

AMPNEY CRUCIS PARISH COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD IN THE VILLAGE HALL
ON WEDNESDAY 6TH DECEMBER 2023**

Present: Cllrs Doug Crook, Jan Mills, Lis Courtown, Jacky Leadbeater, Ross Leadbeater, Nick Wright (part), Clint Grimmer
 Presiding: Cllr Doug Crook
 Clerk: Roz Morton
 In attendance: Martin Harradine (Agent for Ampney Park Ltd), Luke Brennan (Architect Simon Murray Jones), Elizabeth Krohn (Director Ampney Park Ltd), Ivan Leal (Architect Simon Murray Jones), 60 x Members of the public

No:	Item:
059 23/24	<p>To note apologies for absence Cllr Spivey</p>
060 23/24	<p>To note declarations of interest & gifts or hospitality given or rec'd Cllr Grimmer declared a personal interest in item 065 23/24</p>
061 23/24	<p>To approve minutes of the meeting held on 9th November 2023 Resolution 38/23-24. It was RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 9th November were a true and accurate record of the meeting. Proposed Cllr Mills, seconded Cllr Courtown, all in favour.</p>
062 23/24	<p>Matters arising from the meeting held on 9th November 2023 It was agreed to defer all matters to the 11th January meeting.</p>
	<p>Cllr Wright joined the meeting.</p>
063 23/24	<p>To receive a presentation from Luke Brennan (Simon Murray Jones Architects) and Martin Harradine (AZ Urban Studio) LB & MH presented the application for Ampney Park (as detailed below) to the meeting. All details can be found on the CDC planning portal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of use to Sui Generis • NOT a hotel – available only for group bookings. 14 double bedrooms • Host a range of events, not only weddings. Weddings are likely to have the greatest impact so have been the benchmark for traffic/noise modelling • Highways plans have assumed a “Sprinter Van” as the largest vehicle entering or exiting the venue. • Had preapplication advice from CDC which has resulted in the proposed new entrance narrowing from a 10m opening to a 5m opening and the new event building being located closer to the existing house and away from the open parkland. • Glos Highways have not yet commented on the application • Acknowledged some errors in the acoustic report which is being revised

064 23/24	<p>To receive questions from the Public (not every individual question has been noted but comment themes have been grouped)</p> <p>Q: Has the church been taken into consideration?</p> <p>A: The heritage report covers the church and no issues were raised by the CDC Heritage Officer. There is no relationship with the church in terms of access.</p> <p>Q: what if a funeral was taking place – would there be a negative impact from noise generated by events taking place at AP at the same time?</p> <p>A: The church has not been identified as a noise receptor in the acoustic report.</p> <p>ACTION: MH agreed to take the church into consideration in terms of noise and have a survey done.</p> <p>Q: The data in the noise impact assessment is flawed – the data points are mapped incorrectly.</p> <p>A: yes, the report is being reviewed and a new report submitted. MH is assured that the noise level generated will be 5DB less than the current ambient noise experienced by residents inside their homes.</p> <p>Q: the noise levels are very different at different times of day, night and year (leaves on trees help to deflect sound etc). How is that taken into account?</p> <p>A: the survey has a weighted average and the data is modelled to reflect that.</p> <p>Q: Is there a maximum DB level that will be permitted?</p> <p>A: There are limits imposed by environmental health – who will be commenting on the report and its findings.</p> <p>ACTION: MH to provide a non-technical summary of the findings from the noise impact assessment.</p> <p>Q: There are many concerns over the safety of the proposed access.</p> <p>A: Highway are happy with the junction design (<i>note – Glos H'ways have not yet commented on the application</i>).</p> <p>Q: When was the traffic survey carried out and how – can we have the source data?</p> <p>ACTION: MH to confirm dates and methodology of traffic survey.</p> <p>Q: The access through the proposed gate is only one vehicle wide – there is potential for vehicles to cause a problem on A417 if more than one vehicle is trying to exit or enter at the same time.</p> <p>A: A waiting area behind the wall has been planned into the design.</p> <p>Q: What entrance will construction traffic use?</p> <p>A: The 5m wide proposed new entrance.</p> <p>Q: How will large lorries access the site?</p> <p>A: <i>No answer offered.</i></p> <p>Q: The application states that it will “increase public access” to the Park, increase from what?</p> <p>A: From zero to paid public access – accessible to those who are attending an event.</p> <p>Q: What is the capacity of the venue and does that include staff numbers? Has staff parking</p>
-----------	--

been taken into consideration?

A: the venue has a capacity of 150 guests. Staff parking (12-15 spaces) are provided in the plans.

Q: Concerns over drainage. Thames Water have said that the system at Ampney St Peter is already at capacity – plans for upgrading the system in 2025. Will the development be held in abeyance until the upgrading has taken place?

A: yes, although some of the accommodation may be completed prior to the upgrading if capacity allows.

Q: It's not just the pumping station at Ampney St Peter (A St P), but the pipes to it that require upgrading so there is sufficient flow and reservoir capacity through the route to A St P. Currently when there is heavy rain the pumping station at the bottom of School Lane often needs to have the reservoir emptied by tankers as they cannot deal with the foul water plus surface water ingress – will you commit to upgrading these pipes?

A: a Grampian condition may be placed on the application that requires off-site works to be completed prior to the onsite works starting. That would need to be agreed with the LLFA (Glos CC.)

Q: Why has a "buffer zone" of planting been included as part of the change of use – could this allow that area to be used commercially or more building in the future?

A: the "buffer zone" is planting of trees in existing agricultural land to incorporate into the parkland. No plans for it being anything other than parkland.

Q: Could a S106 be entered into to restrict the use of the back drive for non-commercial purposes only?

A: potentially – for CDC to decide. There are no plans to allow commercial vehicles (including staff cars) to use the back drive. However, pedestrians may use it to access the venue. Existing use will continue.

ACTION: MH to produce a statement to the fact that the back drive will not be used for commercial purpose.

Q: How will you stop pedestrians from roaming into the private land either side of the back drive, particularly when the drive is unlit?

A: *No answer offered.*

Q: Are there facilities for staff to stay overnight?

A: there will be staff on site 24hrs when the venue is in use – no staff bedroom though.

Q: The travel plan assumes that staff will cycle – it's a very fast and dangerous road, and very few people cycle down it, particularly at night.

A: Cycling is considered an acceptable way to access the Park, particularly for local staff.

Q: What level of lighting will there be around the Park and in the car park?

A: low level lighting – way-finding lighting from the car park to the venue. No lighting in the park land.

ACTION: The light spill diagram has errors and requires amendments. LB to amend the diagram and resubmit it.

Q: The Garden Building is planned to be 65ft and then show above the C18th wall of 2

	<p>Ampney Park. Given that the building was described as being for storing machinery does it need to be this big with a meeting room, shower etc? It seems excessive.</p> <p>Q: Also queried the use of green corrugated steel roof and could it use an alternative such as slate.</p> <p>A: building was styled as being agricultural, hence the current roof material, but in reviewing the structure the roof material will be reconsidered.</p> <p>ACTION: MH to confirm the height of the garden building.</p> <p>Q: The Crown has a live music licence until 11pm, the application is for one until midnight – why is it later?</p> <p>A: it's for CDC to decide the perimeters of the licence.</p> <p>Q: Would you consider limiting the number and frequency of live music events?</p> <p>A: Yes if required to by CDC.</p> <p>Q: Would you consider limiting the use of fireworks?</p> <p>A: Potentially and will discuss this with the client.</p> <p>Q: Will there be provision for helicopters to land at the venue and for drones to be used for photography?</p> <p>A: A helipad is not part of the current proposal. Should a request be made for a helicopter to land, then the required permission will be sought, and flight plans will keep helicopters away from the village. The use of drones can be conditioned as part of the event management plan.</p> <p>Q: How many events are you planning on holding?</p> <p>A: The business plan is not a public document so a number cannot be given.</p>
065 23/24	<p>To consider and agree response to planning application:</p> <p>23/03368/FUL Change of use of existing residential and ancillary buildings, demolition of modern buildings and structures and erection of new buildings together with access, parking and landscape works, repair of existing listed and curtilage listed structures, all in association with the proposed new use of the site as a function / events venue location including visitor accommodation and associated facilities (sui generis mix of uses) Ampney Park Ampney Crucis Cirencester Gloucestershire GL7 5RY</p> <p>Resolution 39/23-24 The Council resolved to OBJECT to this application on various grounds including Highways safety, Noise, the demolition of a heritage asset (wall on A417) and insufficient parking. The applicant has acknowledged that there are errors in the acoustic report and is awaiting a revised report which will be duly submitted as part of the application. Given the complexity of the application and the outstanding information, including a response from Gloucestershire Highways, the Council would like to request an extension to the deadline for submitting comments. The Council will submit a detailed objection in due course. Proposed Cllr R Leadbeater, seconded Cllr J Leadbeater, all in favour.</p> <p>ACTION: Clerk to request an extension to the deadline for comments from CDC</p> <p>ACTION: Cllr Crook to draft an objection and circulate to the Council for comment.</p>

	ACTION: Clerk to send a copy of the actions to MH & LB.
66 23/24	Date and time of next meeting 11 th January 2024 at 7.15pm.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.40pm.