



**MINUTES OF WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE TOWN COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 26<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 7pm, CIVIC CENTRE**

**PRESENT:** Councillors T Luker (Chair), N Clement, John Cordwell, P Barton, June Cordwell, C Young, N Pinnegar, L Farmer, P Smith, A Proctor, A Wilkinson, R Claydon, A Kendall

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Clerk Ms S Bailey **PUBLIC:** 98 public & District Cllrs C Braun, K Tucker, G Butcher

**P.5601            APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** - Cllr T Luker welcomed attendees, received no apologies as all were present, and handed over the meeting to the Chairman of the Council, Cllr P Smith who took the chair.

**P.5602            DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** none

**P.5603            FRAMPTON CONSULTANTS** –Mr Frampton, as consultant representing developer Oxford Law, was welcomed and he spoke in general terms about plans for the Holywell Farm application. This is an outline application and many matters are reserved for consultation with the various statutory bodies. The previous application by Oxford Law for this site used a different consultant.

**P.5604            PUBLIC FORUM** Three items of public concern were:

**1.** The Silver Lining planning application at the Cloud, where the proposed 1.8metre wall would create a tunnel effect for walkers along the Cotswold Way and destroy views, and also the piling process needed would create problems for adjacent owners of very old properties.

**2.** The Potters Pond new development entrance is dangerous and needs kerbing & defining: it appears that surveyors were measuring for this today.

**3.** Many members of the public spoke of their concerns about the Holywell Farm application. No one spoke in favour. Some concerns are as follows:

- Destruction of peaceful gateway via Cotswold Way; site is totally visible from above surrounding hills & escarpment
- Hundreds of objections on SDC planning website
- Don't want erosion of & development in AONB
- Would lead to more traffic problems/pollution than Wotton can cope with
- Safety of residents walking from Court Orchard into town already an issue
- Appalled at threats by Oxford Law to vulnerable members of public
- Community is united in refusing financial bribery and valuing the wildlife and open public space above materialistic incentives
- Access option via playing fields is legally impossible & already refused
- Other SDC sites shortly available within Wotton area for house building
- The affordable housing portion stated in application is questionable
- Current sewage system is inadequate & needs vast improvements
- A lot of the site is in the flood plain including access road
- This is a lazy/speculative application with no questions answered adequately and everything left to later consultations & 'the experts'.
- Lack of public transport to serve this remote & greatly sloping site
- SDC has already specified 5 year housing supply data and therefore this speculative development application outside the town boundary is not needed

Mr Frampton attempted to answer some of the questions, although many were referred to as needing to be defined at a later date.

*It was agreed to bring forward on the agenda the Holywell Farm application and the developer offer letter item*

**P.5605**

**Correspondence letter from Mr Frampton regarding land at Holywell Farm** – to note and discuss in conjunction with planning application S.16/1587/OUT. A letter offered £125,000 to the Town Council towards projects within the Community Plan subject to Planning Permission being granted. It was proposed by Cllr John Cordwell and seconded by Cllr P Smith that such a bribe is not acceptable and we would not be influenced in this way, agreed unanimously.

**P.5606**

**S.16/1587/OUT Land At Holywell Farm, Wotton-Under-Edge, Outline Planning Permission Residential development, including demolition of 89 Court Orchard for up to 25 dwellings (Outline application - all matters reserved).** After discussion amongst Councillors, it was proposed by Cllr John Cordwell, seconded by Cllr T Luker, agreed by all, that we object to this planning application on the following grounds:

- Site is not identified for development in the Stroud District 2015 Local Plan. This plan has already demonstrated a 5 year land supply in the district.
- Site is outside the boundary of permitted development of Wotton
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) only permits development in such greenfield sites if there would be no adverse effect on the landscape – this is not the case here since immense historic valley beauty of the southern Cotswolds would be destroyed forever.
- Site is in the Cotswold AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) - thus of national significance
- Site is highly visible from the Cotswold Way National Trail - one of the nationally significant walking routes across the UK – and due to its location near the bottom of a long valley, its beauty is highly visible from the surrounding escarpment and hills.
- Proposal for access via Synwell Playing Fields is not an option since the fields belong to a national charity 'Fields in Trust' who have already stated in no uncertain terms that they cannot be sold. This option is therefore factually & lawfully incorrect.
- Proposal for access via Court Orchard is through a highly unsuitable residential area, designed as a cul-de-sac 50 years ago, with many parked cars, thus rendering the road width single track in most places. Not only would this make access difficult for any new residents, but the chaos and danger from the construction vehicles needed for such an undertaking is unimaginable.
- Access onto the busy junction of Synwell Lane/ Potters Pond which has recently been compounded by development of almost 50 houses would render this bend/corner on a hill even more dangerous than it has recently become – the Town Council is currently in discussions with Gloucestershire Highways on possible methods to avoid accidents, as a result of the extra parked cars from the adjacent new development.
- Previous applications on this site have been refused by Stroud District Council Planning Authority as unsuitable development.
- The pressure on local services – which are already stretched – would be compounded.
- Extra traffic flows would be unable to cope with this increased pressure. Wotton has very little employment and along with recently reduced and totally inadequate public transport, more cars and commuting to workplaces further afield would be inevitable – thus exacerbating the regular traffic problems through the Town.
- If permission were granted for such a development on a green field in an AONB, this would set a terrible precedent for the ravaging of the Cotswold landscape and render as useless the Government planning policies designed to protect rural England from developer destruction.
- This site abuts an important wildlife corridor with many protected species – native white clawed crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes*) to name just one. Moreover, the developer's two ecology reports seem to disagree with each other on whether the crayfish is even present!

*In terms of its relevance to Planning Legislation in the context of the 2015 Stroud District Local Plan objection is as follows:*

CP1 - This development is not in accordance with the Local Plan and it cannot be argued that the adverse impacts will outweigh the benefits (there are none for the residents of Wotton!). Residents of Court Orchard will be permanently affected. Their Cul-de-Sac will be turned into a through road which will add to noise, pollution and danger and some properties will be overlooked.

CP3 - 2<sup>nd</sup> tier settlements have "...the potential to provide for modest levels ....of homes...". Recent developments in Wotton (Potters Pond 46 homes, Water Lane, 24 homes and Stokes Bakery, 20 units, plus around 20 fill-ins) have already provided a modest level of development. In addition, the unplanned and unwanted significant developments in Kingswood and Charfield mean that the local area has had more

than its fair share of modest development. Given that modest recent development has already taken place, this proposal is non-compliant with CP3.

CP4 - It is difficult to see how this will integrate into the neighbourhood and reduce car dependency, bearing in mind there is no local employment, and most employment is to the South and West of the town, this development would increase traffic through the town. Any benefits secured by the new residents would be at the expense of those living in Court Orchard which will become a less safe street. Car domination will increase, as will the strain on existing services.

CP7 - The developer has not demonstrated that this development will contribute to the long-term needs of this community. It does not. As evidenced in the recent Community Plan, residents are strongly against the provision of more private housing developments. The development will also put more strain on local services (Schools, Doctors, Sewerage).

CP8 - This development does not satisfy local housing needs (we need more affordable/social housing, not expensive private housing developments (see Community Plan)). Nothing could be done to make it acceptable in townscape and local environment terms. There is no local employment and it will exacerbate existing traffic problems.

CP15 - Developments outside of defined settlement limits will not be permitted. None of the exceptions listed in policy CP15 are met for this development.

ES7, NPPF Paras 109, 115 and 116 - Priority should be given to protecting and enhancing the AONB, not destroying it. This development is not sympathetic to and will not complement the landscape character. The policies state that planning permission should be refused except in exceptional circumstances in the public interest. There is no public interest consideration in this application which will result in the loss of an attractive meadow and will be highly visible on the hillside above the Cotswold Way.

HC1 - This proposed development is outside defined settlement limits. It is incompatible with the character, appearance and amenity of this part of the community. It would be an intrusion into the countryside and it would cause loss of an open space which is of importance to the character of the settlement. It would damage one of the gateways into the town. It would create a precedent for further development along the valley and result in the loss of a locally valued habitat which supports wildlife.

NPPF Para 14 - The Local Plan has assessed local needs and does not require any significant development in Wotton. The proposals will have an impact on landscape, traffic and local residents. Recent developments in Wotton have already satisfied Wotton's notional share of the District's windfall requirements.

NPPF Para 32 and 34 - It is not accepted that Court Orchard will provide a safe and suitable access to the site. It was designed as a cul-de-sac. It is a narrow estate road with poor access onto the main road. The increased traffic will present a danger to residents. In terms of access to employment, the need to travel will not be minimised and no satisfactory sustainable transport modes are available in Wotton.

NPPF Para 47 - The LPA believes it has sufficient land supply. This development is not needed.

NPPF Para 100 and 103 - Despite the assurances given, concerns remains that this development could increase flood risk due to increased run-off into the stream, putting downstream communities at risk. Inappropriate development such as this should be avoided.

*The majority of the public left the meeting and Council moved to the Committee Room  
The Council Chairman handed the meeting back to the Planning Committee Chair, Cllr T Luker*

**P.5607 CHAIRMAN'S REPORT** none

**P.5608 To approve MINUTES** of the August 2016 Planning Committee meeting; it was proposed by Cllr John Cordwell and seconded by Cllr P Smith to approve the Minutes as presented agreed all in favour.

**P.5609 PLANNING CORRESPONDENCE**

- a) Chipping Surgery Enforcement notice: to note enforcement notice- officer recommendation not to pursue. Within the permitted plans S.13/0954/FUL, drawing no 7761/1 (site layout), it detailed a hedge to be planted to the centre of the site, south of a car park space. No hedge was planted and is currently used as a parking space. "In this case the hedge was not planted as per permitted drawings. Though it does not match the plans submitted, it does not impact the development. The LPA cannot enforce its current use as a car parking space. The judgement here is whether or not the hedge, not being present, affects the scheme. Though the hedge is not present, it is the opinion of the officer that it complies with policy HC1 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015 in the sense that without the presence of the hedge, it does not impact the character or appearance of the scheme."

This Council is very upset & concerned to see that planning conditions of this controversial development have not been upheld and disagree with the decision of the SDC Planning officer to renege on enforcing this condition; requested by Cllr P Smith and seconded by Cllr P Barton that a letter is written to SDC Planning Authority, agreed by all, 1 abstention.

- b) Access at Coombe agricultural field – to note SDC planning enforcement response of 28 day permitted temporary usage. It appears unclear and ambiguous what exactly is meant by 28 days – request clarification from SDC.

**P.5610 POTTERS POND** - Public Footpath re-opening being pursued – 11th Sept scheduled reopening not happened – Glos Footpaths being chased for a reason. Glos County Council Legal Agreements Team are still awaiting specific drawings from the developer ahead of signing off the works as acceptable & compliant with their standards.

**P.5611 STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING DECISIONS.** Following were noted:

|   |
|---|
| <b>The Court, Culverhay, Consent</b> S.16/1487/LBC - Various external alterations including the installation of a new gate, the installation of new lighting and the extension of the rear terrace. 2 conditions  |
| <b>Wortley Dairy Farm, Wortley Road, Approval</b> S.16/1711/MINAM - Minor amendment to S.16/0788/HHOLD (use of render instead of stone).  |
| <b>2 Queens Way, Permission</b> S.16/1394/HHOLD - Demolition of garage and erection of single storey extension to the side. 2 conditions  |
| <b>3 Orchard Street, Consent</b> S.16/1393/LBC - Lower garden wall and lower area behind wall to level with current decked area.  |
| <b>23 Water Lane, Permission</b> S.16/1505/HHOLD - Replacement decking and safety rails. 2 conditions   |
| <b>Reform Lodge, Ozleworth, Consent</b> S.16/1564/LBC - Refurbishment works to include re-roofing, minor changes to chimney pots and rainwater goods, masonry repairs, rewiring and installation of heating, installation of multi-fuel stove and liner, installation of mechanical extract fans, draught-proofing of windows and enlargement of loft hatches. 3 conditions |
| <b>13 West View, Synwell Lane, Permission</b> S.16/1630/HHOLD - Proposed single storey side & rear extension. 2 conditions  |
| <b>11A Bradley Street, Permission</b> S.16/1636/HHOLD - Single storey side extension. 3 conditions  |
| <b>Manor Lodge, Manor Lane, Culverhay, Permission</b> S.16/1665/DISCON - Discharge of conditions 3 (materials), 4 (Parking), 6 (drainage), 8 (landscaping), 10 (Tree protection), 12 (CMS), 14 (slab levels) and 15 (Archaeology) of S.13/1269/FUL. <i>Only no. 8 is discharged.</i>  |
| <b>5 Court Orchard, Permission</b> S.16/1529/HHOLD - Move front wall to extend existing porch area and partial conversion of garage. 3 conditions   |
| <b>31 Pitman Place, Permission</b> S.16/1666/HHOLD - Two storey rear extension to a mid-terraced house. 4 conditions  |

#### NEW APPLICATIONS:

**P.5612 S.16/1877/FUL Silver Lining**, The Cloud, Wotton-Under-Edge, Resubmission of withdrawn application S.16/0413/FUL for demolition of existing dwelling and erection of new dwelling.

*It was proposed by Cllr John Cordwell and seconded by Cllr P Smith to enter public session to enable public to speak about application, agreed by all.*

Two residents spoke of their concerns regarding the height of the wall and the tunnel effect which

would be created by this, the destruction of views from this Cotswold Way National Trail, and the worries that their centuries old house would be damaged by piling machinery and vibrations on this steep and unstable site. The access was also very narrow and unsuitable for construction traffic and it would be dangerous for pedestrians whilst works are undertaken. Extra streetlighting is requested – although this path is owned by the Diocese and not covered by Glos County Council.

*It was proposed by Cllr John Cordwell and seconded by Cllr P Smith to re-enter council session agreed by all.*

It was proposed by Cllr R Claydon, seconded by Cllr June Cordwell, agreed by all, that we object to this planning application on the basis of;

1. Construction of a replacement dwelling would be very difficult without damaging such a delicate area. Piling works for foundations would undoubtedly have a detrimental effect on the foundations of nearby properties which have been in situ for a few hundred years. Furthermore, vehicle access is very difficult and narrow along this path, with no turning point, and it would be dangerous for walkers and general users to navigate safely, if extensive works were undertaken.
2. A more sympathetic replacement property design would be preferred in this location, which is along the Cotswold Way and in one of the most historic parts of the town & its Conservation Area, and adjacent to a number of listed buildings.
3. A 1.8 metre high wall is unsuitable in this location and unnecessary. It would create a tunnelling effect and destroy the rural character of this Cotswold Way historic path which currently enjoys lovely views.

**P.5613 S.16/1894/TCA 25 Gloucester Street**, GL12 7DN. Trees in a Conservation Area T1, T2 & T3 Conifers - Fell, cutting stumps as low as possible. By 11 September 2016. It was proposed by Cllr R Claydon, seconded by Cllr T Luker, agreed by all, with 2 abstentions, that we support this planning application.

**P.5614 S.16/1942/HHOLD 85 Pitman Place**, GL12 7SG. Single storey rear extension. It was proposed by Cllr R Claydon, seconded by Cllr T Luker, agreed by all, that we make the comment on this planning application that the relationship between the two properties and a proposed wall gap of approximately 6 inches is unclear - therefore it is not possible to make a specific recommendation.

**P.5615 S.16/1948/FUL Alderley Treatment Works**, Alderley, The erection of a new electrochlorination treatment kiosk, associated salt store and ancillary engineering works. It was proposed by Cllr R Claydon, seconded by Cllr N Pinnegar, agreed by all, that we make the comment on this planning application that the that the plans and elevations are not consistent with the photograph of the kiosk provided. Therefore it is unclear what is intended to be placed on this site, and impossible to make an informed judgement.

**P.5616 S.16/1808/FUL Coombe Hill House**, Coombe, Art studio conversion and change of use to granny annexe. It was proposed by Cllr R Claydon, seconded by Cllr P Smith agreed by all, that we make the comment on this planning application that no justification has been provided for conversion to granny annexe as required by the Stroud District Local Plan 2015. It is in a remote location and not attached to the main house, and the application is unclear whether grounds are separately allocated for this new dwelling. As per the Local Plan a legal agreement is requested that the annexe is in use only by the main dwelling, and that it shall not be separated into a new dwelling.

**P.5617 S.16/1838/FUL 18 Long Street**, Add 1 new CCTV security camera to frontage of RSPCA shop. It was proposed by Cllr L Farmer, seconded by Cllr A Proctor, agreed by all, that we

support this planning application.

**P.5618 S.16/2060/HHOLD 7 The Cedars**, Erection of balcony to first floor lounge (retrospective) (resubmission of S16/1278/HHLD). It was proposed by Cllr R Claydon, seconded by Cllr T Luker, agreed by all, that we support this planning application.

*This completed the business of the Planning Committee at 8.55pm*

Signed .....  
Chairman of the Planning Committee

Date .....