

# Naunton Parish Council

Clerk's Report for

Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> January to 13<sup>th</sup> March 2024

## Supporting documents for meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2024

Agenda item 5	Planning applications – 23/01371/FUL Appeal. Previous comments, Decision notice.	P.2
Agenda item 6	Recreation ground cashbook	P. 5
Agenda item 9	Speeding – (a) VAS assessment criteria (b) 20mph	P.6 P.9

**Item 5 – Planning appeal for 23/01371/FUL**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

**REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION**

Agent

Mr Alan McColm  
8 Spinney Grove  
Evesham  
Worcestershire  
WR11 1BF

Applicant

Mr & Mrs N Hayward  
1 Aylworth Cottages  
Aylworth  
Gloucestershire  
GL54 3AH

**Change of use of barn to dwelling with single storey extension at Land And**

**Barn West Of Church Farm House Naunton Gloucestershire**

APPLICATION REF: 23/01371/FUL

FILE REF:

DATE 16th August 2023

DECISION NOTICE

In pursuance of their powers under the above Act, the Council REFUSES permission for the above development for the following reason(s).

**1** The proposed development would result in the creation of a new-build open market dwelling outside a Principal or Non-Principal Settlement. The proposal to convert the existing barn would require the substantial alteration and extension of the existing barn, contrary to Local Plan Policies EC6 and EN2 and paragraph D.67 of the Cotswold Design Code, in addition to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The development would also not be in accordance with any policies that expressly deal with residential development outside of Principal or Non-Principal Settlements and is therefore, contrary to Local Plan Policy DS4. There are no material considerations that outweigh the conflict with the aforementioned policies.

**2** Church Farmhouse to the east of the application site is a Grade II Listed Building, and the Local Planning Authority is statutorily required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving its setting. Additionally, by virtue of the exiting barns age, historic relationships, materials and

agricultural character, it has been identified as non-designated heritage asset. It is proposed to convert this small barn with the addition of a lean-to extension to its rear, which would substantially increase the scale and wholly alter the form of this simple and modest historic agricultural building. The depth of the lean-to, its awkward junction to rear roof slope above, its sheet roofing, and its fenestration to the currently blank field aspect would also be harmful to the character of the historic barn, on this prominent site, with its open landscape setting and close relationship to Church Farm. The proposals would fall short of barn conversion policy and would be very damaging to the significance of the barn as a non-designated heritage asset. There would be harm to the setting and significance of the listed buildings at Church Farm, and whilst less than substantial, this would not be outweighed by public benefits in this case. It is therefore judged that the proposals would fail to meet the requirements of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and Local Plan Policies EN1, EN2, EN4, EN10, EN12 and EN13 of the Cotswold District Local Plan.

**3** The proposed development has failed to satisfy the requirements of the 3 derogation tests and it has not been demonstrated that there would be sufficient beneficial consequences in order to override public interest, or that the bat population would be maintained as a result of the development. The development has therefore failed to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, The Planning Practice Guidance, Cotswold District Local Plan Policy EN8, and ODPM Circular 06/2005 and The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), preventing the Local Planning Authority from discharging its statutory duty with regards to European protected species.

The [case officer report](#) is very clear about the failure to meet a number of criteria including that the original barn did not meet national living space standards and that this shows that the barn cannot be converted and still fit within the current planning policies. The case officer also points out that the applicant stated that this application relates purely to the extension, as works had already started on the permitted application [19/03261/FUL](#). The case officer disagrees as work has not started on the building.

FYI, if cumulative impact is also being considered, nearby Church Farm has been given permission to convert a barn to residential after resubmitting their application (23/01896/FUL Conversion of a disused storage barn to a single dwelling house (Resubmission) Church Farm, Naunton Cheltenham Gloucestershire GL54 3AJ

It would appear the Parish did not submit comments on this last application but there is an opportunity to submit comments at the appeal stage. Comments should be along the following lines of: 'NPC agrees with the Local Planning Authority@ or 'NPC disagrees with the LPA because (and then state reasons).

#### Comments NPC submitted for the first application

Although the current application is a long way from the first one, the original comments NPC submitted at the time:

Naunton Parish Council objects to this application (19/03261/FUL) for the following reasons:

1. At 35 m sq, the proposed development does not meet the National Space Standards for the minimum space area for one person, one bed accommodation. The minimum standard is 39m sq reduced to 37 m sq if the bathroom is replaced by a shower, as in this case. This minimum is not suitable for wheelchair users, as more space is required to manoeuvre a wheelchair.

The property is therefore too small to be habitable. Further extensions will be needed to make the property a habitable size but would conflict with Cotswold Local Planning Policy DS3 (b).

The Design and Access statement mentions that single person housing is in short supply in the area, however no mention is made of the fact that the greatest need is for 'affordable' housing and no commitment has been made that this would be within that category.

2. The Design and Access Statement includes inaccurate and misleading information. The bus services mentioned do not exist. The residents of Naunton all rely on personal vehicles for access to any services as the village has none of its own.

3. The application may not meet Cotswold Local Planning Policy Planning EC6 which states that rural buildings may be converted to housing provided 'The building is structurally sound, suitable for and capable of conversion to the proposed use without substantial alteration, extension or re-building.'

While the engineer's report and the site description state that the conversion is possible, 9 recommendations are listed in section 5 to make the property sound. The Bat Report (which has nothing to gain from any particular view on the soundness of the building) details significant structural issues such as numerous gaps in the roof and in the ridge tiles, gaps in the stone walls on the West, SE and cracking and gaps to the Northern gable end, the fact that the Southern gable is leaning out and that remedial measures should be taken as soon as possible to prevent further deterioration.

4. The application may not meet Planning Policy DS3 which says that small residential development will be permitted 'provided it (a) demonstrably supports or enhances the vitality of the local community' and '(b) is of a proportionate scale and maintains and enhances sustainable patterns of development ....'. Regarding DS3(a), the small size means that it does not support the local community as it is too small to be a permanent home. For DS3(b), the continued development of rural buildings in Naunton is clearly not sustainable. In addition, any extensions would make the property out of proportion to its surroundings.

5. Although the height of the eaves is quoted as being 4m, the internal height of the development may not meet the national standard of 2.3m ceiling height for 75% of the floor area. This is because of the need for a bat loft and that the description of the property states that the walls are 1.6m (West) and 2m (East). In addition, the floor is currently bare earth so a floor will have to be installed, which may reduce usable height further.

6. The Building is very close to existing listed buildings and may impinge on the privacy of neighbouring properties.

**Item 6 – Recreation field cashbook**

**Naunton Recreation Ground - Income & expenditure FY 2023/24**

			Income	Expendit- ure
C/Fwd			1098.14	
	Naunton Social Committee	Annual Recreation Field hire	300	
	Naunton Music Soc	Annual Recreation Field hire	100	
	Naunton Village Hall Committee	Annual Recreation Field hire	100	
	Greenfields	Improvements to entrance		1895.62
	P Johnson	Rec field hire	25	
	H&A Ready	Rec field hire	50	
	Iona Anderson	Rec field hire	50	
	Cricket club for bodpve	Bodpave	500	
	P Johnson	Rec Field Hire	25	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1150</b>	<b>1895.62</b>
		Total inc C/Fwd	2248.14	
		Surplus of	352.52	
		Ringfenced for Rec	352.52	

## **Item 9 – Speeding in the village**

### **(a) Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) and 20mph requirements – information needed to build a case**

Gloucestershire Highways department has issued a set of criteria against which it determines whether VAS equipment can be installed:

DfT guidance indicates that VAS should be considered only:

- \* where there is a collision problem at the site, and
- \* the collisions are associated with inappropriate speeds.

In addition, within Gloucestershire it is also appropriate to consider:

- \* The number of vehicles using the road – as there is a likelihood that the risk may well increase with higher numbers of users
- \* Any environmental concerns related to the site – schools, community facilities, community severance, vulnerable users etc.
- \* When road layout (bends/crossroads) and seasonal issues (ice/deer etc) need addressing.

### **Assessment criteria for a mobile VAS in Gloucestershire**

There are 5 criteria for a mobile VAS site and the site must pass on speed and community support criteria as well as 2 of the 3 other criteria (collision record, traffic flows, environmental concerns). The local community should provide the information in each section. A GCC officer (Highway Improvement Team) will decide if the criteria have been met, using their discretion where necessary.

At the current time, Naunton would not meet the specified criteria. This is partly because no data is available for the speed, traffic flow or community support criteria. At the same time, it does not meet the collision record or environmental concerns criteria (see below for draft evaluation). However, GCC will carry out a traffic flow/speed and classification survey (both directions, for 1 or 2 weeks) at a cost of £185 +VAT for 1 site and an additional £103 +VAT for additional sites. This would provide data for the speed and traffic flow criteria. The community support criterion will be addressed if the survey which is being discussed at agenda item 9 is carried out and has a good response rate.

The details of the assessment criteria are:

#### **1) Speed**

A speed survey should have been undertaken which shows that there is a non-compliance with the posted speed limit (e.g. this might be a high mean speed compared with posted limit or a significant difference between the mean and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds).

Mean speed: NA

85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed: NA

Date data collected: NA

How was data collected: NA

Outcome: N/A as Naunton has not carried out a speed survey.

Note: An 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed above ACPO limits (Association of Chief Police Officers) i.e. 15% of drivers would be exceeding ACPO levels (= speed limit +10% + 2mph). without a recognised speed problem there is little benefit in reinforcing the speed limit. Thresholds are 35mph (in a 30 mph limit), 48 (40 mph limit) and 68 (60mph limit).

### 3) Collision record

There should be a proven record of collisions within approximately 500m in each direction of the site. Collision data resulting in personal injury can be found on the Road Safety Partnership website ([www.r-gloucestershire.gov.uk/roadsafety/parish-casualty-data/](http://www.r-gloucestershire.gov.uk/roadsafety/parish-casualty-data/)) . [casualties-from-road-traffic-collisions-2019-21-by-parish.pdf \(gloucestershire.gov.uk\)](#) It is also acceptable to provided data collected locally of collisions resulting in damage only, providing there is evidence of how this data was collected.

Gloucestershire Highways parish collision data (2019 – 2021) shows 1 killed/seriously injured and 1 slightly injured in Naunton parish. Both were on B roads, i.e. not in the village.

Outcome: Criteria not met

**4) Traffic flows.** More than 4,000 vehicles per day (24hr 2-way) should use the site. With low traffic flows, associated risk is likely to be reduced.

	Site		
	North bound	South bound	Total
Total volume			

Outcome: No data available. But criteria unlikely to be met.

### 5) Environmental concerns

The site should have an environmental weighted score of at least 5 within 1 km (500m in either direction along the road) of the proposed location. The weighting policy is detailed below.

Environmental concern	Weighting	Present at site
School/college/nursery	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>
Nursing Home	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Community facility(s) e.g. local shop, church, village hall etc	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Well used formal/informal crossing point	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Vulnerable users/ insufficient footway	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Significant number of 'damage only' accidents	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
Isolated / community severance	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total Score:		3

## **20 mph limit**

There has been no response from the Highways Manager or the GCC councillor but there may be other action which may help. GCC hasn't adopted the optional '20 where people and cars mix' approach. Local councils are being encouraged by the '20's plenty' campaign to pass the below motion:

### **Motion**

**[Your Parish or Town council name]:**

- **Supports the *20's Plenty for [your County]* campaign;**
- **Calls on [your County Council] to implement 20mph in [your place];  
and**
- **Will write to [your County Council] to request 20mph speed limits on streets throughout [your county] where people live, work, shop, play or learn, with 30mph as the exception on those roads, where full consideration of the needs of vulnerable road users allows a higher limit.**

Here is a link to [supporting material](#) making the case for 20 mph. If GCC adopts the default 20 mph across the county 'where people live, work, shop, play or learn' Naunton would fit the criteria.

Meanwhile, GCC has asked for a map showing where the limit should be applied. I have sent a map showing where the VAS equipment should go and where the 20mph signs should be positioned i.e. replacing the 30 mph signs to Highways.

**(b) Draft questionnaire**

Thank you for participating in this survey which aims to gather information about people's views on the speed of vehicles in Naunton village. Your responses will contribute to a better understanding of public opinions and attitudes towards traffic in the village. Please answer the following questions.

**Section 1: About you**

1.1 Age:

	√
Under 18	
18 – 34	
35-54	
55 - 64	
65 or older	

1.2 Gender:

	√
Male	
Female	
Other	

**Section 2: Your views on speeding in Naunton:**

2.1 Do you think that speeding is a problem in Naunton?

- Yes

- No

- Not sure

2.2 If yes, please explain why you find speeding problematic.

---

---

2.2 Have you ever seen vehicles appearing to drive faster than the 30 mph limit in the village?

- Yes

- No

- Unsure

2.3 If yes, please briefly describe where you have seen this taking place.

---

---

2.3 If yes, how often do you see this?

- Regularly – daily

- Regularly – weekly

- Less frequently

2.4 Do you believe that the speed limits in the village are about right?

- Yes

- No

- Unsure

### **Section 3: Road safety measures**

3.1 Would you welcome any of the following road safety measures?

- Village Speedwatch speed monitoring volunteers

- 20 mph limit

- Vehicle Activated Signs (which show how fast the driver is travelling)

- Public awareness campaign e.g. signage

- Other (Please specify)

---

3.2 How effective do you believe each of these is in deterring speeding? (Please rank 1 – 5)

	1	2	3	4	5
Village Speedwatch speed monitoring volunteers					
20 mph limit					
Vehicle Activated Signs (which show how fast the drier is travelling)					
Public awareness campaign e.g. signage					
Other (Please specify)					

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your input is valuable in understanding public perspectives of speeding in the village.