

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE****12 August 2014**
**6.00 pm – 10.00 pm**  
**Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Stroud**
**3****Minutes****Membership:**

Ken Stephens**	P	Haydn Jones	P
John Marjoram*	P	Stephen Moore	P
Liz Ashton	P	Dave Mossman	P
Dorcas Binns	P	Steve Robinson	P
Nigel Cooper	P	Roger Sanders	A
Paul Hemming	P	Emma Sims	P

\*\* = Chair \* = Vice-Chair

A = Absent P = Present

**Other Members in attendance**
 Councillor June Cordwell  
 Councillor John Jones

Councillor Paul Smith

**Officers in attendance**
 Development Control Team Manager  
 Locum Solicitor  
 Senior Planning Officer

 Senior Enforcement Officer  
 Planning Technician  
 Democratic Services & Elections Officer
**DC.020 APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Roger Sanders.

**DC.021      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Application No/ Agenda Item</b>	<b>Nature of Interest (where disclosed)</b>	<b>Action taken in respect of disclosure</b>
Ken Stephens	S.14/1049/OUT		Vacated the Chair to the Vice-Chair for this item and remained in the Chamber and took part as the Ward Member.
	S.13/2740/FUL	Declared a personal interest in the Application because he knew one of the objectors.	Vacated the Chamber prior to this item being discussed.
Emma Sims	S.14/1049/OUT	Declared a personal interest in the Application because she knew the Applicant.	Vacated the Chamber prior to this item being discussed.
Dorcas Binns	S.14/1211/LBC S.14/1222/LBC	Indicated that the Applicant was known to her.	None.

**DC.022      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** That the Minutes of the Development Control Committee meetings held on 8 and 24 July 2014 are accepted as a correct record.

**DC.023      PLANNING SCHEDULE**

Representations were received and taken into account by the Committee in respect of the following Applications:-

1.	S.14/1049/OUT	2.	S.13/2740/FUL	3.	S.14/1179/FUL
4.	S.14/0882/FUL	5.	S.14/1211/LBC	6.	S.14/1222/LBC

Late Pages had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting and were available at the meeting in respect of Scheduled Items 1, 2, 5 and 6.

Councillor Ken Stephens left the Chair and Councillor John Marjoram, Vice-Chair Chaired the Committee meeting for Scheduled Items 1 and 2. Councillor Emma Sims left the Council Chamber.

**DC.024**      **ITEM 1 – OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 30 DWELLINGS ON LAND AT BATH ROAD, EASTINGTON, GLOUCESTERSHIRE (S.14/1049/OUT)**

The Development Control Team Manager provided Members with updates to the Late Pages and also highlighted an amendment to the recommended reason for refusal; at the end of the sentence shown in bold and italics the words '*including the need for new development*' should have been added. He also paraphrased an email received from the Agents suggesting that Officers had been supportive of the scheme and questioned various aspects of the Officer's report and recommendation for refusal.

Mr Ian Stewart spoke against the Application on behalf of Eastington Parish Council. He said that the Application would be sited upon a valuable open green space frequently used within the village. An Eastington Parish Plan had been written in 2013 which had incorporated responses to the Parish Survey and work had begun on producing a Neighbourhood Plan.

Mr Tom Lowe also opposed the Application because it was for the wrong type of housing in an inappropriate location and also made reference to the 2013 Eastington Parish Plan. He thought the proposal would be unsustainable and that the site was currently in frequent use by villagers and acted as a buffer between the two villages.

The Officer highlighted two typographical errors within the report:-

Page 5, the word 'swarth' should have read 'swathe'; and  
Page 17, paragraph headed 'CONCLUSION', in the second line, the word 'more' should have read 'less'.

He also highlighted that the Applicant had not sought pre-application advice, which would have included a site visit and also clear written advice. A fee would have been payable but this process had not been followed. Any suggestion by the Applicant that Officers had supported the Application was a misinterpretation. The Officer's report was robust and sound.

In response to questions from Councillor Ken Stephens, it was confirmed that the Officer's recommendation had taken account of the five year land supply and the emerging Local Plan. A site visit had been undertaken by Members to view the site.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendations, with amendments, was proposed by Councillor Ken Stephens and seconded by Councillor Dave Mossman.

The Proposer thanked Members for attending the site visit where various aspects of the site had been viewed. He considered that other development sites were available within Eastington and any future development of this site was not welcomed.

On being put to the vote Members voted unanimously for the Motion, it was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED To REFUSE Application S.14/1049/OUT, for the reasons as set out in these Minutes, stated in the report and in Appendix A to these Minutes.**

Councillor Emma Sims returned to the Council Chamber and Councillor Ken Stephens vacated the Council Chamber.

**DC.025      ITEM 2 – FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR SIX DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE, PROVISION OF A NEW BIKE SHELTER AND RELOCATION OF BEER GARDEN ON LAND TO THE REAR OF THE ROSE AND CROWN, CHURCH STREET, NYMPSFIELD, GLOS (S.13/2740/FUL)**

The Senior Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the Late Pages and also correspondence received following their circulation to Committee. He highlighted concerns that had been raised by G and E Sturgess, CPRE Berkeley Vale and the Parish Council. The Officer made the following amendments to his report:-

Condition 2 – to be revised to reflect the updated plan numbers;  
Condition 7 – the hedgerows be protected during and after construction works;  
Authority to be delegated to Officers regarding the boundary wall and the additional parking area that would be created;  
The correction of a typographical error on page 34, line 6, the word 'dries' should have read 'drives'.

The Development Control Team Manager read out comments made by County Councillor Steve Lydon, (Dursley Division). He very much shared the views of the Parish Council and requested Committee to defer the Application to allay the fears of the local community.

The Officer also read out a written response on behalf of the Parish Council who had initially not objected to the Application because of the proposed enabling development and the £200k which would be used to refurbish the public house. An exhibition had been held outlining this proposal. The Parish Council were now very disappointed because of the design of the development, which was within the conservation area, AONB and was infill. If the Application was granted they requested that a Condition be added to protect the hedgerow and also that the cycle stand, which served no purpose, not be put in place and a higher contribution for leisure facilities within the village was requested instead.

Mr Rob Ridding from Pegasus spoke on behalf of the Application which in principle had been acceptable by Officers. If granted the development would be sympathetic to the character of the area and monies would help restore the Rose and Crown public house which would attract tourism and help boost the local economy.

The Senior Planning Officer showed Committee various photos of the site and its elevations from different locations.

The Development Control Team Manager had recently attended a meeting of the Parish Council that had highlighted their concerns about the hedgerow, parking and the general design.

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

- There were two parking spaces per property.
- The proposed contribution of £200k from the Applicant to refurbish the public house was not a planning consideration or a matter that could be controlled by Officers.
- This was not an enabling development.
- The existing hedgerow would be broken up to form the accesses but would otherwise be protected by a Condition.
- The car park opposite the site was within the ownership of the Rose and Crown public house. By agreement this was currently used by teachers at the nearby primary school.
- The proposed accommodation would be used for holiday lets.

A Motion to REFUSE planning permission was proposed by Councillor Dorcas Binns citing Policies PN8, A6 and A12, but this Motion fell because it was not seconded.

A Motion to DEFER the Application was proposed by Councillor Emma Sims and seconded by Councillor Liz Ashton because of concerns over parking arrangements, access, the impact on the street scene and village. The Secunder cited the following reasons, overdevelopment of the site because of the number of houses and their design.

The Locum Solicitor advised that, whilst the Committee could defer the Application, there had to be stated reasons for doing so. He suggested that a possible reason for deferral could be that further information was required in respect of the matters raised by the Proposer and Secunder.

On being put to the vote, there were 2 votes for the Motion to DEFER the Application, 7 votes against and no abstentions; it was declared LOST.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendation, with the additional Conditions, was proposed by Councillor Dave Mossman and seconded by Councillor Nigel Cooper.

Members debated the Application. Councillor Dorcas Binns outlined reasons why she could not support this Application. Other Members were supportive of the Application, subject to the imposition of the recommended Conditions. Members agreed that the cycle stand was not necessary and asked Officers to negotiate with the Agents for additional monies to be added to the £200k contribution.

The Development Control Team Manager confirmed the additional Conditions that Members had agreed for this Application:-

- Condition 3 - a sample panel of stone walling be submitted to Officers prior to the commencement of the development on site.
- The cycle shed be removed from the Application.

- The hedgerows and their height be preserved where at all possible.
- Parking could be allocated to certain properties; this would be delegated to Officers.
- The paddock should be retained.
- The contents of the Section 106 Agreement be delegated to Officers.

On being put to the vote, there were 7 votes for the Motion, 2 votes against and 1 abstention; it was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED To GRANT PERMISSION to Application S.14/2740/FUL, as set out in these Minutes, stated in the report and in Appendix A to these Minutes.**

At 7.28 pm the meeting was adjourned and reconvened at 7.36 pm.

Councillor Ken Stephens returned to the Council Chamber and resumed as Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

**DC.026      ITEM 3 – FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF THREE DWELLINGS ON LANE ADJOINING RUAVAL, ST JOHNS ROAD, SLIMBRIDGE, GLOS, (S.14/1179/FUL)**

The Development Control Team Manager had nothing to add to the Officer's report.

Councillor John Jones, a Ward Member for Severn, raised no objections to the Application in principle. However, he had concerns about on-site parking for site operatives and requested a Condition on wheel washing be added to the permission.

Mrs Doreen Hobbs a local resident spoke out against the Application citing many reasons, including that the development was unnecessary, affected the watercourses and that the access would be hazardous especially from the construction machinery using an already very busy road.

Mr Nigel Kallow, spoke on behalf of the Applicant and confirmed that there had been a lot of consultation with Officers and also an informal presentation given to the Parish Council which had resulted in amendments being made to the submitted Application.

Members raised their concerns about the water courses and the Locum Solicitor confirmed that an Informative could be attached to the Section 106 Agreement regarding riparian responsibility water courses which would be seen by prospective purchasers. He also drew attention to recommended Condition 17 in the Officer's report which would enable the Council to take enforcement action against the owners of the watercourse if it was not properly maintained.

Officers were aware that the current foul drainage system in the locality was inadequate but Severn Trent Water Authority had no immediate plans to rectify this.

Clarification was given on the wording "informal passing places" which meant that the drives would double up as passing places.

The Council's Senior Arboriculture Officer had been on a site visit and had confirmed that there had been some Poplar trees and old fruit trees, but there was nothing of interest.

Concerns were raised about the type of bricks and windows that would be used and it was agreed the submission of a sample panel showing the bricks could be added as a Condition and that delegated authority be given to the Officers to look into the turning/maneuvering on each plot.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendations, with the additional Conditions, was proposed by Councillor Emma Sims and seconded by Councillor Paul Hemming.

For clarification the Development Control Team Manager outlined the additional and amended Conditions to the Application as follows:-

- Condition 3 to include a full construction environment plan and details of wheel washing water disposal.
- Sample brick panel.
- Delegate to Officers the details of the two parking spaces per property and the turning areas.
- Windows needed to be of traditional design.
- Condition 7 – preservation of the hedgerows.
- Condition 17 – management of water courses.

Members expressed their differing views on the Application. Some felt that two properties on this awkward plot would have been better and the Application did not address local housing need.

On being put to the vote, there were 8 votes for the Motion, 3 votes against and 0 abstentions; it was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED To grant permission for Application S.14/1179/FUL, as set out in these Minutes, subject to the Conditions stated in the report and in Appendix A to these Minutes.**

**DC.027      ITEM 4 – FULL PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF A GAZEBO, CREATION OF A NEW PARKING AREA AND ACCESS TRACK AT EDGE HOUSE, THE GREEN, EDGE LANE, EDGE, STROUD, GLOS, (S.14/0882/FUL)**

The Development Control Team Manager provided Members with an update on the above Application and displayed photos taken by Mr G Lilley, who had raised objections because he felt that the gazebo had an overbearing affect on his property.

Mr Rob Lewis, Chairman of Painswick Parish Council conveyed the views of concerned local residents relating to parking and access. The works had blighted the view from Yoke House across the valley and requested an additional Condition relating to the number of parking spaces.

The Officer confirmed that from discussions with the Senior Enforcement Officer the changes would not set a precedent and an additional Condition could be added to ensure that the granting of permission did not result in the extension of the domestic curtilage.

Mr G Lilley spoke against the Application quoting Policy GE 1 and stated that the gazebo dominated the landscape and affected his property and also that of his neighbours. The works had been also carried out without consultation with neighbours.

Mr Andrew Case, the Applicant's agent, stated that the fact the Application was retrospective was due to a lack of knowledge on the part of the Applicant. He had submitted the Application as soon as he became aware that permission was required.

Mr Aiden Fowler, also spoke in favour of the Application which he did not find obtrusive. The house and gardens had previously been in a poor state and had been restored to a good standard.

Members questioned the use of the material on the driveway and why gravel had not been used. It was suggested by the Officer that gravel was a very stark white in colour and the current surface was unobtrusive and resembled a dirt track. It was also highlighted that the track was located on a slope and gravel would not stay in place.

Members suggested that Condition 3 be amended to allow for a landscape scheme between the boundary wall and the gazebo.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendation, with the additional Condition, was proposed by Councillor Nigel Cooper and seconded by Councillor Stephen Moore.

Members reflected on their recent site visit where some felt that the drive was appropriate, the parking area small and that the gazebo did not harm the listed building. Some Members felt that a lot of good work had been undertaken to the house and garden and were generally supportive of the Application.

On being put to the vote, there were 9 votes for the Motion, 0 votes against and 2 abstentions; it was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED To grant permission for Application S.14/0882/FUL, as set out in these Minutes, subject to the Conditions stated in the report and in Appendix A to these Minutes.**

**DC.028**      **ITEM 5 – LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR THE RECONFIGURATION OF THE ROOFS OF THE LEAN-TO EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS TO THE EXISTING SHED AND AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED ENTRANCE HALL AT SKIVERALLS HOUSE, SKIVERALLS, CHALFORD HILL, STROUD, GLOS (S.14/1211/LBC)**

Members' attention was drawn to the Late Pages and additional comments which had been received and affected both Scheduled Items 5 and 6 and also that Reason 3 was now the only recommended reason for refusal. Details of the two proposals were explained to Members and also site plans were displayed.

Mr Airton, the Applicant, confirmed that he had purchased the house 6 months ago and wanted to change previously permitted schemes to a pitched roof. He did not want to extend the footprint. The Parish Council and neighbours had supported these alterations.

Various points relating to the 'L' shaped window, the view and impact from the road were clarified.

A Motion to grant permission was proposed by Councillor Dorcas Binns and seconded by Councillor John Marjoram. The Proposer stated that the extension was in keeping with a Grade 2 Listed Building and great care had been taken in the design. The Seconder concurred, adding that he had been impressed with the approach to the heritage of the building and the plan had been well thought out.

On being put to the vote, there were 10 votes for the Motion, 0 votes against and 1 abstention; it was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED To grant permission for Application S.14/1211/LBC, as set out in these Minutes, subject to the Conditions stated in the report and in Appendix A to these Minutes.**

At 8.25 pm the meeting was adjourned and reconvened at 8.30 pm.

**DC.029**      **ITEM 6 – LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR THE RECONFIGURATION OF THE ROOFS OF THE LEAN-TO EXTENSION AND SHED WITH ALL WALLS RETAINED, AND AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED ENTRANCE HALL AT SKIVERALLS HOUSE, SKIVERALLS, CHALFORD HILL, STROUD GLOS, (S.14/1222/LBC)**

Members were provided with an update, as outlined in the Late Pages. Reason 3 was now the only recommended reason for refusal.

Mr Airton, the Applicant, thanked the Development Control Team Manager for his assistance in progressing his Application and hoped that the Ward Members would also support this Application.

A Motion to grant Permission was proposed by Councillor Dorcas Binns and seconded by Councillor John Marjoram.

During debate it was confirmed that if Committee approved this Application then the Applicant could decide with which scheme to proceed.

On being put to the vote, there were 10 votes for the Motion, 0 votes against and 1 abstention; it was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED To grant permission for Application S.14/1222/LBC, as set out in these Minutes, subject to the Conditions stated in the report and in Appendix A to these Minutes.**

**DC.030      ITEM 7 – 6 THE CHIPPING, WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE, GLOS (S.14/0035/215)**

The Senior Enforcement Officer informed Members of a breach of planning control consisting of poorly maintained land and buildings at 6 The Chipping and sought authority for enforcement action to remedy that breach by the serving of a Section 215 Notice on the owner of the property.

The condition of the outside of the property required works to be undertaken but the inside of the house had not been inspected.

The Chair suggested that the Section 215 Notice be served and if the owner had not carried out the works within the specified period, a report listing the required works together with their approximate costs was presented to Committee for their further consideration.

Councillors June Cordwell and Paul Smith, the Ward Members for the locality, confirmed that pieces of debris from this neglected property had been falling into the road. The property was in urgent need of attention. They were both of the opinion that the owner was unlikely to undertake any maintenance or repairs to his property.

In reply to Members' questions it was confirmed that that the owner must be given a reasonable time to comply with the Section 215 Notice which in these circumstances could be a period of 3 months.

The Locum Solicitor reminded Members that if they were to discuss personal information regarding the owner then they should consider going into exempt session.

Officers considered that the cost of clearing vegetation from the garden could be modest but the house repairs, new wooden windows, repairs to the garage, structural works and guttering was unknown.

Councillor Paul Hemming proposed a Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendation to initiate Section 125 action and to report back to Committee when the cost of works had been established. Building Control should be requested to investigate whether the building was a dangerous structure. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Dave Mossman.

On being put to the vote, there were 10 votes for the Motion, 0 votes against and 1 abstention; it was declared CARRIED.

**RESOLVED To authorise Officers to issue a Section 215 Notice in respect of the property and, in the event that the works were not undertaken by the owner within the required time to report back to Committee when the cost of the works had been established. Building Control would be requested to investigate whether the building was a dangerous structure requiring action.**

The meeting closed at 10.00 pm.

Chair

**Amendments for Development Control Committee  
12 August 2014**

**Item 1 (S.14/1049/OUT) - land at Bath Road, Eastington**

Amend reason for refusal (changes in bold):

This field, which is subject of the application, forms a break and a green swath between the main village and its satellite hamlets. This break gives Eastington a distinctive form and rural character. Similarly it allows views across the Bath Road frontage which is important to the village's setting in the wider landscape. This field also contributes towards views of rising land and a notable ridge, wherein there is an extensive, well used footpath network. Views into and particularly out of this area are notable and would be jeopardised by this proposal. In various ways the character of the village would be fundamentally harmed by this extensive residential development and would not be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal **including the need for new development**. It is therefore contrary to Stroud District Local Plan Policy NE10, Policy CP15 of the Local Plan Submission Draft, paragraphs 17 and 114 of the NPPF.

**Item 2 (S.13/2740/FUL) - land by Rose and Crown, Nympsfield**

Resolve to grant permission subject to signing S.106 agreement. Delegated authority granted to officers to seek amendments from Agent with regard to boundary treatment, cycle storage and parking together with the following amendments:

Description of development amended to take account of additional units:

Proposed residential development for 6 dwellings (incorporating 2 affordable units) and associated infrastructure, provision of a new bike shelter and relocation of beer garden.

Condition 2 – Amended to take account of revised plans (may still be subject to change if further revised plans are received):

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects in strict accordance with the approved plans listed below:

Site Location Plan of 17/12/2013  
Plan number = 01

Proposed plans and elevations Plot 1 of 17/12/2013  
Plan number = 706/100

Proposed plans and elevations Plot 2 of 17/12/2013  
Plan number = 706/101

Proposed plans and elevations Plot 3 of 17/12/2013  
Plan number = 706/102A

Proposed plans and elevations Plot 4 of 17/12/2013  
Plan number = 706/103

Proposed plans and elevations Plot 5 & 6 of 30/07/2014  
Plan number = 706\_104 Version number = B

Site Plan Proposed of 30/07/2014  
Plan number = 706\_105 Version number = D

Proposed Street Scene of 30/07/2014  
Plan number = 706\_106 Version number = C

Proposed Section of 30/07/2014  
Plan number = 706\_106 Version number = C

Proposed plans and elevations garaging of 17/12/2013  
Plan number = 706/107

Proposed plans and elevations Cycle Storage of 17/12/2013  
Plan number = 706/108

**Reason:**

To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of good planning.

**Condition 3 – Amended to request specific materials:**

The dwellings hereby permitted shall be finished in natural stone with conservation slates and timber casement windows, samples of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development on site. Development shall then only be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

**Reason:**

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policies HN8, NE8, BE5 and BE12 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005, together with Policies HC1, ES7 and ES10 of the emerging Local Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Condition 5 – Amended to incorporate details of remaining area of land:**

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include proposals for:

- 1) The retention of the land between Tinkley Lane, the 'Beer Garden' and the manoeuvring area for plots 1 and 2 shown on drawing 706/105 Rev D as open space.
- 2) A maintenance plan for the management of the open space referred to above.
- 3) The species and size of plant, planting distances/densities and details of how the planting will be undertaken.

**Reason:**

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policies HN8, NE8, BE5 and BE12 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005,

together with Policies HC1, ES7 and ES10 of the emerging Local Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 11 – Amended to request specific information regarding protection of boundary hedge:

All existing trees and hedges shall be retained unless shown on the approved drawings as being removed. Prior to any equipment, machinery, materials or vehicles being brought onto the site for the purposes of commencing development, and until all such equipment, machinery, vehicles and surplus materials have been removed from the site after completion of development, all trees and hedgerows on and immediately adjoining the site must be securely protected in accordance with details to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed measures shall be retained in place for the duration of works on site.

Reason:

To ensure the health and safety of the trees and hedgerow on the site and to ensure continuity of the visual amenity that they provide, in accordance with Policies NE4, NE8, BE5 and BE12 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005, together with Policies HC1, ES6, ES7 and ES10 of the emerging Local Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 18 – New condition to control remaining open space:

The land between Tinkley Lane, the 'Beer Garden' and the manoeuvring area for plots 1 and 2 shown on drawing 706/105 Rev D must be retained as open space and must not be incorporated into the domestic curtilage of any dwelling or otherwise used for domestic purposes.

Reason:

In order to conserve the natural landscape beauty of this part of the Cotswolds AONB in accordance with Policy NE8 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2008, Policy ES7 of the emerging Local Plan and paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 19 – New condition to remove Permitted Development Rights on remaining open space:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, 1995, (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) no development permitted under Article 3 and described in Class A of Part “, Schedule 2 shall take place on the land between Tinkley Lane, the 'Beer Garden' and the manoeuvring area for plots 1 and 2 shown on drawing 706/105 Rev D.

Reason:

In order to conserve the natural landscape beauty of this part of the Cotswolds AONB in accordance with Policy NE8 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2008, Policy ES7 of the emerging Local Plan and paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 20 – New condition to ensure retention and management boundary hedge on Front Street:

The existing hedgerow to the eastern boundary of the site shall be retained at a height not less than 3m (except where shown as being removed on the approved plans), in accordance with a hedgerow management plan to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed plan shall be put into place prior to the first occupation of the dwellings hereby permitted and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason:

To ensure the health and safety of the trees and hedgerow on the site and to ensure continuity of the visual amenity that they provide, in accordance with Policies NE4, NE8, BE5 and BE12 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005, together with Policies HC1, ES6, ES7 and ES10 of the emerging Local Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Condition 21 – New condition requesting sample panel of stone walling:

Prior to the commencement of any development on site, a sample panel of one square metre of the proposed natural stone walling shall be constructed on site and shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The panel shall be constructed and protected from the weather at least 14 days prior to inspection by the Local Planning Authority and the approved panel shall be maintained in situ for the duration of the works. The works shall then be carried out to match the approved panel and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason:

In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policies HN8, NE8, BE5 and BE12 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005, together with Policies HC1, ES7 and ES10 of the emerging Local Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Item 3 (S.14/1179/FUL) – Land adjoining Ruaval, St Johns Road, Slimbridge**

Amend condition 3 to include full construction environment plan, which specifically should require details of wheel washing water disposal.

No development shall take place, including any works or demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and shall provide for:

- i) the phasing of the development;
- ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- iii) the loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iv) the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- v) routing strategies for all deliveries to and removal of spoil from the site;
- vi) wheel washing facilities (including detailed measures to ensure their use) and the means of disposal of dirty water;
- vii) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- viii) procedures for notification of local residents as to when access along the public highway is likely to be disrupted;
- ix) any details of tree protection measures that may be required.

Reason:

In the interest of highway safety and neighbour amenity and to comply with Policies GE1 and GE5 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005 and Policy ES3 of the Stroud District Local Plan: Submission Draft December 2013.

**Note:**

The construction method statement should take account of the various elements of the permitted scheme (creation of the access, removal spoil from the site, re-grading the site, construction of any retaining structures, construction of the dwellings, etc) when compiling the Construction Method Statement to ensure that compliance with the condition can be achieved at all times.

Additional condition on sample panel of brick walling:

Prior to the commencement of any development a sample panel of one square metre of the proposed brick walling shall be constructed on site and shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The panel shall be constructed and protected from the weather at least 14 days prior to inspection by the Local Planning Authority and the approved panel shall be maintained in situ for the duration of the works. The works shall then be carried out to match the approved panel.

Reason:

To ensure a satisfactory appearance in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 57.

Additional condition on window details:

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of the proposed treatment of all external doors and window frames, including detailed elevations, cross sections, reveals, materials and colour have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall then only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:

To ensure that the buildings have a traditional appearance, in accordance with the NPPF paragraph 57.

**Note:**

Narrow modules will be required. White UPVC would be inappropriate.

Additional condition allied to 7 to highlight the importance of boundary hedges and new planting:

The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of retention of the hedge except for the width of the access points.

Reason:

In the interest of the character of the area, in accordance with paragraph 57 of the NPPF.

Officers shall seek additional/amended plans to confirm parking/turning for at least 2 cars per plot.

The Section 106 to include a clause to confirm responsibility for maintaining the watercourse rests with the adjacent owners.

**Item 4 (S.14/002/FUL) - Edge House, The Green, Edge Lane, Edge**

Amend condition 3 on landscaping to include the need for some semi-mature trees as well as replacements in the event of failed planting. Changes in bold:

A landscape planting, management and maintenance scheme shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority within three months of the development being permitted. **The new planting shall include a predominance of semi-mature specimens.** The landscape planting, management and maintenance scheme shall be carried out as approved and maintained for the duration of the use. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved scheme shall be carried out in the first complete planting and seeding seasons following approval of the scheme. **If any trees or plants which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, they shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.**

Reason: in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and to comply with Policy NE8 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan. November 2005.

**Note:** The parking area will need to be largely screened from public view and the line to the access shall be broken up by informal groups of trees.

Condition 5 to be amended to confirm that the permission does not create domestic curtilage. Changes in bold.

**The parking area hereby permitted shall only be used for parking of vehicles in association with and incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. The parking area and access track shall not be used as or constitute domestic curtilage.**

Reason:

In the interests of the amenities of occupiers of nearby residential properties and to comply with Policy GE1 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005 and **to respect the character of the Cotswolds AONB in accordance with Policy NE8.**

**Informative:**

**This planning permission grants consent for the creation of a parking area and its use for parking in connection with the dwelling. It does not grant change of use planning permission for the use of the agricultural land as domestic curtilage.**

**Items 5 and 6 – (S.14/1211/LBC) and (S.14/1222/LBC) Skiveralls House, Skiveralls, Chalford**

Overturn recommendation and grant consent.

Conditions:

1. The walling of the extension shall match the existing natural stone in the existing house. The slate roofing shall be the same as the sample approved under S.14/1440/DISCON.
2. The doors and windows shall be painted to RAL 7034 or white or cream.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the listed building in accordance with paragraph 132 of the NPPF.

3. The works hereby consented shall be strictly carried in accordance with the following approved plans:
  - 15/7/14 proposed west, north and east elevations
  - 15/7/14 door details
  - 15/7/14 window details
  - 29/7/14 proposed floor plans

**Note:** (S.14/1211/LBC shows a hip, S.14/1222/LBC shows a pitched roof).

Informative:

For the purposes of Regulation 2 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas)(England)(Amendment) Regulations 2003, the reasons for the Council's decision are summarised below. In considering the application, the Council has given special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses. Where relevant, reference is made to Government policy set out in PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide and the NPPF.

The extension is to the side of the house. It is modest height and scale. The extension is therefore considered to be subservient to the main dwelling. It would not upset the balance of the house and its outbuildings. Indeed the design reflects the intended form/function of the buildings. There is simple detailing and appropriate materials, reflecting the vernacular tradition. This scheme is preferable to the extant consent, particularly from the main aspect on the frontage.

**Item 7 – (S.12/0035/215) 6 The Chipping, Wotton under Edge**

Accept officer recommendation to initiate Section 215 action but to report back to DCC when the cost of works has been established. Building Control to be asked to investigate whether this is “a dangerous structure”.