



## **Supplement for**

### **PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 11 JUNE 2025**

**Agenda No     Item**

### **Schedule of Applications**

To consider and determine the applications contained within the enclosed schedule:

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**  
**11 June 2025**  
**ADDITIONAL PAGES** (*Published 06.06.2025*)

**AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL  
GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION) ACT 1985**

| <b>ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS : Page 1 – 4</b> |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Agenda No:</b>  | <b>Ref No:</b>  | <b>Content:</b>  |
| <b>8</b>   | <b>24/02854/OUT</b><br><br><i>(Land West of Kingshill Lane Cirencester)</i> | <b>Additional objection comment received:</b><br><br><i>'1. I objected recently again to the application. I have now seen the case officers recommending, I am amending my reasons for objection.</i><br><br><i>2. I withdraw the objection related to the lack of affordable residential, as I note that a 40% provision is being offered which is acceptable to the relevant Council Officer.</i><br><br><i>3. I could see no reference that a Section 111 Agreement, had been signed in relation to protecting the relevant area. However, as it is inconceivable that this matter would not be satisfactorily resolved, I withdraw my objection in relation to that issue.</i><br><br><i>3. I maintain my objection on the basis of conflict with Policy DS4. Furthermore, I do not accept that the development is sustainable. To be so there would have to be better bus linkage to Cirencester, including the Centre, and to Steadings, and the RAU. The Land Availability Assessment, is of no materiel relevance, as the potential of the site being a potential location for residential, only featured in the Issues and Options partial review of the Local Plan consultation. I do not recognize the document, 'Integrated Assessment (IIA) for the Cotswold Local Plan Update (February) 2024), that is noted as identifying the</i> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p><i>site, as part of a larger site, being least contained of six sites, from a sustainability viewpoint around Cirencester. The document remains a research document, of no relevance to existing Policy, which is contained in the Local Plan.</i></p> <p><i>4. The partially reviewed Local Plans is not sufficiently advanced for this to have any material relevance. However, of relevance is the plan for CDC to advance to the next stage of the partial review of the Local Plan, within the next 6 -9 months. That will include proposed residential allocations to cover the reaming Plan period up until 2031. Before, and after that there will undoubtedly speculative be speculative applications for residential on un - allocated residential, that could be supported, as the 'tilted' balance will be supported on the basis that DS4 is out of date, and there being no other issues, of significance, or they will be only be 'marginal' ones. The partially reviewed Local Plan is intended to be adopted in the first quarter 2027. The point being that almost 2 years of residential remains, and time remains for the 5 years supply to be built back up, without permitting residential on sites where there are significant issues, that I gave before, and will again highlight.</i></p> <p><i>5. I do not accept that the absence of the field being within the Natural Landscape, nor part of a Special Landscape Area, by definition makes the landscape not valued. Broad brush designations of Special Landscape Areas in the Local Plan, can never be expected to identify all areas of that have Landscape value. It can be likened to CDC identifying buildings of local Architectural or Historic significance which are of local significance, only at the point when planning applications are submitted that affect them, or their setting.</i></p> <p><i>6. Considering if para 187(a) is relevant, is a planning judgement on whether the natural and local environment, are valued landscapes, as that need to be conserved or enhanced. The case officer has taken a far too narrow a view, that (a) is not relevant. My view is that it is relevant, a wide definition by boundaries in a Local Plan is not the</i></p> |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p><i>arbiter, rather it is the evidence on the ground, related to an application, in cases where the land has no designated in the Local Plan. The proposal would cause harm to the natural and local environment, rather than conserving it, or enhancing it. The existing visual gap is of significance.</i></p> <p><i>7. Furthermore it has been acknowledged by the case officer that para (b), is also a determining factor, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the Countryside. This would be harmed, rather than being conserved or enhanced. There is also a conflict with Policy EN4 of the Local Plan. The issue is also recognised in the Preston Neighbourhood Plan. The visual gap, comprising a park, and the application rural field, provides an important visual gap, between Urban Cirencester, and the small rural village of Preston.</i></p> <p><i>8. I have previous acknowledged that that if the development is considered to be sustainable, the 'tilted' balance is relevant. As noted, I do not regard the residential as currently sustainable. If it were, I acknowledge that the issue becomes whether the positive elements of the application, of reducing the shortfall of residential now needed over the next 5 years, and the beneficial 40% affordable residential of appropriate tenure; outweigh the negative aspects, of losing a valued Landscape, and also the loss of rural character, and will reduce the visual gap between urban Cirencester, and the rural village of Preston.</i></p> <p><i>9. I remain of the view, that even taking account of the 'tilted' balance, the advantages of this proposal are overcome by the substantial disadvantages that I have highlighted. In addition stating that para 187(a), is not relevant, because the land is neither Natural Landscape, nor a Special Landscape Area, is incorrectly interpreting 187(a) in the context of the Local Plan. Furthermore, as agreed by the case officer para 187(b) is relevant.</i></p> <p><i>10. It is for Committee to weigh up the planning balance, which I do appreciate will be challenging, in view of what occurred between about 2012/13, and 2016/2017, when</i></p> |
|--|--|---|

|                 |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|
|                 |   | <p><i>residential development became 'residential by planning appeal', or 'residential by inevitable capitulation'. Obviously, with the 'tilted' balance, refusal should only take place where there are clear defensible reasons for doing so, in accordance with the NPPF.'</i></p>   |
| <p><b>9</b></p> | <p><b>24/03111/FUL</b></p> <p><i>(The Saddlery Kineton Guiting Power)</i></p> | <p><b>Additional comment received from Temple Guiting Parish Council:</b></p> <p><i>'Councillors were already concerned at the potential dangers of having 2 driveways at the same point on the single-track road through Kineton. A further site visit has raised the issue of construction traffic and vehicle movements on this very small site and on the road through the hamlet. There is very little space for vehicles to turn, either on the road or on the site, given the size of typical construction vehicles. If they did not enter the site, they would have to park on a single track road. This is likely to be extremely dangerous for builders, residents and visitors. Temple Guiting Parish Council requests that GCC Highways reassesses its comments, taking into account this major issue.</i></p> <p><i>A site visit would demonstrate the issues clearly - unlike the drawings - which show inaccurate proportions relative to actual human and vehicle sizes.'</i></p> |