



STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices • Ebley Mill • Ebley Wharf • Stroud • GL5 4UB
 Telephone 01453 766321
 www.stroud.gov.uk Email: democratic.services@stroud.gov.uk

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

26 July 2022

6.00 - 7.19 pm

Council Chamber

Minutes

Membership

Councillor Martin Baxendale (Chair)

Councillor Martin Brown

Councillor Haydn Jones

Councillor Jenny Miles

Councillor Chris Brine

Councillor Jason Bullingham

*= Absent

Councillor Helen Fenton (Vice-Chair) *

Councillor Lucas Schoemaker

Councillor Ashley Smith

Councillor Victoria Gray *

* Councillor Loraine Patrick *

* Councillor Mark Ryder *

Officers in Attendance

Head of Development Management
 Principal Planning Lawyer, One Legal
 Development Team Manager

Specialist Conservation Officer
 Planning Officer
 Democratic Services & Elections Officer

Other Member(s) in Attendance

Councillor Tricia Watson

DCC.068 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chris Brine, Jason Bullingham, Victoria Gray, Helen Fenton, Loraine Patrick and Mark Ryder.

DCC.069 Declarations of Interest

There were none.

DCC.070 Minutes

The minutes were not able to be printed due to technical issues, they would be discussed at the next meeting.

DCC.071 Planning Schedule and Procedure for Public Speaking

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

1	S.22/0363/HHOLD	2	S.22/0364/LBC
---	-----------------	---	---------------

DCC.072 Parkfield, Highfield Way, France Lynch, Stroud S.22/0363/HHOLD

The Planning Officer and the Specialist Conservation Officer introduced both of the reports together and explained that they would take all questions on either application at the end of the introduction.

The Specialist Conservation Officer gave a brief description of the site which included:

- The dwelling was a standalone weavers cottage dating from the 18th century which sat in a large open parcel of land that was largely unaltered since the 19th century.
- The site sat within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).
- The current dwelling was situated within the settlement boundary of France Lynch but much of the land within the application site did not.
- The dwelling had previously been reordered into a domestic building with the exception of the donkey stable on the side of the property.
- The lean-to was erected in circa 1922 although it showed signs of being reordered since then.

The Planning Officer summarised the proposal which was for:

- The removal of the historic lean-to to be replaced with a single storey link building leading to a double storey extension.
- New access adjacent to the existing access.
- Removal of existing garage.

The Planning Officer summarised the reasons for refusal which included:

- The principal Local Plan policies HC8 and ES10.
- Section 66(1) of the Planning (listed buildings and conservation areas) Act.
- Due to the scale, massing and design of the proposal, it was felt that it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting.
- Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) deemed the proposal to be less than substantial harm (higher end).

Councillor Watson spoke as a Ward Member for the area. She asked the committee to support the application for the following reasons:

- The applicant received no prior notification that the building could become listed when they purchased the property. This only came to light during pre-planning discussions with Stroud District Council (SDC).
- After the grade II classification had been awarded, it made it difficult for Officers to approve changes that would normally not have been an issue.
- The current proposal responded to as many heritage points as possible such as maintaining specific features and utilising certain materials.
- The applicant purchased the property with a promise to keep it as a family home, in order for it to be usable as such, there was a lot of work to be done. Extending the property would be a better option than letting it fall into disrepair or the surrounding land being further developed.
- The current proposal maximised the views of the valley without any adverse implications.
- The building had a sharp drop to one side which would have been a more preferable location for the extension but due to the uneven ground it wouldn't have been possible.
- The unaltered building would not be viable to live in as a family home.

- Detailed visual recording could preserve the building in its current state and remain as a permanent record to be accessed by all, which would not be possible for a house that was occupied.
- The referenced historical features showed the evolution of the property and this would be the next chapter.
- The proposal would only replace the most recent extension.

Mr Firkins, a planning consultant, spoke in favour of the application. He asked the committee to support the application for the following reasons:

- The applicants were local and had known the property for their whole lives.
- They wanted to extend the original part of the property.
- In order for the dwelling to survive it needed to be suitable for modern living, it was currently in a state of disrepair.
- The extension needed to offset the costs for the applicant.
- The current proposal was delicate and light with the single storey link to the double storey extension.
- The lean to was not historic and had been rebuilt more recently.
- The proportions of the original cottage did not allow for modern living.
- The extension was subservient.
- The dwelling was sited within extensive ground therefore would not look overdeveloped.
- The applicants had already amended the original plans to be more in line with the classification such as leaving the smaller rooms to retain the character of the property.
- If the proposal was harmful then there would have been many objections however, the locals, the Parish Council and the Ward Councillor were in support.

The Specialist Conservation Officer gave the following responses to Councillors questions:

- SDC did not request the listing for the building, it was unknown who had requested that Historic England begin a review of the property.
- Due to the unacceptable nature of the proposal no further design information was sought. If the proposal had been acceptable, suggestions would have been made such as specific materials or requesting chimneys.

The Head of Development Management confirmed that due to the shallow pitch of the roof, only certain materials would be viable to be used for its construction.

Councillor Brown questioned which parts of the proposal were acceptable and which were not. The Specialist Conservation Officer confirmed that after discussions, the applicant had agreed to retain the ground floor partitioning, the main concern was with the work proposed for the donkey stable and the proposed alterations to its fenestration.

In response to Councillor Jones, the Planning Officer confirmed that there were concerns that the proposed extension would become the dominant part of the property footprint.

In response to a question as to whether the settlement boundary had been changed in the draft Local Plan, the Development Team Manager confirmed that the new Local Plan was still in the examination phase and therefore carried no weight. The committee were also advised that there were currently no proposals to extend the settlement boundary.

Councillor Jones questioned the less than substantial harm rating as part of paragraph 202 of the NPPF and enquired as to whether there was any grading of less than substantial harm being introduced. The Specialist Conservation Officer explained that the degrees of harm were emerging and that it was seen to be just under substantial harm and consequently at the high end of less than substantial harm. Therefore, any public benefits required to outweigh the harm would need to be proportionally greater.

In response to Councillor Brown, the Head of Development Management explained that any future considerations as to what may happen to the plot if the application was not permitted should not carry any weight.

The Planning Officer confirmed, in response to the Chair, that the extension would be subservient in terms of height to the existing building, however, it would be dominant in scale due to it being significantly longer.

The Specialist Conservation Officer confirmed that concerns had been raised by Historic England. She further informed the committee that should the proposal be approved it would lead to a great loss of the special interest of the building which could in turn lead to the buildings de-classification.

Councillor Schoemaker questioned the footprint of the existing dwelling and stated that a flat is approximately 50m² and suitable as a family home. The planning Officer confirmed the approximate footprint of the building including the upstairs was 90m².

Councillor Brown proposed and Councillor Schoemaker seconded the recommendation.

Councillor Brown stated that the property seemed unique in its area and that the historic value and character should be protected.

Councillor Schoemaker raised concerns over the size of the proposed dwelling and the cost to the environment for heating and materials.

Councillor Smith debated ways in which to make the proposal viable for both the applicant and the historic character of the property.

Councillor Jones raised concerns with the proposed garage causing harm and he couldn't see a public benefit for the proposal.

It was confirmed that although the application site was sited within the AONB there were no concerns in respect of the impact of the proposal on the AONB.

The Principal Planning Lawyer summarised the refusal reasons as being contrary to Policies HC8 and ES10 of the Local Plan and paragraph 202 of the NPPF due to the public benefits of the proposal failing to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to the grade II listed building if it were permitted.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED To refuse permission.

DCC.073 Parkfield, Highfield Way, France Lynch, Stroud S.22/0364/LBC

The item was introduced and received questions with the above item.

Councillor Brown proposed and Councillor Schoemaker seconded.

The Head of Development Management summed up the refusal reasons as shown on page 31 of the reports pack.

After being put to a vote, the Motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED To refuse permission.

The meeting closed at 7:19pm

Chair