

**PAINSWICK PARISH COUNCIL**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD ON  
WEDNESDAY 16<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2019 AT 7.00 P.M. HELD IN PAINSWICK TOWN  
HALL**

**Present:** Cllr Rob Lewis Chairman  
Cllr Ann Daniels  
Cllr Mike Fletcher  
Cllr Rosie Nash  
Cllr Martin Slinger  
Cllr Abigail Smith  
Cllr Stephen Tye

**Also Present:** 1 Member of the Press  
8 Members of the Public

**Public Time:**

1. Mr P Cotsworth raised two concerns:

- 1) Claypipes – further development by Stamages Lane could cause issues with the existing sewage system.
- 2) Children playing by Stamages Lane – further street lighting should be considered in this area.

2. Question was raised by a Member of the Public – Would the Footpath be retained on the new application for Stamages Lane S.19/0050/OUT?

The Parish Council have not yet looked at the application – it will be included on the next Planning Committee Agenda.

3. C Sheeran raised concerns about access to the proposed development at Stamages Lane S.19/0050/OUT.

4. Mr D Allott stated that he has read the Councils' draft asked the Council to modify their response considering his points below:

1. To challenge the assertion that Painswick "has a strong local retail role for day-to-day needs". It patently has NOT
2. To query the vague inclusion of blue bordered "alternative sites" on Map on Page 94. Particularly PAI 007 and 008. What about 012? (and also 009,010,011)
3. To promote the classification of "unsuitable for development" of PAI 007,008 and 012. See SALA recommendations for most PAI sites. Those three were

rejected mostly on landscape criteria. Probably they also have geological 'problems' as did Richmond.

3a To propose them as Heritage areas.

4. To stress Painswick's needs for more "workers", low-cost houses; but not more millionaires' houses.

The Chairman thanked Mr Allott.

## **1. TO NOTE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were accepted from Cllrs James Cross, Edd Crownshaw, Dawn Dart, Ian James and Roey Parker.

## **2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

There were none.

## **3. TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 12<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2018.**

The minutes were approved and signed as a true record.

## **4. MATTERS ARISING NOT ON THIS AGENDA**

There were none.

## **5. TO CONSIDER AND APPROVE THE RESPONSE TO THE STROUD DISTRICT COUNCILS' LOCAL PLAN REVIEW (EMERGING STRATEGY).**

The Committee considered the draft in full and agreed a few minor alterations.

The Committee unanimously approved the response. See Appendix One.

## **6. MATTERS REQUIRING A DECISION:**

- a. S.18/2594/FUL LANESIDE, Queens Mead  
Replacement dwelling and new garage.

*The Committee agreed to neither object or support this application but submit the following comments: -*

*The Committee have concerns, bearing in mind the size of the proposed house, has enough space been allocated for parking and turning space?*

- b.** S.18/2669/LBC FLAT 18, Gyde House, Gyde Road  
The proposal is to add a mullioned window to the west wall of the 1990's drawing room extension.

*The Committee agreed to support this application.*

- c.** S.18/2716/TCA ST JOHNS CHURCH, Sheepscombe  
Lawson Cypress in the churchyard extension - Fell to near ground level.

*The Committee agreed to support this application.*

**7. Date of next Routine Meeting** – Wednesday the 6<sup>th</sup> February 2019, in Painswick Town Hall.

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS THE MEETING CLOSED AT 8.25 pm.**

## Appendix One

### RESPONSE TO THE LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – EMERGING STRATEGY

The Parish of Painswick is in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and affords further consideration due to the Conservation Areas, the many Listed Buildings and Sites of Special Scientific Interests (SSSI).

Painswick Parish Council adopted their reviewed Parish Plan in February 2017 – Please see Appendix One.

#### **Settlement Boundary (Page 42 of the Emerging Strategy Document ‘settlement development limits’):**

Painswick Parish Council supports **Option One**. There should be no development outside the Settlement Boundaries except for a limited range of types defined as acceptable within the countryside. The exception being where sites have already been identified, which are dealt with in further detail below.

In regards, to the specific question on whether the Parish Council would support a small number of houses for Sheepscombe outside the Settlement Boundary – the answer is **NO**. Sheepscombe has very restricted road access, is generally poorly-connected and is therefore highly car-reliant to access services and facilities elsewhere. Additionally, Sheepscombe is situated within the AONB so any additional development outside of the settlement boundary would be detrimental to the local environment and landscape. Painswick Parish Council has not identified any requirement for further expansion of the village to enable Sheepscombe to remain a sustainable and thriving community.

#### **Possible sites for development (page 94 of the Emerging Strategy Document):**

Painswick Parish Council understands that some development would be beneficial to the local community, but this needs to be balanced against causing long term harm to the important architectural character of the area. However, any potential development should be directed to meet local needs; which we believe is smaller properties to allow for starter homes and downsizing.

It is important to state that the Parish Council is mindful of the findings of the SALA Heritage Impact Appraisal 2017. Accordingly, any application for new development will need to demonstrate there has been a robust assessment of the heritage impact and where appropriate present solutions to these impacts by virtue of good design, in order to protect and ideally enhance those assets.

#### **a. PS41 (PAI004) - Proposal Location for 20 dwellings at Lower Washwell.**

The Parish Council has no objection in principle to the identification of this site as a potential site for development, however with strong stipulations:

- That concerns raised by residents are first addressed. The Council is especially mindful of the issue of access to this site; therefore, before this site is included – the access arrangements MUST first be agreed.
- Should a planning application for development be approved it should be conditioned that the infrastructure (Roads, Services and Drainage) is put in place as a condition, prior to the development of any housing units.
- Any application before being granted permission should demonstrate that the site is viable; to ensure that at least 30% of any dwellings will be 'affordable'.
- Any design MUST be sensitive to the local vernacular.
- There MUST be no more than 20 dwellings for the whole site; as the design MUST include open spaces indicative of the location and / to minimise the impact to the views from across the valley. (Note the SALA report states potential development for 15 houses – not 20).
- Any design/application needs to ensure no harm is caused to any Trees with TPO's.

**b. PAI005** – this site is too remote and therefore unsustainable. The Council objects to this site being considered for development.

**c. PAI001** – The Council acknowledges the significant heritage constraints highlighted in the SALA Assessment that would likely preclude development. However, the Council has no objection in principle to this site being developed with the right type of development that represents a careful exercise in the local vernacular. The Council may support the inclusion in the plan for a ribbon (between the existing built forms of Gyde Road) of small town houses (2 bedroom dwellings, of which there is a shortage) in this location, provided that a well thought out proposal with a socially desirable purpose could be achieved. This could assist as starter homes for the younger generation and an opportunity for the older generation to downsize. At least 30% of the homes MUST be 'affordable'; so, any developer would need to demonstrate the site is viable before permission could be granted.

**d. PAI002** – the Council objects to this site being considered as it is too close to Gyde House and the heritage impacts appear insurmountable. Consequently, any development will be detrimental to the important heritage of this Listed Building

**e. PAI007 & PAI008** – The Council has no objection in Principle to one of these sites being developed, as an alternative site to PS41, with the following caveats: -

- That the number of dwellings is limited to small group, preserving the open space as recommended by the SALA findings.
- Any infrastructure required to access the site MUST be first agreed. Should a planning application for development be approved, the infrastructure (Roads, Services and Drainage) should be put in place as a condition, prior to the development of any housing units.
- Any application before being granted permission should demonstrate that the site is viable; to ensure that at least 30% of any dwellings will be 'affordable'.

- Any design MUST be sensitive to the local vernacular and seek to minimise the impact on the setting and significance of the Painswick Conservation Area and landmarked listed buildings.
- The design MUST include open spaces indicative of the location and / to minimise the impact to the views from across the valley.
- The Council understands there are Geotechnical concerns with these sites.
- Any design/application needs to ensure no harm is caused to any Trees with TPO's.

### **Tier Two:**

Painswick Parish Council will support the change to Tier Two under the new definition of the Tiers; for the purposes of protecting its' retail centre. This is on the understanding that Tier Two no longer means a suitable location for increased development (as defined under the current adopted Plan).

### **Retail Centre:**

Painswick Parish Council considers the current Town Centre defined in the Local Plan Map as flawed. The Council wish to provide protection for the current retail facilities and therefore would like to propose amendments to the town centre boundary; more in keeping with the actual shop frontages in the Town (See Appendix Two) and the area considered to comprise the Town Centre to locals. The Council notes the comments made on Page 13 "There may be opportunities to grow the tourism market at the District's town centres particularly where there are existing links to the Cotswold AONB and Cotswold Way". The amendment to the Town Centre Boundary is an important part of the above goal and to protect the settlements 'strong retail role' as identified in the consultation document.

Painswick Parish Council thanks you for the opportunity to shape our community and wishes you well with the implementation of this review. Please feel free to contact us, should you require any further details.