

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BISLEY-WITH-LYPIATT PARISH COUNCIL HELD
ON TUESDAY 10 JANUARY 2018 AT BISLEY WI VILLAGE HALL**

Present

Hazel Saunders	}	
Lesley Greene	}	Bisley Ward
Michael Garratt	}	
Jacqui Ayers	}	
Mike Eccott	}	Eastcombe Ward
Mr R Brooks	}	
Roger Budgeon	}	Oakridge Ward
Dennis Robbins	}	
Mr P M Morris		Clerk

In attendance - Keith Rippington County Councillor

In the absence of Mike Bell, Bob Brooks chaired the meeting.

18. 01 1. **Apologies for Absence**
Apologies for absence were received from Mike Bell and Tim Williams.
18. 01 2. **Declaration of Interests**
There were no declarations of interest.
18. 01 3. **Community Led Housing Presentation**
Lois Taylor, Community Led Housing Enabler gave an interesting presentation explaining the various types of Community led Housing options and what support is available.
The Chairman thanked Lois for her thorough presentation and for taking questions from Councillors.
18. 01 4. **Public Participation**
Ten members of the public were in attendance.

Keith Watson enquired if the County Council could re-instate the bus service between Bisley and Cirencester and if SDC Planning would review the proliferation of lights on buildings.

He also identified a spelling error in the December 2017 minutes at item 9 b paragraph 6.

Ashley Dickenson thanked everyone for their support regarding his planning application S.17/2710/FUL

18. 01 5. **Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 6 December 2017**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 6 December 2017 having been circulated to all councillors were approved unanimously.

18. 01 6. **Matters arising from the Minutes of Previous Meetings**

There were no matters arising from the previous Minutes.

18. 01 7. **Agree Parish Council response to the following Planning Applications**

a) S.17/2648/FUL

Property Address: Highdown Farm, Catswood Lane, Stroud

Description: New field access, gate and track

Decision: 2 **Object**

Reasons / Comments: A tarmac apron access to a small field adjacent to a public footpath and Cotswold stone stile in this application is inappropriate in Catswood Lane, (and indeed other Parish lanes). All other field gate entrances in Catswood Lane maintain the verge, or the verge has a simple covering of rough stone or similar (even for access for very large combine harvesters for very large fields). Given the likely infrequent use by agricultural machinery through this proposed field gate to a small area of "small – holding" grassland, tarmac is overly intrusive for this narrow lane and we therefore object.

In this area only accesses to residences are characterised by tarmac entrances.

b) S.17/2710/FUL

Property Address: The Dutch Barn, Calfway, Bisley

Description: Agricultural barn into farmer's dwelling

Decision: 3 **Support**

Reasons / Comments: The Parish formally asks that this application please be referred to the SDC Planning Committee/DCC for their decision'.

We strongly support this application because the development of this barn will assist the continued management of the surrounding land, and develop further the sustainability and economic activity by the occupants working the land and selling the produce through their Farm Shop nearby. It will considerably add to the security of the farming enterprise.

We would like to see an agricultural condition attached to the permission to ensure the dwelling occupancy remains tied to the land use. This also helps secure the continued use of the surrounding land for agricultural and horticultural use.

The Proposal complies with Policy CP1 -1.

It complies with HC1, the design is consistent with the rural setting, it is on the edge of the settlement and on the land that is managed by the occupants, it will not change the natural wildlife and habitat space

around it, in fact it will add support to the natural and economic area around it.

The proposal is supported by Policy EI5, because it will enable the continued sustainable agricultural food growing and marketing through the existing farm shop. It will reduce traffic movements because it will enable dwelling occupancy on the land being worked.

The Proposal complies with all of CP14, CP15, ES7 & ES8- the proposal will enable the continued the management of the surrounding land to retain the Cotswold AONB character.

This development proposal will not detract from the local biodiversity or add to the environmental load, it will, as NPPF Para 11 states (updated 29 December 2016) "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible contributing to the government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity...opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged."

c) S.17/2746/HHOLD

Property Address: Well Close, Oakridge

Description: Extensions and alterations to existing single storey outbuilding to create first floor extension.

Decision: 2 **Object**

d) S.17/2380/TCA

Property Address: Overcourt, School Road, Bisley.

Description: 6 trees felled or pruned

Decision: 3 **Support**

e) S.17/2768/DISCON

Property Address: Land at Dane Lane, Daneway

Description: Discharge of conditions

Decision: 1 **No observations**

f) S.17/2862/FUL & S.17/1716/FUL

Property Address: Little Sherwood, Tunley

Description: Proposed erection of a replacement dwelling

Decision: 2 **Object**

Reasons / Comments: We strongly object to this application for the following reasons:- 1. This massive increase in size over what is presently there, about 120m², what has previously been passed, about 200m², and this massive almost 550m² does not comply with the replacement house policy. It is more than three times the size of what is there and much larger than what has previously received consent, plus when the usual domestic paraphernalia is added it will result in a great intrusion into a rural setting. The consented proposal has 3 bedrooms this one has 5 bedrooms with other sundry rooms including en-suite rooms and dressing rooms. This fails to comply with Policy HC5 and CP15. There is no evidence of any renewable energy generation to comply with ES2 or enhancement of biodiversity comply

with Policy ES6. The proposal conflicts with Policy ES10, valuing our historic assets.

2. The domestic curtilage of this proposal extends into the adjoining agricultural field, a lot of this change of use has taken place already with earth works, tree planting and domestic paraphernalia evidenced. This requires Change of Use and we do not support domestic paraphernalia extending into open countryside. The proposed building will cover a large proportion of the site domestic land area compared to the original building leaving little room for the usual rural accompanying buildings and garden facilities, conflicting with ES6, ES7 and ES8.

3. This domestic development into the agricultural field causes considerable harm to the setting of the Listed Building, The Thatched House, and impinges on the setting of this house. Significantly planting the row of trees surrounding the Listed Building to the south obscures the vista and causes considerable harm to the setting. This fails to comply with Policies ES7, ES8, and ES10.

4. The proposal puts at risk the privacy of adjacent properties because it easily allows the occupiers to overlook these properties, this proposed development sprawls from one side of the site to the other - it appears even crossing the site ownership boundaries in places. Fails to comply with HC1.

5. The decision notice on previous application S.16/2483/FUL on 21st December 2016, states "excessive expansion of the application site away from the original building at Little Sherwood, contrary to point (ii) of Local Plan Policy CP15" as one of the main reasons for refusal. This application ignores this reason.

6. The previous decision notice also states - By virtue of the scale, siting and form, the proposed replacement dwelling would disrupt the visual hierarchy within the secluded setting and adversely compete with Thatched House, thus failing to respect the setting of the listed building and failing to contribute to the existing sense of place, conflicting with Local Plan policy ES10 and point 5 of policy CP14. The proposal is also considered to be contrary to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, paragraphs 132 to 135 of Chapter 12 of the NPPF. This has taken place already without the benefit of Planning Consent and enforcement processes should be implemented.

7. The building mass will obstruct the wildlife corridors existing through the site.

8. In the interests of future clarity this application should be refused, previous history indicates that any conditions will not be complied with.

We request that the application is not determined by officers under delegated powers, but is referred to the Development Control Committee pursuant to Appendix A of the Officer Scheme of Delegations. This is for the following reasons:

- a) The application has generated very significant public interest. Like the previous application on this site, S.17/1716/FUL, we understand that many of those living in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development object to the application and will be formally objecting to the application. We, as representatives of residents of the wider area, also object most strongly. This is exactly the type of application that the Development Control Committee exists to determine.

- b) All of the objections raised both by us and other parties are clearly based upon sound material planning considerations.
- c) We understand that application S.17/1716/FUL, which was previously decided under delegated powers, is currently subject to judicial review. In our view, therefore, the interests of propriety and good governance demand that this application should be decided by elected Councillors in a public forum, and not by officers.
- d) The strength of feeling against this application in the local area means that a decision on the application should be made by our elected representatives and not by unelected officers. A decision by the Development Control Committee will be made transparently, in public, and not behind closed doors.
- e) The application does not concern a matter of technical appraisal, fact or legal opinion, nor is it an application with a fixed determination period. The exclusion in paragraph 4 of Section II of Appendix A does not, therefore apply.

Frankly, in our view if this application is not considered to be suitable for referral to the Development Control Committee then we find it difficult to imagine what would be.

If you wish to discuss anything further please contact us.

g) S.17/2841/TCA

Property Address: The Old Vicarage, George Street, Bisley

Description: fell ash tree & shrubs instead

Decision: 3 **Support**

h) S.17/2869/HHOLD

Property Address: 82 Stonecote Ridge Bussage GL6 8JY

Description: Proposed extension and alterations to form a self-contained disabled unit.

Decision: 3 **Support**

i) S.18/0001/HHOLD

Property Address: Scrubs Bottom, Bisley

Description: small open porch into larger porch with door

Decision: 3 **Support**

18. 01 8. **County Council Matters - (Councillor Keith Rippington**

Councillor Keith Rippington reported the following.

The application for installation of Incinerator at Waterlane is almost certainly to be referred to Planning Committee.

Received a complaint from Parishioner of damage to wall caused by Snow Plough. Highways confirm that no Snow Plough was in that area. It was observed that the wall was damaged before the snowfall.

Most of council time being taken up in the preparation of budgets.

Michael Garratt highlighted the problem with a bus service from Stroud being full and having to leave passengers at the roadside. Requested the matter is raised on behalf of passengers using this service.

18. 01 9. **District Council Matters – (Councillor Tim Williams)**

District Councillor Tim Williams was not present and no report received.

18. 01 10. **Co-option of Parish Councillors**

Following the recent Parish Council retirements, the Parish has only nine of its complement of twelve Councillors.

The following were co-opted to the Parish Council

Bisley Ward - Mr David Partridge

Oakridge Ward – Mr Rod Simcox

18. 01 11. **Matters for Discussion**

a) Parish Tree Warden

The appointment of Lesley Greene as Parish Tree Warden was approved unanimously.

b) SDC Cycle Routes

Mike Eccott was appointed to represent the Parish Council at meetings with Stroud District Council regarding cycle routes.

c) Agree Parish Precept

Having received confirmation from SDC for the Tax Base for FY2018-19 and maintaining the Parish Council Budget at £60,440, this will decrease the Band D rate by 1.40% from £55.52 FY2017-18 to £54.74 for FY2018-19. This would decrease the Band D rate by £0.78. This was unanimously approved.

d) Letter to SDC Planning Department

We continue to be concerned about Stroud District Council Planning decisions, in our opinion some decisions do not follow policy, and in addition they fail to demonstrate a result in the best interests of the Parish. Two recent examples are below.

Recently Stroud have given permission for a speculative development, a replacement house, 4 1/2 times the size of the original, the domestic area now extends into an agricultural field, the field is also currently being used as a builders yard. This development is next to a Listed Building and conifer hedges have been planted along the field boundary, which causes harm to the Listed Building and is against the AONB guidance policy. This

development will give no benefit to the Parish or the neighbourhood, will not contribute in any way, it is purely speculative. Currently the Parish Council is supporting a Judicial Review of this decision.

Conversely Stroud have refused permission to convert a Dutch Barn to a dwelling on the land of a parish market garden and farm business, this is for two generations of the family that manage the surrounding land and that have contributed greatly to the parish, environmentally and economically.

This perverse approach to Planning decisions goes against the principles that Planning should be trying to achieve. The contribution that has been made, and will continue to be made to the Parish, the community, the environment and the local economy by the Dutch Barn application and its occupants is enormous compared to the speculative replacement house development which does not even comply with Policy.

The Parish Council would like a reasoned response why, following our previous complaint about The Summerfields development, the District Council Planners think granting permission to this type of speculative development against Policy contributes to the Parish and community, when another that is at the heart of the community gets refused?

If you prefer we could discuss this at the forthcoming Parish and Town Council meeting.

Following our last meeting with you it appears that nothing has changed so please let us know by return how you wish to deal with our concern.

8.112 **Finance**
Payments for January 2018

The following payments were approved by the Parish Council

Cost code	<u>Details</u>	£	VAT	Total
4070	Stroud District Council – Garage Rent - <i>Direct Debit</i>	65.47		65.47
4460	Water Plus – Oakridge Pavilion – <i>Direct Debit</i>	36.43		36.43
4120	Peter Rushton Landscapes Ltd – replace 3 Yew Trees at Tennis Court	52.50	10.50	63.00
4201	HomeFree – Bisley Pavilion cleaning	31.00		31.00
4020	BT – Broadband – <i>Direct Debit</i>	48.99	9.80	58.79
4000	P Morris - Clerk's Salary	873.35		873.35
4000	HMRC – Tax & NI	229.90		229.90
4050	R H Attwood – Grass cutting	359.17		
4221	Playing Fields	30.00		
4250	Bisley Allotments	37.50		
4405	Teeds Rise	128.75		
4421	Oakridge Footpaths & Waterlane	60.00		
4400	Oakridge & Far Oakridge Allotments	62.50		
4405	Oakridge Burial Ground	29.17		
4403	Oakridge Fountain Piece	17.50	144.92	869.51
	Strim Oakridge Play Area Soft Surface			
	Gardiners			

4320	Install stone path – Eastcombe Play Area	480.00	96.00	
4310	Install safety matting – Eastcombe Play Area	240.00	48.00	864.00
	Totals	2,782.23	309.22	3,091.45

18. 1 13 **Correspondence**

The following items of correspondence had been received since the last meeting:

Clerks & Councils Direct
Longfield

18. 1 14 **Ward Matters**

Eastcombe

Flag pole destroyed due to high winds.

Exchange the ordinary waste bin by the Telephone Box with a proper 'dog waste' receptacle.

Bisley & Oakridge

There were no Ward matters to report that were not covered elsewhere in the meeting.

18. 1 15 **Date and Place of Next Meeting**

The next Meeting of the Parish Council will be held in Bisley WI Village Hall on Wednesday **7 February 2018** commencing at 7.30pm.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.10pm.