

<b>APPLICATION NO: 15/01441/OUT</b>		<b>OFFICER: Mr Ed Baker</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED:</b> 15th August 2015		<b>DATE OF EXPIRY:</b> 10th October 2015
<b>WARD:</b> Battledown		<b>PARISH:</b> Charlton Kings
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr R.J. Ashton	
<b>AGENT:</b>	Mrs Becky Brown	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land off Harp Hill, Charlton Kings	
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Outline application for the erection of dwelling (revised submission following refusal of 14/01612/OUT)	

## Update to Officer Report

### 1. OFFICER COMMENTS

- 1.1. Members may recall that this application was considered by the Planning Committee in November 2015 and at that meeting, the committee resolved to refuse permission with the matter delegated back to officers to give further consideration in relation to visibility and potentially include lack of visibility as a further refusal reason.
- 1.2. The matter in relation to visibility has now been resolved and the County Council are satisfied that appropriate visibility can be achieved. Officers are therefore now in a position to refuse planning permission solely on the one issue, namely the cramped nature of the development.
- 1.3. Notwithstanding this, since the November meeting, officers have met with the applicant who expressed his disappointment about how the matter regarding highway safety was handled by officers, with particular reference to the late update given to members which re-introduced visibility as a concern.
- 1.4. Having reflected on this point, officers do have some sympathy with the case that is being advanced. The visibility concern was re-introduced at a late stage and, at the time, officers did give serious consideration to deferring the item to enable a clearer picture to be presented to the committee at a later meeting. Instead, the recommendation was presented such that regardless of the outcome of the substantive suggested refusal reason, the highway matter was delegated back to officers to resolve. The applicant's contention is that this recommendation may have influenced the debate that the committee went on to have.
- 1.5. Officers are revisited the minutes of the meeting and there is nothing to suggest that this was the case, but on reflection, members were not presented with the clearest of recommendations. With this in mind, and due to the fact that the decision has not yet been issued, officers consider it appropriate to bring the matter back to the committee for a further debate.
- 1.6. The recommendation remains that planning permission is refused for the reason set out below and the original officer report is attached to these papers.

### 2. REFUSAL REASONS

- 1 The application site is within the AONB and contributes to the spacious semi-rural character of the area. The development of the site would be detrimental to this

character and would result in a cramped form of development which would fail to respond to the prevailing character and layout of the surrounding area. As such the application is contrary to policies CP7 and CO2 of the Adopted Local Plan, the Development on Garden Land and Infill Sites in Cheltenham SPD and advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.