



Planning and Licensing Committee  
14/January2026

**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday,  
14 January 2026**

Members present:

Dilys Neill (Chair)	Ian Watson (Vice Chair)	
Ray Brassington	Daryl Corps	Julia Judd
Patrick Coleman	David Fowles	Michael Vann

Officers present:

Justin Ayton, Senior Conservation and Design Officer	Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services Officer
Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services	Geraldine LeCointe, Assistant Director - Planning Services
Laurie Davis, Senior Conservation & Design Officer	Andrew Moody, Senior Planning Officer
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic Services Support Assistant
Amy Hill, Senior Planning Officer	Andrea Thomas, Licensing Officer
	Leonie Woodward, Head of Legal

Councillor Andrea Pellegram

**224 Apologies**

There were apologies for absence from Councillor Nick Bridges.

**225 Substitute Members**

There were no substitute Members.

**226 Declarations of Interest**

2:05 Councillor Fowles arrived at the Chamber.

Councillor Brassington declared that he lived in close proximity to application 24/02513/FUL.

## Planning and Licensing Committee

14/January2026

Councillor Julia Judd declared that she had known the applicant for 25/02175/FUL approximately 17 years ago but approached the application with an open mind.

Councillor Fowles declared an interest as the Coln Valley Ward Member and confirmed that he approached the application, 25/02175/FUL, with an open mind whilst representing residents' views.

Councillor Coleman declared an interest as a member of Cirencester Town Council and its Planning Committee in relation to application 25/02763/REM. He had not played a significant role in the Town Council's response and had no predetermined view.

### **227 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2025 were discussed. Councillor David Fowles proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Ray Brassington seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2025.

<b>Minutes 10 December 2025 (Resolution)</b>		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Ian Watson	1
<b>Carried</b>		

### **228 Chair's Announcements**

The Chair announced that the planning lunch had been postponed until later in the year.

### **229 Public questions**

There were no public questions.

### **230 Member questions**

There were no Member questions.

### **231 New Fee for Primate Licenses**

The purpose of the report was to seek approval to implement a fee for primate licensing applications.

Planning and Licensing Committee

14/January2026

The report was presented by Councillor Andrea Pellegram, Cabinet Member for Environment and Regulatory Services and Andrea Thomas, Licensing Officer, who made the following points:

- Fees for Primate Keeper Licences were introduced under the Animal Welfare (Primate Licences) (England) Regulations 2024. The regulations came into force on 6 April 2025, and it was noted that from 6 April 2026 it would be an offence to keep a primate without a licence.
- Provision existed to renew, vary, surrender, or revoke a licence, with inspections included.
- Proposed fees aligned with similar licensing regimes (e.g. horse-riding establishments).
- Proposed fees:
  - £530 for a new licence, £364 for a renewal, £30 for a variation
- Fees would be reviewed annually.

In discussion and questioning the following points were made:

- No primates were currently known to require a licence in the District.
- Plans were to contact local vets to identify any primates that may need licensing.
- If a primate was discovered and the keeper did not obtain a licence, the Council had enforcement powers, including prosecutions, rectification notices, or licence revocation/variation.

Councillor Ian Watson proposed supporting the recommendations in the New Primate Licencing report. Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT the application.

<b>New Fee for Primate Licences (Resolution)</b>		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	8
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
<b>Carried</b>		

---

**232 25/02763/REM - Chesterton Farm**

Reserved Matters pursuant to outline permission 16/00054/OUT relating to appearance, layout, landscaping and scale for the erection of 100 dwellings.

Case Officer: Julian Pye

Ward Member: Councillor Andrea Pellegram

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

- Updates and additional representations were included on the late pages, mainly relating to revised materials and conditions.
- A consolidated list of submitted plans was provided, along with suggested updates to conditions attached to the recommendation.
- The proposal concerned reserved matters pursuant to the outline permission for the development and erection of 100 dwellings, associated landscaping, and public open space for Phase/Subphase 2A.
- The submission effectively discharged conditions C11, 16 18 ,48 56 of the outline permission.
- The Case Officer gave an overview of the previous outline planning permission and planning framework, including the overarching, vision, parameter plans, development phasing, Site Wide Design Code (condition 9) and delivery strategy. In respect of sub Phase 2, the key issues for consideration included, design iteration/revised plans, layout, scale and massing plan, housing mix plans, elevations, street scenes, 3D visuals, materiality plan, landscaping, energy and sustainability, consultations.

Speaker 1 – Cirencester Town Councillor Andy Jopp

Cirencester Town Council had objected to the Reserved Matters application at its Planning Committee meeting on 18 November 2025. Concerns raised by the Conservation Officer had been addressed, and Gloucestershire Highways had withdrawn their objection. However, the Gloucestershire Constabulary's objection remained, particularly regarding safety and the potential fear of crime associated within 'Parking Courts' at the rear of properties. No Solar PV panels, air source heat pumps, or battery storage had been included in the plans. The Energy and Sustainability Statement assessed what may be appropriate but did not commit to provision; therefore, the objection on this matter was maintained.

Speaker 2 – Ben Leather – Applicant

The applicant explained that the site benefitted from outline permission and agreed design codes, which provided parameters and guidance for high-quality homes. The development contributed to the Council's housing target with 31 affordable homes. Amendments had been made to the eastern entrance to the Steadings plan. All homes would be electric-only, exceeding current building requirements, and including air source heat pumps and solar PV cells.

Member Questions:

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

- 'Designing Out Crime' comments were a material consideration but must be balanced against the approved outline principles and consistency with earlier

phases. Private gardens were appropriately enclosed to ensure resident privacy. Adequate parking provision was included, with revisions made to parking and amenity areas. Rear parking courts were necessary to deliver terraced housing and maintain the primary village street required by the Outline Permission. The design of parking courts had been carefully considered, including surveillance, lighting, and environmental quality.

- Officers confirmed that lighting and the quality of shared parking spaces had been carefully considered, drawing on experience from Subphase 1A, and provided assurance that these spaces would be appropriately designed and lit. It was noted that poorly designed parking courts could discourage use and undermine schemes.
- The recommendation proposed delegated authority for officers to finalise the references to updated plans and the list of conditions. Ongoing engagement with the applicant and consultees was noted, providing assurance that any minor outstanding matters were being addressed.
- Condition 13 was discussed in relation to energy provision. Officers confirmed that all dwellings would rely on air source heat pumps, as shown on the submitted plans. It was noted that photovoltaic panels may not be suitable on every dwelling due to roof orientation and efficiency. Officers proposed that the condition required development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted detailed energy strategy identifying the locations of air source heat pumps and photovoltaic panels, where appropriate. Members supported strengthening the condition to secure this information in writing.
- Officers advised that experience from other local developments had informed ongoing negotiations on new schemes. Key traditional elements were retained, including appropriate materials, built form, roof pitches, chimneys, window hierarchy, and boundary treatments, whilst incorporating simplified detailing and larger window proportions to create a cohesive and successful public realm.
- The wider development (The Steadings) included approximately 40 hectares of public open space along with play areas and sports provision. The overall aspiration remained to achieve a 10% biodiversity net gain across the development as a whole, with the Outline Permission allowing for variation between individual phases and parcels in line with the agreed delivery strategy.
- Whilst functional chimneys would have been preferable, they could not be required. Including chimneys into the roofscape was considered an important and integral design element, contributing to a positive response to the traditional character and adding visual interest.
- A refuse collection strategy plan had been submitted and formed part of the approved plans. The Highway Authority had reviewed the strategy, including swept path and vehicle tracking analysis for refuse vehicles, and was satisfied.
- The Community Management Trust would oversee the long-term management of public realm and amenities across the site. The trust was in its early stages, and residents would be expected to make a financial contribution towards its future responsibilities.

Member Comments:

- Members noted the police comments on defensible space and buildings facing inwards, emphasizing the need to create safe, liveable communities.
- Members welcomed the variation in building heights and textures shown in the plans.
- It was noted that green spaces were important for residents' recreation, including dog walking.
- Concerns were raised to ensure that the Community Management Trust would be responsible for maintaining subsequent phases of the development.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed and Councillor Ian Watson seconded the proposal approve the reserve matters subject to the conditions and allowing delegated authority to make minor adjustments to the conditions. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT the application.

15:46 – 15:56 Break

<b>25/02763/REM - Chesterton Farm - PERMIT (Resolution)</b>		
For	Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Ray Brassington	1
<b>Carried</b>		

---

**233 25/02175/FUL Thyme - Southrop Estate Office**

The proposal was for the erection of 3 new structures and associated landscaping to provide additional spa facilities and hotel accommodation.

Case Officer: Amy Hill

Ward Member: Councillor David Fowles

Officer Recommendation: PERMIT

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

- Further comments had been received in the late pages, including a letter of support, an additional objection, and information from the agent providing public footpath viewpoints and photo montages.

## Planning and Licensing Committee

14/January2026

- Shared site location, aerial photographs, title maps site boundaries, photographs from various directions, elevations plans.

### Public Speakers

#### Speaker 1 – Southrop Parish Council – Councillor Timothy Guest

Southrop Parish Council confirmed that their previously submitted statement reflected their unanimous view and remained unchanged. Whilst recognising the applicant's rationale to increase room numbers and local employment benefits, the Parish Council raised concerns about impacts on residents' enjoyment of the village, protection of heritage assets, and potential construction disruption. They did not oppose the application in principle but requested mitigation through design changes and enforceable conditions.

#### Speaker 2 - Objector - Jonathan Turnock

The objector reiterated concerns regarding visual impact, design, and proximity to listed buildings. Concern was raised about the proposed hotel accommodation block being overly dense, forming a hard edge to the village, and dominating views from public footpaths. The proximity of new buildings to the Dovecote, Newman's House, and other listed structures was highlighted, with potential harm to the conservation area and the significance of these heritage assets. The objector concluded that the development would result in substantial and permanent heritage harm, including the loss of a green gap, negative visual impact, inappropriate density and design, and loss of historic legibility, and urged the Committee to refuse the application in accordance with the 1990 Planning Act and local plan policies EN1, EN10, and EN11.

#### Speaker 3 – Supporter – Kirsty Wills

The supporter highlighted their long-term residence in Southrop and personal experience with the business. They emphasised the positive local impact of Thyme, including year-round employment, use of local suppliers, support for community events, and contribution to the village's heritage and landscape. The supporter noted that the proposed development would have minimal impact on traffic and neighbouring properties, and would be in keeping with the village character.

#### Speaker 4 – Applicant - Camilla Hibbert

The applicant noted the restoration of the derelict farmstead into a significant rural business. They highlighted the challenges of maintaining year-round occupancy and explained that the proposed spa facilities were essential to improving off-season demand, extending guest stays, and supporting local employment. The applicant noted that Planning, Environmental Health, Gloucestershire Highways, and Conservation Officers had all recommended approval, and that the scheme would sustain the business's long-term viability and contribution to the local economy.

Planning and Licensing Committee

14/January2026

Speaker 5 – Ward Member – Councillor David Fowles

The Ward Member noted that 50 residents, approximately 40% of the village, had objected, while 36 letters of support had also been submitted. They highlighted the significant contribution of Thyme to the local economy, employing over 138 people and providing wider community benefits, and recognised the sensitive restoration of existing buildings over the past 18 years. The Ward Member expressed concern that the application involved new buildings in open countryside, which could result in overdevelopment, harm to the Cotswold landscape, adverse impacts on heritage and listed buildings, noise, light, and highways issues, and the creation of a “village within a village.”

#### Member Site Inspection Briefing Feedback

- The landscape was flat with gentle slopes, the existing buildings were clearly visible with their age and use apparent, and the public footpaths were well used. They described the proposal as a finely balanced scheme.
- The site was viewed from various public footpaths, as well as in relation to the church and nearby listed buildings. The Dovecote itself was not entered.
- The lanes through the village were driven to assess the site context.
- The model showing building heights and the CGI model aided visualising the development’s impact. It was commented that it was unfortunate that light pollution could not be assessed due to the time of day.

16:50 Councillor Ray Brassington left the meeting

Councillor David Fowles raised concerns about the number of Members on the Planning and Licensing committee. The Chair explained that the Committee was quorate.

#### Member Questions

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

- The closest building to the boundary was single-storey, with a one-and-a-half-storey building set further back. There were no windows on the western elevations of the hotel bedroom or yoga studio with limited windows or doors on the spa building. Therefore, there would be no unacceptable overlooking from these buildings.
- The Flood Risk Management Officer requested additional information on drainage. The agents had agreed to the pre-commencement condition requested.
- Some lighting would be visible in the evenings, primarily from the lightweight link between the two stone buildings, but this was not considered out of character with the setting or the Conservation Area.
- Whilst the development would change the site, this would not necessitate harm to the significance of the listed buildings or the soft-edge character of the settlement. The proposed buildings were designed with small-scale, broken

Planning and Licensing Committee

14/January2026

massing in an agricultural style and the setting of the barn had already been altered by existing domestic features.

- The height of the existing boundary wall would not have affected the officer assessment or recommendation with regard to impact on heritage assets.
- Biodiverse green roofs were proposed on the more contemporary buildings to create a visual contrast with the traditional pitched-roof buildings. These roofs were intended as meadow grass roofs rather than sedum coverage.
- While permitted development rights could allow for the landing and taking off of helicopters, in the officer’s view, the addition of three extra bedrooms would not materially intensify helicopter activity.

Member Comments

- The site was already visually cluttered and confusing, noting that some existing buildings might not receive permission if assessed today.
- Concern was raised about the single-storey residential building whose garden faced the field, with features appearing overly urban and out of keeping with the countryside setting.
- From public viewpoints, including footpaths, the application site was clearly visible, reinforcing the importance of how boundaries were treated.
- The economic benefit of the proposal carried greater weight than was typically the case when assessing impacts on listed buildings and their settings.

Councillor Ian Watson proposed and Councillor Michael Vann seconded the proposal to permit the application. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT the application.

<b>25/02175/FUL Thyme - Southrop Estate Office - PERMIT (Resolution)</b>		
For	Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	5
Against	David Fowles	1
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Julia Judd	1
<b>Carried</b>		

---

**234 25/02722/LBC Thyme - Southrop Estate Office**

The proposal was for the erection of glazed extension to curtilage listed building at Thyme.

Case Officer: Amy Hill

Ward Member: Councillor David Fowles

Planning and Licensing Committee

14/January2026

Officer Recommendation: PERMIT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application. The Case Officer shared the Site Location Map, aerial photographs and photographs from different directions.

Member Comments:

- Clarity was sought regarding the meaning of curtilage listing within the context of this application. Officers explained that Southrop Lodge was the principal listed building. Stable Cottage was curtilage-listed, with its significance and protection deriving from its historic association with the Lodge. It was stated that when there was an ancillary structure that has been within the curtilage of a listed building since at least 1948 then it was treated as if it was a part of the primary building.

Councillor Michael Vann proposed and Councillor Ian Watson seconded the proposal to permit the application. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT the application.

<b>25/02722/LBC Thyme - Southrop Estate Office - PERMIT (Resolution)</b>		
For	Patrick Coleman, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	4
Against	Julia Judd	1
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Daryl Corps and David Fowles	2
<b>Carried</b>		

---

### **235 24/02513/FUL Siddington Park**

Development of land and erection of buildings to expand an existing Integrated Retirement Community (Use Class C2).

Case Officer: Andrew Moody

Ward Member: Councillor Mike Evemy

Officer recommendation: PERMIT SUBJECT TO THE COMPLETION OF A SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT.

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

- The Tree Officer's condition had already been included in the agenda but had been omitted from the consultee list in error.

## Planning and Licensing Committee

14/January2026

- Revised comments from the Parish Council had been received which raised an objection to the proposal.
- Site location plan, proposed site block plan, aerial photograph, proposed landscaping, elevations, shadow diagrams and photographs in around the site were shared.

### Public Speakers

#### Speaker 1 – John Vale - Objector

The Objector claimed that the scheme was flawed, with officer assessments considered unreliable. They noted that the Council's Conservation Officer had unresolved concerns and that local residents and the ward councillor objected. The proposed development was described as overdevelopment, causing overlooking and harm to residential amenity. The Shadow Study was criticised for failing to account for the loss of mature boundary trees and reduced privacy. Phase 2 building heights and massing were not seen as responsive to site levels or the surrounding low-rise homes.

#### Speaker 2 – Rob Henderson – Agent

The agent stated that the applicant had worked closely with officers, particularly the Conservation Officer, to refine the design over time. Revisions addressed impacts on neighbouring homes, avoided overlooking and exceeded separation standards. The Care Village required a certain density to function, which was carefully balanced with its setting. Most concerns raised had been resolved, parking was acceptable, biodiversity gains were high, and the scheme had been presented as a successful and appropriate extension of the existing village.

17:34 – Councillor Ray Brassington returned to the Chamber but did not vote on the application.

#### Speaker 3 – Councillor Mike Evemy – Ward Member

The Ward Member identified the concerns of the size, scale and impact of the development whilst acknowledging the community value of providing 55 dwellings for older people and accepting that demand had been demonstrated. They expressed disappointment that the scheme contained no affordable housing and would be entirely market-led. The Ward Member concluded that the decision rested on whether 55 market units in six blocks, including one four-storey block, was too large and too close to neighbouring properties at Preston Lye with the potential loss of mature boundary trees. They urged the Committee to give careful consideration to whether the proposal was overly intensive and harmful to neighbouring amenity.

### Member Questions:

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

- The site was within a sensitive area identified in the Preston Neighbourhood Plan as Area 6, where recent development had altered the historic agricultural

Planning and Licensing Committee

14/January2026

setting. The only area specifically referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan was to the North-West of Preston Bridge, adjoining the Tesco car park.

- The site had originally been allocated for employment use in the 2006 local plan but had not been brought forward, resulting in a C2 residential use being established through a 2011 outline permission.
- Adopted local plan policies and the Gloucestershire Local Housing Needs Assessment identified a significant and increasing need for sheltered, extra care and nursing accommodation.
- An independent assessment by external consultants and the Council Strategic Housing team, having reviewed both the viability appraisal and the consultants' advice, was satisfied that affordable housing could not be required in this case.
- The development included a total of 109 bedrooms and provided 68 parking spaces.
- Part of the legal agreement, which was still pending completion, included a travel plan to promote sustainable transport and facilitate residents' travel. Similar travel schemes were already in place for Phase One residents.
- An additional condition could be added to specify the use of air source heat pumps or solar panels.
- Conditions could be amended to apply from the first occupation of any units, and references to NPPF paragraphs could specifically cite paragraphs 135(f) and 198.

Member Comments:

Members proposed the following reasons to arrange a Site Inspection Briefing:

- To assess the impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties.
- To consider the effects on existing trees, including identifying which trees would be lost.
- To evaluate the massing and siting of the new buildings in the context of Preston Leigh.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed an All-Member Site Inspection Briefing and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To DEFER the application in favour of a Site Inspection Briefing.

<b>24/02513/FUL Siddington Park - DEFER pending SIB (Resolution)</b>		
For	Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
<b>Carried</b>		

**236 Licensing Sub-Committee**

There were no licensing sub-committees planned.

Subsequently, a Licensing Committee meeting was called for 12 February 11am.

**237 Sites Inspection Briefing**

The Chair advised all Members to keep 4 February 2026 free for a Site Inspection Briefing.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 5.56 pm

Chair

(END)