

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

12 November 2013

6.00 pm – 11.08 pm

Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Stroud

3

Minutes

Membership:

Ken Stephens**	P	David Drew	A
John Marjoram*	P	Paul Hemming	P
Liz Ashton	P	Haydn Jones	P
Dorcas Binns	P	Graham Littleton	P
Rowland Blackwell	P	Stephen Moore	P
Nigel Cooper	P	Martin Whiteside	P

** = Chair * = Vice-Chair

A = Absent P = Present

Other Members in attendance

Paul Carter

Nick Hurst

Officers In attendance

Head of Planning

Senior Planning Officer

Development Control Team Manager

Locum Solicitor

Environmental Protection Manager

Democratic Services & Elections Officer

Principal Planning Officer

DC.046 APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor David Drew.

Late Pages had been circulated to all Members and were available to members of the public prior to the commencement of the meeting.

The Chair explained the public speaking scheme whereby members of the public for or against an application would be allowed to speak for a maximum of 3 minutes per speaking slot, clarifying that if there were more than one person wishing to speak they needed to arrange between themselves to share the time. The first 3

scheduled items on Aston Down would be taken separately. The agenda was long and he apologised to members of the public if Committee took a break prior to their item being debated.

The Head of Planning stated that the BBC would be filming for their programme 'The Planners'. The item that they had been following was Agenda Item 6. If anyone had concerns about the filming they needed to speak to one of the film crew.

DC.047 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

DC.048 MINUTES

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Development Control Committee meeting held on 8 October 2013 are accepted as a correct record.

DC.049 PLANNING SCHEDULE

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

1.	S.10/1764/COU	2.	S.12/2095/COU	3.	S.12/1759/COU
4.	S.13/1772/FUL	5.	S.13/0954/FUL	6.	S.13/1999/FUL
7.	S.13/1822/FUL	8.	S.13/1497/FUL	9.	S.13/1333/FUL
10.	S.13/1140/106R	11.	S.13/0166/OUT		

DC.050 ITEM 11 – OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR UP TO 140 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS ON LAND AT SUMMER STREET, STROUD (S.13/0166/OUT)

The Head of Planning explained that when the Schedule went to print, the revised appeal scheme was due to be considered by Committee. However, the developers had confirmed their intention to submit a revised planning application for the scheme. Consequently, it was not appropriate for the Committee to consider the application at this time and the Officer report had not been included within the agenda papers. Members were requested to defer the application.

A Motion to DEFER the application was proposed by Councillor Rowland Blackwell and seconded by Councillor Martin Whiteside. On being put to the vote the Motion was CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLVED To DEFER application S.13/0166/OUT.

DC.051 **ITEM 10 – APPLICATION FOR THE REMOVAL OR AMENDMENT OF SECTION 106 AGREEMENT AT FOREST GREEN ROVERS FC, THE NEW LAWN, SMITHS WAY, FOREST GREEN, GLOS (S.13/1140/106R)**

The Head of Planning confirmed that there had been an IT problem and the application had not appeared on the Council's website for the prescribed period. This would leave the Council open to legal challenge if the Committee determined the application at this stage. Accordingly, Members were requested to defer the application.

A Motion to DEFER the application was proposed by Councillor Stephen Moore and seconded by Councillor Liz Ashton. On being put to the vote the Motion was CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLVED To DEFER application S.13/1140/106R.

DC.052 **ITEM 1 – ASTON DOWN, COWCOMBE LANE, CHALFORD, STROUD, GLOS (S.10/1764.COU)**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the above report for the change of use of land between Building 66 and Building 104 for the parking of vehicles. Attention was drawn to the Late Pages and the concerns of Mr G Murray from the CPRE and a letter of objection from the Aston Down Action Group. Two typographical errors were highlighted within the report:-

- Page 20 second paragraph, second line, the word 'be' should be inserted between the words 'can' and 'safely'.
- Page 21, first line, sixth word should read 'machinery'.

The Principal Planning Officer also advised the Committee that following their determination of the application the Secretary of State would be notified.

Dr A Hill spoke on behalf of the Aston Down Action Group in opposition to the application. The Group were passionate to protect the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) at Aston Down. He outlined their concerns for all three applications on the agenda, highlighting that there were 17 pages of objections from the Group. The Secretary of State had previously stated that there should be no further development of the site. All three applicants had operated from the site illegally, without planning permission. The application should not have progressed this far and was in contravention of the NPPF. The Officer's report contained technical jargon and inconsistencies. Conflict between residents and the Planning Department had resulted from these proposals and ongoing problems. In conclusion, he stated that if the application was approved there would be grounds for challenge in the Courts. He requested Committee to defer the application for further consideration.

Mr N Hardcastle, the Applicant concurred with the Officer's report which he said was in line with planning policy and had nothing further to add.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the Aston Down site was a former military base and had been granted commercial mixed use permission following a public inquiry in December 2009. Plans identifying the area and showing the revised drawings received on 12 October 2013 were displayed. Members had benefited from a recent site visit which showed the large hangers and the AONB.

Members were advised that if the operating times for this application were changed it would result in a lack of consistency across the whole of the site. A key change in planning NPPF guidance suggested that operating hours should be as unrestricted as possible. The vehicle movements would be approximately between 6 - 12 vehicles per day and restricting this would be difficult to argue on a planning basis. The Police would enforce any breaches of the law concerning weight restrictions on the adopted public highway and existing weight restrictions.

Members were reminded that each application before Committee must be determined on its own merits. The site was an existing employment site used for industrial activity and identified as a key employment site within the Council's emerging Local Plan. A plan showed that residential properties were approximately 300m from the site. The existence of other unrestricted storage uses had been permitted on the site by Cotswold District Council and made known to the Committee as was the due weight applicable to use permissions as material considerations.

The Environmental Protection Manager confirmed that he had visited Aston Down on numerous occasions as early as 3.00 am. Noise from the site could travel beyond the boundaries of the site and it was possible to hear vehicle movements on the site in the early hours.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendation was proposed by Councillor John Marjoram and seconded by Councillor Graham Littleton.

Concern was expressed about the operational times and also that the applicant was currently in breach of planning control.

On being put to the vote, there were 10 votes for the Officer's recommendation, 1 vote against and 0 abstentions; it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED To PERMIT application S.10/1764.COU for the reasons stated within the report.

DC.053 ITEM 2 – APPLICATION FOR THE CHANGE OF USE OF BUILDING 17 AND THE ADJACENT COMPOUND, ASTON DOWN, GYPSY LANE, MINCHINHAMPTON (S.12/2095/COU)

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the history of the site and the application for the change of use from Class B1 to vehicle workshop and the use of existing compound for HGV/car parking. He drew attention to a drawing received on 16 October 2013 and the Late Pages with additional representations from Mr G Murray and Mr D Gauci. The Aston Down Action Group were also opposed to this application. Again, the Secretary of State would be notified of the Committee's decision.

Mr Gauci spoke in opposition to the application and drew attention to the conditions that the Secretary of State had attached to previous applicants, which had been ignored. He had suffered from disturbed sleep for the past 3 years due to noise disturbance from the site. Despite complaints, no action had been taken. A neighbour had moved from a front bedroom to a back bedroom because of disturbed sleep. He asked why should he have to close his windows? The Council had not controlled the site and there had been breaches of his human rights. Confirmation had also been given by the Council's Environmental Protection Manager on an early morning visit that disturbance from vehicles was an issue. In conclusion he requested that Officers do their jobs and enforce the conditions.

The Applicant, Mr Hardcastle, spoke in support of the application and stated that he concurred with the Officer's comments within the report. He had carried out noise monitoring to gauge the threshold of disturbance and none were found. There were no time restrictions on vehicles using the Cirencester Road. Aston Down was an employment site. Early morning vehicle movements were not daily and the disturbances were only to particular properties. A balance had to be made between employment and disturbance. The application was in accordance with NPPF – economic growth and future sustainable development. In concluding he hoped that Committee would approve the application.

At Sites Panel the Principal Planning Officer had shown Members Building 17, which was the old boiler house. A site plan was displayed to show Committee the proposal. Between 3.00 am and 4.00 am two HGV vehicles (out of 8) left the site. The proposal was for an unrestricted number of vehicles and the Officer's recommendation was to refuse the application on the basis of local amenity. It was not appropriate to impose a condition restricting operating times as this would negate the planning permission being applied for contrary Circular 11/95.

Members were most concerned about the noise nuisance to neighbours. The Environmental Protection Manager confirmed that background noises running up to and at the point a vehicle passed had been evaluated when making his report. In his opinion the proposal would have a detrimental impact on local amenity contrary to Section 123 of the NPPF relating to significant noise impact and vehicle movements before 6.00 am and would have a significant impact on residents. The Environmental Protection Manager explained the different tests relating to statutory nuisance and detriment to amenity.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendation was proposed by Councillor Dorcas Binns and seconded by Councillor Martin Whiteside.

The proposer was grateful for the Officer report and was not happy that the applicant had flouted the rules and had not been a decent neighbour.

On being put to the vote the Motion was CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLVED To REFUSE application S.12/2095/COU for the reasons stated within the report.

DC.054 **ITEM 3 – APPLICATION FOR THE CHANGE OF USE OF BUILDING**
15 ASTON DOWN, GYPSY LANE, MINCHINHAMPTON
(S.12/1759/COU)

The Principal Planning Officer presented the above application to change the use of Building 15 to B1, B2 and B8 uses. Attention was drawn to the Late Pages received from Mr G Murray, CPRE and Mrs L Cook.

Typographical errors were highlighted on pages 38 and 39 in Conditions 2, 4 and 5 the word HGV should have read “LGV” and in Condition 6 the fourth word should have read “bringing”. As with the other two previous applications the Committee’s decision would be notified to the Secretary of State. An extra condition regarding landscaping management and maintenance plan for the retention of the trees and hedgerow for screening was also recommended. A recent Sites Inspection Panel had visited the site.

The Applicant, Mr Hardcastle, spoke in support of the application and concurred with the Officer’s comments. He had three interested parties who were keen to occupy the buildings which would help support local employment.

The Principal Planning Officer explained the planning history of the site and clarified that Building 15 was an old garage site with flexible use and had its own parking areas. There were, however, time restrictions upon this site. There was a material difference with this application compared with previous applications regarding new employment on new land. The Officer explained the policy position by reference to Policies EM1 to EM10 and Paragraph in the NPPF.

In answer to Member questions, a map was displayed showing the location of Black Horse bungalow, which was located within a group of 7 properties. Reference was made to a recent application approved on the site by Cotswold District Council for B8 storage with no time restrictions. If the application was granted it would have an impact on residential amenity but the significance of that impact when assessed against activities on the wider site and the volume of traffic was a matter of planning judgement. There was, however, the potential to increase employment upon the site.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer’s recommendation, together with the extra landscaping and maintenance plan condition was proposed by Councillor Rowland Blackwell and seconded by Councillor John Marjoram.

During debate, the Seconder stated that bringing the building back into use would be an improvement.

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

RESOLVED To PERMIT application S.12/1759/COU for the reasons stated within the report and minutes.

DC.055 **ITEM 4 – APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION AT 20 ROCK ROAD, CAM, DURSLEY, GLOUCESTERSHIRE (S.13/1772/FUL)**

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the report for the erection of 8 residential units and associated works on the above site. Two letters of objection had been received from A Marsh and D Brown in Late Pages. A Sites Inspection Panel had recently visited the site.

Mr R Pearce, a neighbour opposed the application because he thought the site would be overdeveloped. The number of flats had been decreased from the original application from 9 to 8 but the number of bedrooms increased.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendation was proposed by Councillor Graham Littleton and seconded by Councillor John Marjoram.

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

RESOLVED To PERMIT application S.13/1772/FUL for the reasons stated within the report.

DC.056 **ITEM 5 – APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION AT THE CHIPPING SURGERY, SYMN LANE, WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE, GLOUCESTERSHIRE (S.13/0954/FUL)**

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the report for the erection of 4 dwellings upon the above site. Late Pages had been received from Wotton Town Council objecting to the revised plans. A Sites Inspection Panel had recently visited the site.

In the absence of Councillor June Cordwell, the Ward Member, Councillor Paul Hemming read out a prepared statement on her behalf objecting to the application.

Dr R Ward, GP at the surgery, spoke on behalf of the application. The proposed dwellings were for house bound or infirm residents who would be close to primary care and had 2 parking spaces per dwelling. The fire station was part-time and was served by a separate entrance and emergency exit; obstructing these was illegal.

The Locum Solicitor gave advice on whether it was appropriate to impose a condition restricting the age of occupants. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that whilst the previous permission was described as 'sheltered housing' no occupancy condition was imposed. The current application was for market housing.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendation was proposed by Councillor Hayden Jones and seconded by Councillor Stephen Moore.

During debate Members compared the design of the current application with the previous permitted scheme and had differing views. Concern was also expressed regarding parking provision.

On being put to the vote, there were 5 votes for the Motion, 5 votes against and 1 abstention. The Chair used his casting vote and it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED To PERMIT application S.13/0954/FUL for the reasons stated within the report and minutes.

At 8.08 pm the meeting was adjourned and reconvened at 8.22 pm.

DC.057 ITEM 6 – APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING PERMISSION AT THE COLLIAN, MAGNOLIA COTTAGE AND CARPENTERS, BOX, STROUD, GLOUCESTERSHIRE (S.13/1999/FUL)

The Development Control Team Manager outlined the above application for the change of use of C3 dwelling houses to residential accommodation associated with the Cotswold Chine School within Use Class C2. The three representations in the Late Pages from the Applicant's planning agent, Mr Chandler and Mr P Gardiner were highlighted.

Councillor Nick Hurst the Ward Member read out a prepared statement. This outlined the nature of the application and cited policies, HN7 and GE1 of the Local Plan, and Policy 6 of the NPPF as reasons for refusal.

Mr S Hemmings spoke in opposition to the application on behalf of Minchinhampton Parish Council. He stated that the Novalis Trust had no care for the local community and owned other properties within the facility.

Mr R David, a local resident, spoke in opposition to the application. He stated Policies C3, C4 and NPP8 as reasons for refusal. There had been no effort to integrate the children into village life and on many occasions there had been anti-social behaviour and criminal activity.

Mr D Jones, the agent for the Applicant addressed Committee. He explained that the application was for a change of use to C2 because each house needed to have a fully trained member of staff present. There would have been no need for a change of use if the members of staff were not being rotated. Each house would accommodate a maximum of three children, providing them with a stable environment. There had been no objections received from either the Police or Environmental Health. 12 incidents had been recorded by the School. The Novalis Trust accepted the proposed conditions in the Officer report.

Members received advice from the Locum Solicitor on Use Classes C2 and C3 and drew Members' attention to Condition 2 on page 75 of the Officer's report which linked the three houses to the remainder of the School site. It was confirmed that if permission was granted, the entire plot of each house would change to C2 use.

A Motion to REFUSE the application was proposed by Councillor Dorcas Binns and seconded by Councillor Rowland Blackwell.

The Chair adjourned the meeting to seek legal advice at 20.52 pm and the meeting reconvened at 21.11 pm.

On reconvening, the Proposer confirmed the proposed reasons for refusal were:-

1. The loss of three residential units would undermine the social cohesion and sense of community bearing in mind the limited development opportunities within the village of Box contrary to Policy HN7 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2005 and paragraph 17 of NPPF.
2. The proposed development would not permit a healthy community within the village contrary to paragraph 69 of NPPF.
3. The lack of continuous care as offered by a permanent house parent would be likely to result in increased levels of noise and disturbance to the surrounding community contrary to Policy GE1 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2005.

The Proposer stated that she had visited the site at a recent Sites Inspection Panel. The village of Box had a wonderful community spirit and the locals supported and worked together and held many local activities. The Cotswold Chine School had bought local properties, including the public house, which had a huge impact on local residents, visitors and walkers. The community were in conflict with the Novalis Trust who were isolated and not part of the community. The application was for retrospective permission and had divided the community. If the application was granted it would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Box and requested other Members to support her request for refusal.

Members debated the application, expressing their differing views on the effect the application would have on both the community and the school.

The Locum Solicitor reminded Members that the application had to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. The Applicant's business practices and reported conflict between the community and School were not material to the Committee's decision. Members should put their minds to the three reasons for refusal put forward in the motion. The Head of Planning read these out.

On being put to the vote, there were 7 votes for the Motion, 2 votes against, and 0 absentions; it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED To REFUSE application S.13/1999/FUL on the following grounds:-

- 1. The loss of three residential units would undermine the social cohesion and sense of community bearing in mind the limited development opportunities within the village of Box contrary to Policy HN7 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2005 and paragraph 17 of NPPF.**
- 2. The proposed development would not permit a healthy community within the village contrary to paragraph 69 of NPPF.**
- 3. The lack of continuous care as offered by a permanent house parent is likely to result in increased levels of noise and disturbance to the surrounding community contrary to Policy GE1 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2005.**

The meeting adjourned at 21.35 pm and reconvened at 21.43 pm.

DC.058 **ITEM 7 – APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING ON LAND ADJOINING SETWELL, WALKLEY WOOD, NAILSWORTH, GLOUCESTERSHIRE (S.13/1822/FUL)**

The Development Control Team Manager outlined the above application for the erection of one detached dwelling. He provided an update from a highway consultant on behalf of the neighbours who had confirmed that Walkley Road was adopted but substandard and there was no record of a highway collision concurring with the Officer's recommendation to permit the application.

Councillor Paul Carter, Ward Member spoke against the application stating that a previous Council decision had been upheld after appeal. There were chronic access and parking issues and he requested Committee to refuse the application because of its access. He requested that, if the application was approved, an additional condition should be imposed to ensure that the road was not blocked at any time.

Mr A Newport spoke on behalf of the neighbours in opposition to the application. He felt that the development would cause severe disruption, especially when there were deliveries being made.

The Locum Solicitor clarified that if the public highway was blocked this would be a Police matter and not for consideration by Committee.

Members viewed a plan showing the layout of the property and site location plan. Confirmation was given that the current proposal was for segregated parking because of the topography of the site. County Highways had carefully looked at the site and had not raised any objections, subject to the imposition of conditions. The Development Control Team Manager advised that it was not uncommon to have separate parking/garaging some distance from the dwelling.

A Motion to DEFER the application was proposed by Councillor Nigel Cooper and seconded by Councillor John Marjoram. The proposer requested the deferment of the application to further clarify the status of the highway land verses private land.

On being put to the vote, there were 7 votes for the Motion, 0 vote against and 2 abstentions; it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED To DEFER application S.13/1822/FUL for determination at a future meeting for the reasons stated in the minutes.

DC.059 **ITEM 8 – APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING AT DUMBLEDORE, BEACON CLOSE, PAINSWICK, STROUD, GLOS (S.13/1497/FUL)**

The Development Control Team Manager outlined the above application for a replacement dwelling and new garage on the above site. A verbal update was given on the revised ecological survey and assessment, including a reptile survey that had been submitted by the Agent in Late Pages. Two additional conditions were suggested to be added namely an ecological condition and a slab height condition.

Councillor Martin Slinger, Chairman of Painswick Parish Council spoke on behalf of the Parish Council and also concerned neighbours against the application. He cited the size and massing of the dwelling, invasion of privacy and loss of light to adjoining properties as reasons for refusal.

Mr Wolowiec, the owner of a nearby property spoke in opposition to the application. He considered that the criteria to Policies HN14 and GE1 had not been met. Neighbouring properties would have a loss of light because the property had moved forward by 7m and the height would severely impact on neighbours. The site could accommodate a 4-bedroomed house in a different position and reduced height.

Mr A Pearson, the Applicant stated that neighbours did not want change and a new house would enhance the area. The footprint was the same as the old house and also in a similar position. The house was being brought forward by several metres, not by 7m to give light to the back of the house. The materials used would be of good quality. There was no planning reason to refuse the application.

The Development Control Team Manager confirmed that the ridge height of 8.3m was a standard modern height and the garage height of 4m was modest. The location of the dwelling had moved and there was a slightly different footprint. Members were shown a plan to compare the layout and distances between properties.

A Motion to REFUSE the application was proposed by Councillor Nigel Cooper and seconded by Councillor Dorcas Binns, based on the following Policy reasons:-

1. Policy GE1 – if permitted the size, position and massing would be detrimental to the loss of amenity.
2. Policy NH14 – the replacement dwelling was not similar or smaller than the existing dwelling, it was bigger.
3. Policy NE14 – the dwelling would not enhance the AONB landscape.

Members debated the Motion and had differing views. Some Members felt that the existing building was small and would be replaced by a reasonably sized house.

On being put to the vote, there were 3 votes for the Motion, 6 votes against, and 0 abstentions; it was declared LOST.

A Motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, together with the two additional conditions was proposed by Councillor Stephen Moore and seconded by Councillor Liz Ashton.

On being put to the vote, there were 6 votes for the Motion, 1 vote against, and 2 abstentions; it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED To PERMIT application S.13/1497/FUL for the reasons stated within the report and minutes.

DC.060 **ITEM 9 – APPLICATION FOR FULL PLANNING AT THE RAILWAY HOTEL, STATION ROAD, NAILSWORTH, GLOS (S.13/1333/FUL)**

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the above application for a biomass outbuilding with purpose built bat roost at the above location. He provided a verbal update on the Late Pages that had been received from A Saunders and the Gloucestershire County Council's Public Right of Way team. An error was highlighted in Condition 10, the word 'Railway' should have been inserted before the word 'hotel'. An issue had been raised regarding a public sewer on the site, which was not a planning consideration.

Councillor Paul Carter, Ward Member spoke in opposition to the application because there had been a number of applications that had all been refused and subsequently won on appeal which all needed to be considered.

Mr Flint represented the objectors to the application. He confirmed there had been 30 letters of objection to this application. There was already a natural gas supply in the area. The proposed building would not fit in and would be another wooden clad structure which was not sympathetic to the hotel building. The sewer pipe was also of concern. He requested Committee refuse the application.

Mr Webb, the Applicant confirmed that the boiler size was irrelevant; the important factor was the technology in the box. There was already permission for a smaller building on the site and over time the wooden cladding would blend in.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that materials would weather down. A condition was attached to the application requesting samples of materials being used. There were concerns on the impact on neighbours and also ecology issues. The Officer confirmed that the sewer pipe was not a planning consideration; the Applicant would have to reach a building over agreement with Severn-Trent.

The Head of Planning confirmed that the building complied with building regulations, was exempt from building control and the bike shed had already been relocated. It was confirmed that the Railway Hotel was a listed building but was not part of this application. The Conservation Officer had been consulted.

The Environmental Protection Manager confirmed that the woodchip would have to be dry to burn. If there were problems in the future there was statutory nuisance legislation in place to address noise nuisance or fumes. The bats would enter the bat loft through a 'letterbox' opening which would be separated from the boiler.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the development would be in a location which was a reasonable distance away from other properties. The Council's Senior Arboriculture Officer had visited the site and had been satisfied that the running of the boiler would not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding trees. Confirmation was given that if permission was granted the building would only be used for a biomass boiler. The wood chips would either be blown in through a pipe or carried in bags.

A Motion to ACCEPT the Officer's recommendation, with changes to the wording of Condition 10 was proposed by Councillor Stephen Moore and seconded by Councillor Liz Ashton.

During debate Members expressed their differing views.

On being put to the vote, there were 5 votes for the Motion, 3 votes against, and 1 abstention; it was declared CARRIED.

RESOLVED To PERMIT application S.13/1333/FUL for the reasons stated within the report and minutes.

The meeting closed at 11.08 pm.

Chair

AMENDMENTS FOR DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE
12 November 2013

In addition to the amendments stated on the Late Pages

ITEM No: 03	Application: S.12/1759/COU
Address: Building 15, Aston Down, Cowcombe Lane, Chalford, Stroud	

Extra Condition:

Prior to the bringing into use of any part of the development hereby permitted, a landscape management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted management plan shall include measures for the long term retention and maintenance of the hedge, at a specified height, which forms the boundaries of the compound area hereby permitted together with identical details for the existing trees located between the application site and the western boundary of the Aston Down Main site. The development shall then be carried out in the accordance with the approved management plan and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason:

In order to safeguard the rural character of this part of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in accordance with Policy NE8 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005 and paragraph 115 of the NPPF

Amendments to Conditions 2, 4 and 5:

Substitution of the abbreviation 'HGV' with 'LGV' where it appears in conditions 2, 4 and 5.

ITEM No: 06	Application: S.13/1999/FUL
Address: The Collina, Magnolia Cottage and Carpenters Cottage, Box, Stroud	

Refusal:

The loss of three residential units would undermine the social cohesion and sense of community bearing in mind the limited development opportunities of the village of Box contrary to Policy HN7 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005 and Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed development does not promote a healthy community with the village of Box contrary to Paragraph 69 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The lack of continuous care as offered by a permanent house parent is likely to result in increased levels of noise and disturbance to the surrounding community contrary to Policy GE1 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005.

ITEM No: 08	Application: S.13/1497/FUL
Address: Dumbledore, Beacon Close, Painswick, Stroud	

Extra Condition:

Prior to the commencement of development, details of the finished slab level of the dwelling and garage hereby permitted, including fixed points showing the relationship with adjoining land and highway and reference to a known datum (Ordinance Survey) outside the site. The slab level, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby permitted shall then only be carried out in accordance with those approved details.

Reason:

In the interests of the amenities of the area and to accord with Policy GE1 of the Stroud District Local Plan, November 2005.

ITEM No: 09	Application: S.13/1333/FUL
Address: Railway Hotel, Station Road, Nailsworth.	

Amendment to Condition 10

Insertion of the word 'Railway' before 'hotel'.