

PAINSWICK PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 6TH FEBRUARY 2019 AT 7.00 P.M. HELD IN PAINSWICK TOWN
HALL**

Present: Cllr Rob Lewis Chairman
Cllr James Cross
Cllr Ann Daniels
Cllr Dawn Dart
Cllr Mike Fletcher
Cllr Rosie Nash
Cllr Roey Parker
Cllr Martin Slinger
Cllr Abigail Smith
Cllr Stephen Tye

Also Present: District Cllr Keith Pearson
1 Member of the Press
19 Members of the Public

Public Time:

- Residents from Washwell Fields, would like to meet with representatives from the Council, to discuss the Councils' response to the Local Plan Review.

The Chairman agreed to this request.

- Mr Allott presented numerous concerns on behalf of the New Field Drive Action Group.

The Chairman thanked Mr Allott and said that their concerns would be taken into consideration, when the Committee discussed the application (Agenda Item 5a).

- Mrs Luke, on behalf of the Painswick Valleys Conservation Society, requested that the Council support their request to Stroud District Council to extend the Conservation Area.

The Chairman said that the Committee would add this to a future agenda.

1. TO NOTE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were accepted from Cllrs Edd Crownshaw and Ian James.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

There were none.

3. TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 16TH JANUARY 2019.

The minutes were approved and signed as a true record.

4. MATTERS ARISING NOT ON THIS AGENDA

There were none.

5. MATTERS REQUIRING A DECISION:

- a. S.19/0050/OUT LAND ADJOINING HOWBEG, Stamages Lane.
Outline for erection of 8 dwellings.

The Members had a lengthy discussion with regards to this application. The Chairman also invited comment from District Cllr Keith Pearson.

The Committee agreed to strongly object to this application and request that it is called into the Development Control Committee, if the Officer is minded to support it.

The Committee agreed that the Deputy Clerk draft the response and check it with the Chairman, before sending onto the Planning Department. **CLERK**

Please see Appendix One for the response.

- b. S.19/0060/FUL LAND AT GREENBANK, Sheepscombe.
Erection of single storey dwelling.

The Committee agreed to support this application; but would like to record its concerns over the access.

- c. S.19/0011/LBC KINGS MILL HOUSE, Kings Mill Lane.
Replacement of an existing ground floor level wooden doorframe and leaf with a wooden frame with vertically boarded outer leaf & a pair of inner glazed leaves.

The Committee agreed to support this application.

- d. S.18/2711/HHOLD LANTERN, Kingsmead
Extensions and alterations: new porch, garden room, and extension to kitchen/dining room. New verandah and conservatory: replacement windows, window cills and rain water goods, and re-rendering.

The Committee agreed to request an extension, as there are no plans online to view.

- e. S.18/2771/LBC COURT HOUSE, Hale Lane
Retrospective application for the formation of a doorway in an internal wall and erection of a small section of external wall to form a bathroom.

The Committee agreed to 'No Comment' to this application.

- f. S.18/2773/LBC COURT HOUSE, Hale Lane
Restoration of King Charles bedroom.

The Committee agreed to 'No Comment' to this application.

- g. S.19/0135/HHOLD HORSESHOE COTTAGE, Tibbiwell Lane
Replacement conservatory, two storey rear extension and alterations.

The Committee agreed to support this application.

- h. S.19/0166/HHOLD LOWER GREENHOUSE, Greenhouse Lane
Demolition of garage, erection of extension, addition of dormer windows, alterations to fenestration, new boundary wall and revised landscaping.

The Committee agreed to support this application.

- i. S.19/0167/CPE PRICE DOWNWOOD MILL, The Camp
Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the use of a building as a residential dwelling house. Resubmission of the application S.17/2859/CPE.

The Committee agreed to 'No Comment' to this application.

- j. S.19/0064/TPO 6 COURT ORCHARD
1) 3 largest lime trees - Reduce crown spread towards your house to leave it no longer than 3.5m out from the main stem and shape a little into the sides and top to improve the look of the tree. Crown raise all round to approximately 7m. Remove epicormic growths on the trunks up to the first branches. 2) Small lime tree at the left hand end - Reduce crown spread towards your house to leave it no longer than 4.0m. Shape a little into the sides and top to improve the look of the tree. Crown raise all round to approximately 7.0m. Remove epicormic growths on the trunk up to the first branch.

The Committee agreed to support this application.

- k. S.19/0065/TPO TARN HOUSE, Court Orchard
1) Lime tree to the left of side boundary - Completely remove the lowest 2 limbs / branches over the corner of the garden. 2) 2 smaller Limes adjacent to property: Reduce their crown spread towards house to leave it no longer than 2.0m. Shape a little into the sides and top to improve the look of the tree. Crown raise all round to approximately 7.0m. Remove epicormic growths on the trunks up to the first branch.

The Committee agreed to support this application.

- l. S.19/0070/TCA SALUTATION, Far End, Sheepscombe
Tree 1: Goat Willow - fell (excessive shading in garden) Tree 2: White Willow - fell (dangerously leaning tree).

The Committee agreed to support this application.

- 6. Date of next Routine Meeting** – Wednesday the 20th February 2019, in Painswick Town Hall.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 8.00 pm.

Appendix One

S.19/0050/OUT LAND ADJOINING HOWBEG, Stamages Lane

Painswick Parish Council strongly objects to this application. The application is for Outline Permission for 8 dwellings, 6 large Market and 2 Affordable, on a site that would be classified as an 'In Fill'. Painswick in is the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, has a significant number of Listed Buildings and a Conservation Area. Please note that the proposed site can also be identified on the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SALA) report as PAI 012.

The reasons for Objecting are as follows:

a. Adverse effect on the Important Historic Settings. The SALA, Heritage Impact Appraisal (October 2018) for this site (Appendix One) – clearly summarises that there is no scope to develop this site without causing significant harm to the Historic Settings within the village of Painswick. It is noted that in the Applicants' Heritage Statement they state; *"In addition the proposal will provide much needed affordable housing to comply with adopted policies"*. Please see point 'b' below; the provision of just 2 Affordable Houses doesn't provide significant benefits that outweigh the harm. **Delivery Policy ES10** *"Any harm or loss would require **clear and convincing justification** to the relevant decision-maker as to why the heritage interest should be overridden"*. **Delivery Policy ES13** *"There should be no harm to spaces which: provide the setting for important buildings or scheduled ancient monuments"*

b. Affordable Housing. Although, the Applicant uses the supply of Affordable Housing as a justification to adversely affect the important Heritage Sites; the applicant chooses to commute down to just 2 Affordable Houses rather than commute up to 3. Note, the Affordable Housing are for the two '3 bed houses' and all the others are for large '5 bed houses'. **Core Policy CP9** *"the provision should be well integrated with the wider site and **indistinguishable** by either design or location from the market housing"*.

c. Housing Needs within the Painswick and the wider District. Please refer to the Stroud District Council Strategic Housing Market Assessment, in which identifies 85% of the houses needed in the District is for 2 & 3 bed roomed dwellings. This application is for six '5 bed houses' and only two '3 bed houses'. These proposals therefore don't reflect the Housing Needs for Painswick or the wider district. **Delivery Policy HC1** *"where appropriate schemes should include a variety of dwelling types and sizes, which meet identified local needs"*.

d. Protecting Open Space. The proposal for this development would result in the infilling of a green space that forms part of the beauty of this part of the AONB and intensification of the built form would be apparent locally and in long range views resulting in the erosion of a character that makes Painswick a unique place to live and visit. **Delivery Policy ES13** *"There should be no harm to spaces which contribute to the distinctive form, character and setting of a settlement"*.

This is clearly set out in the SALA report for this site (PAI 012) - *“The site is not suitable for development because of the likely impacts on heritage assets where the area provides a contrast to the generally dense built form. Housing could block open views which would be significantly detrimental to the character of the approach to the core of the settlement and conservation area. There are therefore potential impacts preventing further sustainable development in this location.*

e. Public Rights of Way. Footpath Number MPA 62/1 runs through the middle of this field. Painswick receives thousands of tourists each year; who wish to walk on the many Rights of Way, in this area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; development on this field will be detrimental to the views in and out from the footpath.

f. Access from Howbeg. Whilst, it is noted that GCC Highways have raised no objections to the access from Stamages Lane, it appears that no consideration has been given to the adverse access from the Howbeg property. Painswick Parish Council requests that due consideration is given to the detrimental impact the proposed access arrangements will have on the visibility from their access. **Core Policy CP14** “No unacceptable adverse affect on the amenities of neighbouring occupants”.

Painswick Parish Council concludes that this application is contrary to various policies with the current Local Plan, including **CP1, CP2, CP9, CP14, ES7, ES10, ES13** and **para 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

As there is a considerable amount of public interest in this application and the numerous concerns raised in this response; then Painswick Parish Council would like this to be brought before the Development Control Committee, if the Officer is minded to support this application.