

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

8 January 2019

6.03 pm – 7.47 pm

Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Stroud

# 3

### Minutes

#### Membership

Councillor Tom Williams (Chair)	P	Councillor Haydn Jones	A
Councillor John Marjoram (Vice-Chair)	P	Councillor Steve Lydon	P
Councillor Martin Baxendale	P	Councillor Karen McKeown	P
Councillor Dorcas Binns	P	Councillor Jenny Miles	P
Councillor Miranda Clifton	P	Councillor Jessica Tomblin	P
Councillor Nigel Cooper	P	Councillor Mark Reeves	P

P = Present    A = Absent

#### Officers in Attendance

Planning Manager	Principal Planning Officer
Development Manager	Interim Head of Legal Services and
Team Manager	Monitoring Officer
Conservation Officer	Democratic Services Officer
Solicitor and Deputy Monitoring Officer	

#### DC.045      APOLOGIES

An apology was received from Councillor Haydn Jones.

#### DC.046      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Schedule Item 4.9 – land adjacent to 1 Orchard Road, Ebley. Councillor Miles declared that as ward member she would not take part in the debate nor vote as a committee member; but would exercise her local ward member rights to speak at the start of the item.

#### DC.047      MINUTES – 27 NOVEMBER 2018

**RESOLVED** That the Minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2018 are accepted as a correct record.

#### DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANNING SCHEDULE

The Chair stated that application (S.18/1039/FUL), The Ram Inn had been withdrawn by the Monitoring Officer. The in-house application S.18/1094/FUL had been formally withdrawn by the applicant and the in-house applications S.18/2219/FUL,

S.18/2222/FUL, S.18/2237/FUL had all been removed from the Agenda by the Chair and Planning Manager.

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

1	S.18/2326/REM	4	S.18/1797/HHOLD	5	S.18/1798/LBC
9	S.18/2275/FUL				

Late pages relating to items 1, 6, 7, 8 and 9 on the schedule had been circulated to committee prior to the meeting and items being withdrawn.

**DC.048**      **PARCEL H11 & H12 LAND WEST OF STONEHOUSE, GROVE LANE, WESTEND (S.18/2326/REM)**

The Chair outlined the above application. The Planning Manager read the comments within the late pages. The Principal Planning Officer had nothing to add to his report.

No persons were present to speak on the application.

Members asked questions regarding the disruption caused by the temporary closure of bridleways/footpaths. Steps were being taken to reduce inconvenience as much as possible. Meetings had been set up with the developers and parishes have been kept updated. The width of the footpath was also discussed and members wanted a condition to be added for the footpath width to be a minimum of 3m, rather than the normal 1.8m width.

Councillor Cooper proposed a motion to accept officers' advice; this was seconded by Councillor Binns, with the addition of the width of the footpath being conditioned to 3m.

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

**RESOLVED To grant application S.18/2326/REM, subject to the additional condition that the footpath width was 3m.**

**DC.049**      **OLD WEAVERS, PITCHCOMBE, STROUD. (S.18/1797/HHOLD)**

The Conservation Officer outlined the above application. Members raised concerns about the future protection of the trees that were currently in place.

Mr Shore, Chair of Pitchcombe Parish Council read out a statement which outlined reasons for refusal, this included Local Plan policy ES.10.

Mr Little, a local resident also did not support the application because the extension was inappropriate.

In reply to members' questions it was established that when driving through the core of the village the extension would not be highly visible but it would be at night and also from other aspects. The trees were not protected by a Tree Preservation Order and they also fell outside of the conservation area but had been included within the Arboriculture report for maintenance. Drawings of the site were handed around to members. The footprint of the extension would be approximately ¼ of the whole building. The terrace wall and extension were highlighted. The building was built in the 1800's. The landscaping formed part of the application.

Councillor Marjoram proposed a motion to refuse the application because it did not enhance the character of the listed building and conservation area and failed to demonstrate any architectural cohesion; this was seconded by Councillor Cooper.

Councillor Cooper stated he liked the extension but it was in the wrong place and did not enhance the listed building or conservation area stating it was contrary to policies ES3 and ES10.

Members debated the application and when put to the vote there were 6 votes in favour, 5 votes against and no abstentions.

**RESOLVED To refuse application S.18/1797/HHOLD, because it did not enhance the conservation area and was contrary to policies ES.3 and ES.10.**

**DC.050 OLD WEAVERS, PITCHCOMBE, STROUD (S.18/1798/LBC)**

The Conservation Officer confirmed that the above application was for listed building consent and the impact of the extension on the listed building.

Mr Shore and Mr Little had nothing to add to their objections and reasons for refusal.

The Chair reminded members that this application was for the impact of the extension on the listed building.

Councillor Marjoram proposed a motion to refuse the application because it would damage the character of the listed building; this was seconded by Councillor Cooper. Councillor Cooper also cited policies ES.10 and ES.3 which Councillor Marjoram was happy to adopt into his motion.

Members debated the application and Councillor Baxendale thought the extension detracted from the existing character of the listed building.

When put to the vote there were 6 votes for, 5 vote against and 0 abstentions.

**RESOLVED To refuse application S.18/1798/LBC, because it would damage the character of the listed building and was contrary to policies ES.10 and ES.3.**

At 19.22 pm the meeting adjourned and reconvened at 19.30 pm.

**DC.051 LAND ADJACENT TO 1 ORCHARD ROAD, EBLEY (S.18/2275/FUL)**

Having taken advice from the Monitoring Officer, Councillor Clifton declared that she did not consider she had an interest in this item because she was a member of the Housing Committee. Nevertheless in being transparent and open she wished it to be noted that she was part of the Housing Committee; however, she had not been involved with the application and did not consider she had an interest under the Code of Conduct which would prevent her from taking part and had retained an open mind.

The Team Manager outlined the application and drew members' attention to the late pages. There had been further objections received from the Parish Council and two neighbours.

Councillor Miles speaking as Ward Member raised concerns of the loss of this piece of green amenity land, the speed of traffic, the location of construction vehicles and the affect this would have on local residents.

In reply to questions there was no data on the use of the land, which was not a public open space. In the parish the public had access to Victory Park, Queen Elizabeth II field and also the canal tow path.

A plan showing the designated spaces from the local plan was displayed. The retention and maintenance of the trees had been included in Condition 3. The proposed layout had been agreed with Gloucestershire County Council.

Councillor Binns proposed a motion to accept officers' advice and to impose a further planning condition relating to retaining the existing trees; this was seconded by Councillor Cooper.

On being put to the vote there were 9 votes in favour and 1 against and 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED To grant application S.18/2275/FUL, subject to a suitable Section 106 Deed/Unilateral Undertaking being entered into.**

The meeting closed at 7.47 pm.

Chair