



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday,
12 November 2025**

Members present:

Dilys Neill (Chair)

Ray Brassington

Nick Bridges

Julia Judd

David Fowles

Michael Vann

Clare Turner

Patrick Coleman

Officers present:

Marie Barnes, Lawyer

Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services

Andrew Moody, Senior Planning Officer

Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services
Officer

Eleanor Ward, Senior Conversation Officer

Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer

Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic
Services Support Assistant

202 Apologies

There were apologies for absence from Councillors Ian Watson, Andrew Maclean, Daryl Corps and Tristan Wilkinson.

203 Substitute Members

Councillor Clare Turner substituted for Councillor Andrew Maclean. Councillor Julia Judd assisted the Chair in the absence of the Vice-Chair.

204 Declarations of Interest

There were no interests declared.

205 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 8 October 2025 were discussed. Councillor Fowles proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Brassington seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

Minutes of meeting held on 8 October 2025 - APPROVE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Clare Turner	1
Carried		

206 Chair's Announcements

Members were informed that the annual planners' Christmas lunch will be arranged for January.

207 Public questions

There were no public questions.

208 Member questions

There were no Member questions. A question from Councillor Maclean was deferred.

209 25/02458/FUL - Brook Close, Rodmarton

The proposal was for the demolition of existing dwellings and outbuildings and the replacement with a self-build dwelling.

Case Officer: Andrew Moody

Ward Member: Mike McKeown

Officer recommendation: REFUSE

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application who made the following points:

- Various plans were shared, including block and site plans, aerial photographs, existing and proposed elevations showing the proposed dwelling's ridge height, proposed floor plans and street view, photographs of building and neighbouring 'arts' buildings.

Public Speakers:

Speaker 1 – Supporter

Candida Feversham stated that the suggestion of any 'group value' with the seven historic Little Tarlton cottages was incorrect, as those cottages formed a distinct and

Planning and Licensing Committee

12/November2025

cohesive group and Brook Close was entirely separate in both style and setting. They noted the need for the village to attract younger families and believed this project supported that aim.

Speaker 2 – Applicant

Emily Olsen explained that the existing, heavily altered house was neither listed nor suitable as a modern family home. They argued that the proposed replacement would not harm the conservation area or nearby listed cottages. The new design used Cotswold stone and traditional vernacular forms, alongside a landscape scheme that enhanced biodiversity. They emphasised the high sustainability standards and reported no objections or letters of support.

Speaker 3 – Ward Member

Councillor Mike McKeown's words were read by Democratic Services.

The Ward Member explained that the application was referred to Committee because it represented a balanced case requiring open consideration. They noted that whilst officers recommend refusal on heritage grounds, the existing dwelling had been heavily altered and its heritage value was limited. The proposed replacement was high-quality, used local materials, improved landscaping and biodiversity, and would deliver significant sustainability benefits.

SIB Feedback

Committee Members who attended the Site Inspection Briefing made the following observations:

- There was an unusually large garden-to-property ratio and the outbuilding was an authentic example of Arts and Crafts design.
- Whilst the property was a unique and attractive asset and staged development could enhance the value of an older building, there were a significant number of issues to be addressed.
- The front façade of the property was attractive, but the rear was less so. The tall garage would be visible to neighbouring properties.
- Previous alterations, including the sympathetically raised roof, were acceptable, whereas the 1970s extension was considered less attractive.
- The property had traditionally been a smaller, more modest house within the village.

Member questions

Members asked questions of the officers, who responded in the following way:

- The existing house had a ridge height of 6.8m, while the proposed dwelling's ridge height was 9.395m, an increase of 2.595m. The reference to 10.865 m was the maximum height of the proposed chimney.
- The existing ground floor area was 77.1m² whilst the proposed area was approximately 243m²

- The site included a non-designated heritage asset of low significance, alongside designated heritage assets, namely the conservation area and listed buildings, which carried greater weight. Under paragraph 216 of the NPPF, the harm to a non-designated asset should be balanced against its significance, considering design quality and climate mitigation. The non-designated asset was assessed as low to moderate significance.
- Officers raised concerns about the loss of the non-designated heritage asset and the proposed dwelling's design, scale, and position. No issues were noted regarding the garage and neighbouring property, as a hedgerow and tree planting were planned. Permitted development rights would be removed to prevent new openings on the outbuilding's rear elevation.
- The Conservation Officer highlighted that the key harmful elements of the proposal related to the site context, scale, and massing of the new building, including the proposed garage which would exceed six metres in height, rather than the architectural design itself.
- The Conservation Officer explained that introducing a modern, contemporary structure of this size in the historic context could increase perceived harm. The site sat between two designated heritage assets, the conservation area and the Little Tarlton listed buildings and the spatial separation and treatment of this area was important. The relatively small scale of the surrounding buildings meant that the proposal's overall size and massing, rather than its design, were the primary issues.
- Members made the point that the proposed garage was almost the same size as the existing house that was to be demolished. Officers concluded that they did not have concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring properties.
- The proposed property would be large compared to most other residential properties nearby.
- Members asked whether it would be possible to refuse the proposed garage while approving the rest of the development. Officers confirmed that a split decision was technically possible but extremely challenging. It would require very precise planning conditions, clearly defined approved plans, and potentially a revised description of development.

Member Comments

In discussing the application, Members made the following comments:

- The existing cottage could be replaced to gain the sustainability benefits of a new dwelling, but the proposed house was considered too large for its location, with a significant impact on the site and surroundings.
- The hierarchy of the site and heritage asset had been considered, reflecting a finely balanced assessment of the setting.
- Concerns were raised about the garage, with its scale, increased height, and floor space considered too large; the proposed building did not comply with the Cotswold Design Code.

Planning and Licensing Committee

12/November2025

- Rodmarton comprised of simple, modest buildings, and that the open gaps between them were important to maintain the village's rural character.
- There was support for a house on the site with modern facilities, but concerns were raised that the proposed size and scale were disproportionate to the village hierarchy.

Councillor Fowles proposed refusing the application and Councillor Brassington seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to REFUSE the application.

25/02458/FUL - Brook Close, Rodmarton - REFUSE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Clare Turner and Michael Vann	7
Against	Patrick Coleman	1
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

210 Sites Inspection Briefing

The Chair advised members to keep 3 December 2025 free for a possible Site Inspection Briefing.

Councillors Dilys Neill, Ian Watson, Nick Bridges, Daryl Corps, Michael Vann.

211 Licensing Sub-Committee

There was no licensing sub-committee planned.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 3.21 pm

Chair

(END)