



## **Supplement for**

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 10 DECEMBER 2025**

**Agenda No     Items 8 and 9**

This page is intentionally left blank

**PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE**  
**10 December 2025**  
**ADDITIONAL PAGES** (*Published 08.12.2025*)

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

<b>ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS : Pages 1 - 19</b>		
<b>Agenda No:</b>	<b>Ref No:</b>	<b>Content:</b>
<b>8 &amp; 9</b>	<b>25/02175/FUL 25/02722/LBC</b>  <i>(Thyme – Southrop Estate Office)</i>	<p><b>Letter received from Pegasus Group – please see attached dated 2 December 2025</b></p> <p><i>Paragraph 207 states “In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.”</i></p> <p>Officers are satisfied that the information submitted between the full planning application and listed building consent application includes sufficient information to enable the impact of the proposal relevant historic assets in a manner which is proportionate to the assets’ importance.</p> <p><b>Letter and enclosures (<i>Suggested amendments following meeting at ‘The Dovecot’ 16.10.2025</i>) received from agent Howard Cole Ltd – please see attached dated 5 December 2025</b></p>

		<p><b>1 additional comment of support received (<i>summarised</i>):</b></p> <p>Proposal in accordance with Council's hospitality and tourism industry policies.</p> <p><b>Case Officer Update: Conditions 4 &amp; 5 amended following enforceability concerns:</b></p> <p><b>4.</b> No development, including demolition, site clearance, or construction works, shall take place on the application site outside the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. No works shall be carried out on Sundays or Public Holidays.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in accordance with Local Plan Policy EN15.</p> <p><b>5.</b> Prior to the installation of any pumps and associated plant to be installed, details of these shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted information shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manufacturer and model specifications</li> <li>• Location and mounting details</li> <li>• Predicted noise levels and any proposed mitigation measures</li> <li>• </li> </ul> <p>The approved pumps and plant shall be installed and operated in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p><b>Reason:</b> To ensure the development does not result in unacceptable noise impacts on neighbouring properties, in accordance with Local Plan Policy EN15.</p>
--	--	---

P25-2091

2<sup>nd</sup> December 2025

Ms A. Hill  
Cotswold District Council  
Trinity Road  
Cirencester  
GL7 1PX

Via email: [planning@cotswold.gov.uk](mailto:planning@cotswold.gov.uk)

Dear Ms Hill,

**Application reference 25/02175/FUL – Erection of 3 new structures and associated landscaping to provide additional spa facilities and hotel accommodation, Thyme, Southrop Estate Office, Southrop Estate, Southrop, Lechlade, Gloucestershire, GL7 3PW**

Pegasus Group have reviewed the latest Conservation consultation response (dated 20<sup>th</sup> November 2025) on behalf of Sue Dale and Julian Gleek (the owners and residents of The Dovecote, Southrop). We have set out our observations and comments in relation to this response below.

### **Historic Functional Associations**

The consultation response does not give regard to the historic functional association between the application site and the Grade II Listed Barn ('The Dovecote') and Grade II Listed Newmans House.

Please refer to our previous letters dated 21<sup>st</sup> August, 29<sup>th</sup> September and 24<sup>th</sup> October 2025 in which we drew your attention to the evidence for this historic functional association and the contribution this link makes to the significance of the assets through setting in accordance with Historic England's professional guidance.

This lack of regard is reflected in the consultee's conclusion that, "*The application site consequently contributes to the setting and significance [of the Grade II Listed Barn] only insofar as it forms part of the general, edge-of-settlement character of the surroundings.*" / "*... the only contribution that the site makes to the setting and significance of Newman's House is limited to the general, edge-of-settlement character of the area.*" (Underlined is our emphasis). We do not

33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ  
T 01285 641717 E [Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk)  
Offices throughout the UK.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.  
Registered Office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ

**Expertly Done.**

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



recommend that weight be given to these conclusions, or the subsequent assessment that there would be no harm to the significance of the Grade II Listed Barn or Grade II Listed Newmans House, as part of the decision-making process given there are manifest deficiencies in the evidence that has been relied upon.

For clarity, our professional opinion remains that the current proposals would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II Listed Barn and Grade II Listed Newmans House through change to their settings (again, please refer to our previous letters).

### **Grade II Listed Southrop Lodge**

The consultation response includes an assessment of Grade II Listed Southrop Lodge. It is conjectured that the application site came to be associated with this asset by the later 19<sup>th</sup> century based on the curved wall feature to the south that is still extant and appears to be depicted on the First Edition Ordnance Survey map.

Unfortunately, this historic association has not been confirmed through any further research, such as reference to contemporaneous documents recording landownership and tenancy. Assuming there was an association between the application site and Southrop Lodge by that time, the enclosure provided by the curved wall could be the remnant of some form of designed landscape, with the site potentially forming part of this historic design intent. Again, such an intent would need to be further explored, or empirically ruled out, through further research, including consideration of sources held at the Gloucestershire Archives.

We therefore have concerns that the contribution of the site to the significance of Grade II Listed Southrop Lodge through setting, and the resultant impact of the proposed development on this significance have not been properly understood.

We would also reiterate that the NPPF (paragraph 207) requires the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting.

### **Impact on the Southrop Conservation Area**

The consultee's position has changed with regard to the impact of the proposed development on the Southrop Conservation Area. In the previous consultation response (dated 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2025) it was concluded that the proposals would sustain the significance of the Southrop Conservation Area. It is now concluded that there could be less than substantial harm to the significance of the Southrop Conservation Area (articulated in the consultation response as "*of a very limited nature, and at the extreme bottom of the less-than-substantial spectrum*" / "*at most very slight, less-than-substantial harm*").

The latest consultation response asserts that the application site "*does not contribute to any significant views and is not widely visible*". We would draw your attention to our letter dated 21<sup>st</sup> August 2025 in which we described and illustrated how the site is visible in short- and long-range views from several historic routes/public rights of way to the south; is readily perceptible

33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ  
T 01285 641717 E [Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk)  
Offices throughout the UK.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.  
Registered Office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ

**Expertly Done.**

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



as an open, green gap with a residual agricultural character; and forms the content of important views towards the Conservation Area by giving legibility to the historic grain of settlement and the interface between the settlement core and its immediate agricultural hinterland.

We therefore have concerns that the contribution the application site makes to the significance of the Conservation Area and the adverse impact of the proposed development have not been given proper regard.

### **Heritage Harm and Public Benefits**

In light of the less than substantial heritage harm that has been identified, great weight should be given to the conservation of the heritage assets.

We would question whether sufficient evidence has been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate the public benefits of the development scheme, and whether it can be demonstrated that the heritage harm would be outweighed by any such benefits.

### **Summary Conclusions**

Our main concerns are as follows:

- Proper regard has not been given to the historic functional association between the application site and the Grade II Listed Barn ('the Dovecote') and Grade II Listed Newmans House. As a result, the contribution that the site makes to the significance of these Listed Buildings through setting, and the resultant less than substantial harm caused by the development proposals, have not been adequately understood.
- The assessment of Grade II Listed Southrop Lodge is insufficient and raises the prospect of a historic design intent between the asset and the application site which has not been fully researched or understood. By extension, the contribution that the application site makes to the significance of the Listed Building through setting and the potential impact of the development proposals cannot be adequately understood.
- Insufficient regard has been given to how readily the application site is perceived in significant views towards the Southrop Conservation Area from historic routes/public rights of way to the south. As a result, we do not consider that the positive contribution the site makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or the adverse impact of the proposals on the significance of the asset have been properly assessed.
- We are not aware that the applicant has submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the public benefits of the development would outweigh the heritage harm identified, which would include less than substantial harm to the significance of the Southrop Conservation Area, the Grade II Listed Barn, and Grade II Listed Newmans House.

33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ  
T 01285 641717 E [Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk)  
Offices throughout the UK.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.  
Registered Office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ

## **Expertly Done.**

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



Given the deficiencies in the heritage assessments submitted to date, we would advise Cotswold District Council to request further information from the applicant (in line with paragraph 207 of the NPPF) and to seek further revisions to the scheme to mitigate heritage harm (as set out in our previous letters). This is to ensure that your statutory duties with regard to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 have been discharged.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Jonathan Turnock BA (Hons), MAR, PhD, IHBC  
Associate Heritage Consultant  
Email: [jonathan.turnock@pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:jonathan.turnock@pegasusgroup.co.uk)

33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ  
T 01285 641717 E [Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk](mailto:Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk)  
Offices throughout the UK.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.  
Registered Office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ

**Expertly Done.**

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Amy Hill  
Development Management  
Planning Services  
Cotswold District Council  
Trinity Road  
Cirencester  
GL7 1PX

5th December 2025

Dear Amy,

**25/02175/FUL -- Erection of 3 new structures and associated landscaping to provide additional spa facilities and hotel accommodation at Thyme, Southrop, GL7 3PW**

I write regarding the above application, on which you will be aware we are the retained planning consultancy. In reviewing the Officer report to Planning & Licensing Committee there is a matter we believe is need of addressing.

Your report is comprehensive and responds to many of the objections raised and arrives at a positive recommendation to permit.

However, we note the report begins by giving reasons why Cllr Fowles has requested the development proposal to be considered by the Review Panel for referral to the Planning & Licensing Committee. It would be remiss of me, in my professional capacity, not to highlight that the claims made within those reasons are simply false and have since been discussed and clarified at subsequent meetings between Thyme representatives and the Parish Council and some objectors.

- At para 2.1.1 Cllr Fowles alleges the business at Thyme has very little engagement with the village, either by virtue of generating local employment or providing locals with a leisure amenity. This is untrue on many levels.

Thyme has a long record of recruiting locally. It has provided many opportunities for residents, either by long-term employment or short-term temporary engagement. On the latter, there are numerous examples whereby Thyme has offered holiday employment for local students who have then used that opportunity to move onto successful careers in the hospitality sector. Currently, there are 30 employees living within the GL7 3 postcode and 44% of staff live within the GL7 postcode.

Thyme also has a significant impact on indirect local employment opportunities within the local economy with its 'local-first' policy for goods, business support, and back of house services.

Further, it is incorrect to suggest that few residents use the hotel's amenities. Indeed, it is not lost on the business that a number of those objecting to the planning application are regular users of the restaurant and bar at Thyme.

- At para 2.1.2 Cllr Fowles implies the business at Thyme might be operating in breach of previous planning conditions. No specifics have been provided, just the spectre that there might be some wrong doing.

Here we note there has been some local misunderstanding related to car parking, with some leading community members referring to the southern car park as the 'overflow'. Some people have referred to a breach of planning control because that car park is operated as the principal car park. However, the fact is that planning permission 17/01013/FUL relating to the hotel use contains a planning condition, No.22, which expressly requires Thyme to "*undertake all reasonable measures to ensure customers are directed towards the southern access*". That condition was imposed by the LPA following local requests at the time and all subsequent planning applications illustrate the southern car park as the 'main car park'.

- At para 2.1.3 Cllr Fowles notes highway safety issues in Southrop. Firstly, the Highway Authority has reviewed the spa development proposal and has concluded there are no highway safety reasons to preclude the proposal from coming forward. Secondly, Thyme has worked closely with the Parish Council on the matter of local highway safety. The evidence is that the principal speeding issues faced within the village are not attributed to guest traffic. In the past 3-months one speeding vehicle has been associated with the operation at Thyme, that being a supplier and the business has addressed this matter directly with the supplier.
- At para 2.1.4 Cllr Fowles suggests the development will have a dramatic effect on the conservation area and the surrounding listed buildings. These are technical judgement matters that require proficiency and we ask the Committee to be informed on this issue by its qualified planning and heritage advisors.
- At para 2.1.5 Cllr Fowles raises concern about noise, in particular the plant room which was previously indicated being close to the boundary of a neighbour's property. This matter has been resolved following a request to sit down with the neighbouring occupiers and is documented in the attached note.

Cllr Fowles notes three more bedrooms are proposed very close to a neighbouring property and points out this is not a business which shuts at 5.30pm. The facts are that Thyme has a long history as operating as a considerate neighbour and the track record is telling. No issues have been raised by your Environmental Health colleagues and no anti-social behaviour complaints made in respect of the business's 24/7 operation. The proposed development is principally for spa facilities, which will provide a tranquil and serene environment.

Finally, for the Ward Cllr to introduce into the planning argument that "*it is not unreasonable to assume further applications will be made*" is a spurious claim which has no material relevance.

I do recognise that Cllr Fowles' comments were probably drafted some time ago, and that much progress has been made since they were submitted to you. However, the comments could easily push the tone of your report in the wrong direction. It is, therefore, important that at the Planning Committee meeting the reasons for referral are not simply used to oppose the application, and all Councillors including Cllr Fowles commence the meeting with an open mind, coming to a balanced view after listening to the sound planning reasons to permit.

Considering these matters, I would be most grateful if this note, and its attachment, could be circulated to all Committee Members.

Yours sincerely



Mark Chadwick BA (hons) DipTP MRTPI  
**Partner**

E: [mark.chadwick@howardcole.net](mailto:mark.chadwick@howardcole.net)  
T: 07788147902

ENC: Suggested Amendments Following Meeting at 'The Dovecot' 16th October 2025<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> NB: These amendments have now been formally made.

**25/02175/FUL**

Erection of 3 new structures and associated landscaping to provide additional spa facilities and hotel accommodation

Thyme, Southrop, Gloucestershire, GL7 3PW

**Suggested Amendments Following Meeting at  
‘The Dovecot’ 16th October 2025**

A meeting was held on the 16th October 2025 between Sue Dale and Julian Gleek (of The Dovecote), and the Architect (Trevor Taw) together with Town Planner (Mark Chadwick) acting on behalf of Thyme regarding a live planning application for three new structures and associated landscaping, to provide additional spa facilities and hotel accommodation ("the application proposal"). The meeting was held on a without prejudice and good faith basis. It was chaired by the Chairman of Southrop Parish Council. Also in attendance was Patrick Anderson, Surveyor (advising Ms Dale & Mr Gleek) and Rob Garnham of Mediation in Planning (instructed by Mark Chadwick).


It should be noted this was not a meeting called for by the LPA.

The meeting was held in consideration of the written objections made by Ms Dale and Mr Gleek in respect of the application proposal. The meeting was held in the acknowledgement that the submitted objections to the principle of the proposed works were not likely to be withdrawn. However, the meeting provided an opportunity to discuss design details with the aim of seeking to identify common ground on potential amendments that might address specific areas of concern.

This note provides details of potential amendments discussed which could, subject to agreement between the parties, be made to the application proposal. The aim of the note is to document suggested proposals for agreement between the two parties prior to informally engaging on those changes with the Planning Authority. It is acknowledged by all parties that if the Planning Authority object to any of the suggested changes, for whatever reason, those changes would not be made. However, provided all parties agree, including the LPA, a formal amendment of the application proposal would be made, as set out within this document.


It is important to note that this document does not seek to comment on the merits of the scheme, nor does it seek to comment on the merits of the objections raised. It simply seeks to provide alternative design suggestions as discussed at the meeting.

ISSUE	PROPOSED MITIGATION	COMMENTS
<b>Proximity of proposed plant room - Risk of noise pollution</b>	Breaking up and redistribution of sauna and spa pool plant away from west boundary	More time has been spent developing the specification for the plant required for the proposed spa facilities. This work continues to confirm that the plant requirement is minimal. The main space requirement is anticipated to be for filtration of the spa pools. This is proposed to be moved to an externally accessed cupboard at the northern end of the building. Sauna 'plant' which is small in scale and localised to the saunas has been moved to cupboards adjacent to the saunas. Water cylinders for the bedrooms have been moved to the bedroom buildings. All heating will be supplied via ground source heating, which does not require an external unit.
<b>Privacy - Risk of overlooking</b>	Introduction of new stone wall as a physical barrier, extended to 1.8m high. Additional fencing to west of yoga studio preventing access to space directly east of the Dovecot pool courtyard.	Add new stone wall introduced between bedroom 2 and yoga studio. Add new estate fencing to north of yoga studio.
<b>Privacy - Sense of over-looking from high-level glazing</b>	Omission of high-level arrow slot window to bathroom of bedroom 2.	Delete window to western gable of bedroom 2.
<b>Visual impact of slate roof - Concerns over impact of the slate roof when new. Visions of one bold homogenous surface.</b>	Clarification of specification - reclaimed slate will have a soft variegated appearance in contrast to new roof of imported Spanish or Chinese slate.	Further to the move from corrugated metal roofing, reclaimed welsh slate has been specified to provide a soft, weathered finish. Illustration has been provided for clarification in the first instance. Cotswold stone roofing tiles have been dismissed partly as a design decision to articulate hierarchy of building forms and partly to protect a very limited natural resource.
<b>General comment on disturbance from noise.</b>	<div>To further safeguard the amenity of the Dovecote, the applicant is to invite the LPA to attach the following planning conditions to any planning permission issued:</div> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>No outdoor amplified music shall be played that is audible at the site boundary.</li><li>The level of noise emitted from the site shall not exceed 50 dB LAeq (30 Minute), between 09:00 and 23:00 hours Monday to Saturday and 09:00 and 22:30 on Sundays; and 40 dB LAeq (15 minute), at any other time, as measured on any boundary of the site.</li></ul></div>	Suggested as reassurance as to the levels of noise expected from the site.





DRAFT


1 **Proposed Site Plan**  
Scale: 1:200




1 **Proposed Site Plan**  
Scale: 1:200








Page 19




PROPOSED HIGH LEVEL  
ARROW SLOT WINDOW




BEDROOM 2 WEST ELEVATION -  
AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED

PROPOSED HIGH LEVEL  
WINDOW OMITTED



BEDROOM 2 WEST ELEVATION -  
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS



EXAMPLES OF RECLAIMED  
SLATE ROOFS

This page is intentionally left blank