councillor Ken Tucker, Ward Member for Wotton-under-Edge felt the development would be overbearing and overdevelopment, parking would be disrupted and highlighted the offer made by the Synwell Community Action Group to buy the property.

Wotton Town Council spoke in objection to the proposals expressing concern over overdevelopment, parking, poor manoeuvrability for cars, access to the site and the loss of the pub and asked the committee to refuse it.

Mrs Hunt spoke on behalf of the local residents expressing concern over the amount of plots on the site, parking and asked that a condition be added relating to site traffic during development.

The agent spoke on behalf of the applicant and confirmed that the pub had been vacant for 3 years. This is not public land and asked the Members to support the officer's recommendation and approve the proposals.

In reply to questions officers confirmed the following:

- Consideration should be given to the surroundings and how the development would fit in with these, taking into account materials, elevations, shape and form of the layout.
- Possible opportunities for the development of adjacent land (which are not the subject of a planning application) should not influence the consideration of this application. This application should be considered on its own merits.
- Local Plan Policy EI6 criteria for supporting a proposed development requires evidence that there is no prospect of continued community use of the property. Members were advised that this should be regarded as an objective test and all of the circumstances needed to be taken into account including the viability of continuing the community use and the availability of a purchaser representing the community interest with funding to acquire the property at a reasonable price. The Committee were advised by officers that it would be difficult in this case to conclude that there is **no** prospect of continued community use. Consequently the proposal contravened Policy EI6.
- The Community have offered £160,000 and would do their own refurbishment.
- Bruton Knowles report indicated that the commercial running of the pub would be difficult.

- The three trees on site are protected, but one (a Norway Maple) could be felled. If the application was approved it would conflict with paragraph 70 of the NPPF.

Councillor John Marjoram proposed a motion to **DEFER** the application as it conflicts with Local Plan Policy E16 and paragraph 70 of the NPPF. Additionally, insufficient information had been provided to enable the committee to appreciate the visual impact of the development in the street scene bearing in mind the very prominent location of the site; this was seconded by Councillor Dave Mossman.

Members debated the application and the following points were raised:

- Deferment of the application will mean the community can put more details to their proposal
- The developer has been very co-operative.
- Reduction of the amount of houses on the site - Policy E12.
- Secure the site whilst the application is brought to a conclusion.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried; 10 votes for, 1 abstention.

1. **RESOLVED** to DEFER application S.14/2430/FUL.
2. **REASON** the application conflicts with Local Plan Policy E16 and paragraph 70 of the NPPF as the applicant had not been able to show that there was no reasonable prospect of the community use continuing and furthermore insufficient information had been provided in respect of the visual impact of the proposed development to make a decision.

DC.081 TOWNSEND FARM, THE STREET, STINCHCOMBE (S.15/2704/HHOLD)

The Planning Officer outlined the above application.

Councillor Penny Wride, Ward Member for the Vale Ward expressed concern over the application in relation to the historic setting, conservation area, AONB, quoting Local Plan Policies HC2, HC8, ES10, ES12 and ES15 and recommended that Members refuse the application.

A representative of Stinchcombe Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. Concern was expressed over building within the conservation area, increased footprint of the building, impact on the landscape, no reference to the AONB. Policies S12, ES7, HC2 and HC8 of the Local Plan were quoted.

The Planning Officer read out a statement from the applicant, explaining that the building was cold and damp, there was water penetration and it had not had the care and attention it needed. The applicants would renovate the building into a family home.

In reply to questions officers confirmed the following:

- There would be 5 bedrooms
- The dormer windows would be removed, although planning permission is not required to be able to do this.
- It is legitimate to add extensions to historic buildings that are subservient to the main building

Councillor Paul Hemming proposed a motion to accept officer's advice to permit the application, this was seconded by Councillor Dorcas Binns.

Members debated the application.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED To GRANT PERMISSION for application S.15/2704/HHOLD in accordance with the officer's recommendations.

Meeting ended at 8.40 pm.

Chair