

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

3

16 October 2018

6.00 pm – 7.05 pm
 Council Chamber, Ebley Mill, Stroud

Minutes

Membership

Councillor Tom Williams (Chair)	P	Councillor Haydn Jones	P
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	Biodiversity Officer
Development Manager	Senior Planning Officer
Team Manager	Democratic Services Officer
Solicitor and Deputy Monitoring Officer	

Other Members in Attendance

Councillors Ross and Brine for Item 4.1 – Site of the former Ship Inn, Bristol Road, Stonehouse (S.18/0492/FUL).

The Chair welcomed Councillor Tomblin to her first meeting of Committee.

DC.027 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies.

DC.028 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Miles and Clifton noted that in respect to Item 4.1 on the agenda – Site of the former Ship Inn, Bristol Road, Stonehouse (S.18/0492/FUL) they both sit on Housing Committee, but did not have a Personal Interest as defined within the Code of Conduct.

DC.029 MINUTES – 4 SEPTEMBER 2018

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2018 are accepted as a correct record.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLANNING SCHEDULE

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

1	S.18/0492/FUL	2	S.18/1624/NEWTPO	3	Enforcement Report
---	---------------	---	------------------	---	--------------------

Late pages relating to all items on the schedule which had been circulated to committee prior to the meeting.

DC.030 **SITE OF THE FORMER SHIP INN, BRISTOL ROAD, STONEHOUSE (S.18/0492/FUL)**

The Chair asked Committee to defer this item due to the volume of late pages circulated to Members prior to the start of the meeting.

Councillor Marjoram proposed a motion to defer this item, explaining that transparency should be a priority when dealing with council sites. This was seconded by Councillor Baxendale.

Following discussion relating to an adjournment of the meeting for Members to read the papers the motion was put to the vote and was carried.

RESOLVED To defer application S.18/0492/FUL to a future meeting.

DC.031 **LAUREL COTTAGE, BRIMSCOMBE HILL, BRIMSCOMBE, STROUD (S.18/1624/NEWTPO)**

The Biodiversity Officer presented this item explaining the reasons that Members had been asked to confirm a Tree Preservation Order. It was considered that the tree could be managed as there was no evidence that the tree was damaging the retaining wall or there was any loss of light to properties or cabling being entwined in the tree. The tree was healthy and vibrant Yew Trees can live for many years.

Public speaking took place and it was explained to Committee that if the wall is damaged due to the tree, the landowner could get insurance for the wall and the tree which would cover the costs.

Discussion took place in relation to management of the tree, future applications and that confirming the TPO would not necessarily affect any such applications.

Councillor Marjoram proposed a motion to confirm the order, this was seconded by Councillor Binns and on being put to the vote was carried.

RESOLVED To CONFIRM a Tree Preservation Order for S.18/1624/NEWTPO.

DC.032 **CHERRY TREE HOUSE, CRANHAM**

The Team Manager introduced this item explaining that the building, as built, is overbearing and causes harm to neighbours, is not built to plan and is contrary to the Stroud District Local Plan CP14(7) and ES3(1), Section 172 and 173 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Officers were asking Members to consider taking enforcement action for the total demolition of the building as it was expedient to do so.

Public speaking took place in opposition to enforcement action being taken. It was explained to Members the height difference was minimal 760mm and that the extra height would not be overbearing on neighbouring properties and amenities. Complaints to applicants were more about traffic on neighbouring land.

Members asked questions relating to appeals, as there was an ongoing appeal against the decision to refuse planning permission for the dwelling as built and whether two appeals could be joined together if enforcement action was approved. Previous applications to vary conditions had been refused. If the appeal is upheld by the Inspectorate then enforcement action would not need to be taken.

Councillor Jones proposed a motion to defer the decision on taking enforcement action until the appeal currently with the inspectorate has been heard. This was seconded by Councillor Reeves.

Members debated the motion. On being put to the vote there were 5 votes in favour of deferment and 7 votes against.

Councillor Marjoram proposed a motion that enforcement action be taken for the reasons outlined in the report and quoting Local Plan Policies CP14(7), ES3(1) and NPPF paragraph 58. This was seconded by Councillor Clifton.

Members debated the motion and the Planning Manager explained to Committee that the applicant would have 28 days to lodge an appeal. The appeals would be joined and be decided together.

The motion to take enforcement action was put to the vote, there were 7 votes in favour of enforcement action, 3 against and 2 abstentions.

RESOLVED To give delegated authority to officers to serve an enforcement notice for the total demolition of the unauthorised building as set out above.

The meeting closed at 7.05 pm.

Chair