



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on
Wednesday, 8 July 2026**

Members present:

Ian Watson (Chair)	Nikki Ind (Vice Chair)	
Ray Brassington	Daryl Corps	Julia Judd
Nick Bridges	Paul Evans	Michael Vann
Patrick Coleman	David Fowles	

Officers present:

Marie Barnes, Lawyer	Geraldine LeCointe, Assistant Director - Planning Services
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer
Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services Officer	Rebecca McAndrew, Consultant Planner
	Matthew Jopp, Principle Highway Development Management Officer

Observers:

Councillor Gina Blomefield

303 Apologies

There were apologies from Councillor Dilys Neill.

304 Substitute Members

Councillor Nikki Ind was Vice Chair and Councillor Ian Watson was Chair.

305 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Daryl Corps declared an interest in the application for Land by the Fosseyway Garden Centre. He declared that he would address the Committee as Ward Member and then leave the Chamber before the debate and vote.

306 Minutes

Planning and Licensing Committee

08/July2026

The minutes of the meeting on 10 June 2026 were discussed.

Councillor Brassington requested an update on the Member question from the last meeting.

Councillor Fowles proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Coleman 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 June 2026.

To Confirm the minutes held 10 June 2026 (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Paul Evans, David Fowles, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	10
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

307 Chair's Announcements

Members were advised that Licensing training would take place on 27 July, the next Planning Committee meeting had been rescheduled to Tuesday 11 August, and supplementary reports had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

308 Public questions

There were no public questions.

309 Member questions

There were no Member questions.

310 25/02687/FUL Land Parcel East of Willersey Business Park

The proposal was for residential development comprising 60 dwellings.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Member: Councillors Gina Blomefield and Tom Stowe

Recommendation:

PERMIT subject to no objection from Biodiversity Officer (and associated conditions), the completion of a S106 legal agreement covering matters such as affordable housing, self-build/custom build plots, Biodiversity Net Gain monitoring, and financial contributions to education and library services, highways and Willersey Parish Council.

Planning and Licensing Committee

08/July2026

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application. The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee including additional pages:

- Members were advised of two additional Parish Council representations, relating to foul drainage and a Section 106 contribution towards a Multi-Use Games Area.

Public Speakers

Public Speaker – Kevin O'Donoghue – Parish Council

The Parish Council requested a larger Section 106 contribution towards recreation, arguing that the proposed on-site provision did not adequately cater for older children or adults and that a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) was needed to serve the growing village population. Concerns were raised regarding foul drainage, with a request that a pre-occupation condition be added to ensure sewerage improvements were completed before any dwellings were occupied.

Public Speaker – Councillor Gina Blomefield – Ward Member

Whilst welcoming the additional highway mitigation measures, concerns remained that they did not address existing highway safety issues, particularly given cumulative development and the proximity of a proposed industrial access.

Concerns were also raised regarding the adequacy of the existing footway and sewerage capacity. Support was expressed for the Parish Council's proposed condition requiring drainage improvements to be completed before occupation of the development.

Members questions

Members of the Committee asked a series of questions and noted that:

- The requested highway contributions had been accepted. Biodiversity net gain calculations remained under discussion, although protected species and habitat issues had been resolved.
- No solar panels were proposed as part of the application.
- A Gloucestershire Highways site visit had been undertaken. Cumulative impacts from surrounding developments had been considered, and the proposed highway mitigation measures were considered proportionate and sufficient to provide safe and suitable access for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, including at the public footpath crossing opposite the site.
- The proposed recreation provision complied with planning policy, with an £8,000 contribution secured towards the village recreation ground. A Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA) was not considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and therefore could not be required through a Section 106 agreement. The Parish Council would also receive Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding, which could be used towards future infrastructure projects.
- Severn Trent had not yet identified whether network improvements would be necessary. The recommended Grampian condition required drainage details and any necessary upgrade programme to be agreed before development commenced

and was considered sufficiently robust while allowing flexibility for Severn Trent to determine and implement any required works.

- A deferral was not considered necessary, as foul drainage was regulated under separate legislation and Severn Trent had a statutory duty to provide a connection.
- The residential travel plan contribution would fund the monitoring and implementation of sustainable travel measures over a five-year period. Public transport contributions would be used to improve existing bus stops within the village, with the final specification to be agreed through the Section 106 Agreement.
- Education transport contributions were calculated to mitigate the impact of the development on home-to-school transport provision, based on projected pupil numbers and a three-year funding period.
- The highway works were required to be completed before occupation of the development. The Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce revised speed limits would be progressed separately under the Highways Act and was not considered necessary to condition before occupation.
- The precise cause and scale of the sewerage capacity issues had not yet been identified but were understood to relate to the sewer network rather than the treatment works themselves. Responsibility for identifying and delivering any necessary improvements rested with Severn Trent under its statutory duties, with the planning condition requiring an agreed drainage scheme and implementation programme.

Member comments

Councillor Fowles proposed that consideration of the application be deferred pending the outcome of Severn Trent's investigations into the existing foul drainage network, expressing concern that the nature and extent of the identified capacity issues remained unknown.

Councillor David Fowles proposed DEFERRING the application and Councillor Daryl Corps seconded the proposal.

The proposal was put to the vote and rejected by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to REJECT the proposal to defer the application.

- Concern was raised that the development did not include solar panels, given the Council's declaration of a climate emergency and its environmental policies.
- Concern was raised regarding the site's proximity to the adjacent industrial estate and the potential for future amenity issues, including noise, dust and fumes.
- There were no sustainable highway grounds for refusal, given the advice and recommendations of the Highway Authority.
- Objections related not to the principle of development, but to whether the supporting infrastructure, particularly foul drainage, was capable of accommodating further housing.

Planning and Licensing Committee

08/July2026

- Ongoing uncertainty surrounding sewerage capacity, although it was acknowledged that the proposed Grampian condition reflected current planning guidance and appeal decisions.
- Appreciation was expressed to the Gloucestershire Highways Officer for attending the meeting and providing clarification on the proposed highway mitigation measures

Councillor Julia Judd proposed PERMITTING the application and Councillor Coleman seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

08. 25/02687/FUL Land East of Willersey Business Park - DEFER (Resolution)		
For	Daryl Corps and David Fowles	2
Against	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Nick Bridges	1
Rejected		

08. 25/02687/FUL Land East of Willersey Business Park - PERMIT (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	8
Against	Daryl Corps and David Fowles	2
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

311 26/00613/OUT Land to the East of Nostle Road

The proposal was Outline application for 50 dwellings.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Member: Councillor Tony Dale

Recommendation:

PERMIT subject to no objection from Biodiversity Officer (and any associated conditions), completion of a S106 legal agreement covering the provision of affordable and self-build/custom build housing, Biodiversity Net Gain Monitoring and financial contributions to secondary (16-18) education, library services, school transport, bus stops and a travel plan.

Planning and Licensing Committee

08/July2026

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee including additional pages:

- Further representation had been received from the Cotswolds National Landscape Board objecting to the application on the basis that it constituted major development within the AONB. These matters had been addressed within the report and the recommendation remained unchanged.

Public Speakers

Public speaker – Councillor Michael Seath – Town and Parish Council

The Town Council did not object to the principle of development but remained concerned about the scale of the proposal and its impact on the landscape and local community. The proposal would result in a permanent loss of landscape and that the development did not accord with the landscape guidance for the site. Reference was made to the objection from the Cotswold National Landscape Board. Concerns were raised regarding drinking water capacity, foul drainage and flood risk, with support expressed for pre-commencement or pre-occupation conditions relating to water infrastructure. If permission was granted, it was requested that additional landscape, drainage and principal residence conditions be imposed.

Public speaker – Mr George Hudson – Agent/Applicant

The proposal formed part of the allocated Local Plan site and had been developed following officer advice to deliver a comprehensive scheme. The development sought to provide high-quality homes using local materials, support the local economy during construction, and contribute to the long-term sustainability of Northleach by increasing the resident population and supporting local services.

Site Inspection Briefing

- The site was prominent within the landscape, with rising ground and visible contours that were not fully apparent from the plans.
- The proposed access from Nostle Road avoided the main road network.
- The proposed development would extend beyond the established building line of the existing development opposite, increasing its visual prominence.
- It was recognised that the detailed design of the development would be considered at the reserved matters stage and would be important in integrating the development into the surrounding area.
- The adjacent residential development had become well integrated into the town over time, demonstrating good design and landscaping.

Members questions

Members of the Committee asked a series of questions and noted that:

- The site was allocated for housing in the Local Plan and that the submitted layout was indicative only. The increased capacity reflected changes in national planning policy promoting the efficient use of land, with officers considering the proposed extent of development to respond appropriately to the site's

topography and setting. Detailed design, landscaping, lighting, green infrastructure and water supply infrastructure would be considered through reserved matters and planning conditions.

- The proposed road layout was indicative only and that the road terminus would provide continued access through the existing field gate to the adjoining land, rather than indicating future development access.
- The secondary education contribution would be used to provide additional education infrastructure, including school places or facilities, to accommodate pupils generated by the development.
- Members could request the reserved matters application be brought back to Planning Committee. However, forthcoming changes to the national scheme of delegation could result in reserved matters applications being determined under delegated powers rather than by committee.
- Whilst the Cotswold National Landscape Board objected on landscape grounds, officers considered the visual impact to be localised and not sufficient to justify refusal when balanced against the benefits of the development.

Member comments

- Support was expressed for the indicative layout, noting that the proposed design would create a more balanced entrance to the town and demonstrated thoughtful design.
- The scale of development would be delivered over a number of years and was considered proportionate in the context of the town's growth.
- The provision of affordable housing was welcomed, with the view that it could make a significant contribution towards meeting identified local housing need.
- Additional housing would help support the long-term vitality and sustainability of Northleach's local services and facilities.
- The Town Council did not object to the principle of development and that scrutiny had identified matters to be addressed through the subsequent stages of the application.

16:30 Councillor Michael Vann left the chamber and did not take part in the vote.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed PERMITTING the application and Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

09. 26/00613/OUT Land East of Nostle Road - PERMIT (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Paul Evans, David Fowles, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd and Ian Watson	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

312 25/02443/FUL Land to the West of Fosseway Farm

The proposal was for the construction of 10 dwellings.

Case Officer: Rebecca McAndrew

Ward Member: Councillor Daryl Corps

Recommendation:

PERMIT subject to the completion of a S.106 agreement securing travel plan and the offsite highways work monitoring

Subject to conditions. – Updated Recommendations.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee including additional pages:

- Gloucestershire Highways had withdrawn the requirement for a Travel Plan and associated Section 106 obligation. The recommendation was therefore amended to grant planning permission subject to conditions only.

Public Speakers

Public speaker – Cllr Eileen Viviani – Town and Parish Council

Concerns were raised that the Highway Authority's assessment did not fully reflect existing congestion in Moreton-in-Marsh or the cumulative impact of additional traffic. It was requested that the Committee apply the same pre-occupation water infrastructure conditions as those imposed by a recent Planning Inspector's appeal decision. It was further argued that, given the site's location within the Cotswold National Landscape and the absence of affordable housing, the proposal's benefits did not outweigh the perceived harm.

Public speaker – Dale Radford – Agent/Applicant

The proposal had been developed in collaboration with officers and technical consultees to address issues raised during the application process.

The scheme would deliver ten high-quality bungalows in a sustainable location, providing a specialist form of housing whilst incorporating landscaping and biodiversity enhancements. Technical consultees had raised no outstanding objections and the proposal represented an appropriate balance between identified impacts and the public benefits of the development.

Public Speaker – Councillor Daryl Corps – Ward Member

Concerns were raised regarding the site's location adjacent to the A429, existing traffic congestion, cumulative development, the proximity of the access to the adjacent care home and the resulting highway safety impacts. The site lay outside the development boundary within the Cotswold National Landscape and was therefore contrary to Local

Planning and Licensing Committee

08/July2026

Plan Policy DS4. Concern was also expressed that the proposal would provide no affordable housing. A site visit and further consideration by Gloucestershire Highways were requested before the application was determined. If approved, it was requested that the development be restricted to single-storey bungalows.

17:00 – Councillor Corps left the chamber and did not take any further part in the debate or vote.

Members questions

Members of the Committee asked a series of questions and noted that:

- Whilst the proposal met the threshold requiring affordable housing, the applicant had submitted a viability assessment demonstrating that affordable housing could not be provided. This assessment had been independently reviewed on behalf of the Council, which agreed that a viability gap existed. Concern was expressed that the development would not deliver any affordable housing despite the identified local need.
- The Highway Authority had assessed the proposed site access and was satisfied that it was suitable, with officers relying on the specialist advice provided. The consultation response did not confirm whether a site visit had been undertaken.
- A petition had been received objecting to the application on grounds relating to the impact on the adjoining care home, highway safety, development outside the settlement boundary within the Cotswold National Landscape, and conflict with the emerging neighbourhood plan.

Member comments

A proposal was made to defer the application to enable Members to undertake a site visit. The reasons included concerns regarding the site's relationship with the adjacent care home, the proposed access arrangements and existing traffic conditions.

Councillor David Fowles proposed deferring the application for a Site Inspection Briefing and Councillor Paul Evans seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to DEFER the application.

10. 25/02443/FUL Land West of Fossey Farm - DEFER (Subject to Site Inspection) (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, David Fowles, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd and Ian Watson	8
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	Daryl Corps	1
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

Planning and Licensing Committee

08/July2026

313 Sites Inspection Briefing

The Chair advised members to keep the 5 August 2026 free for a Site Inspection Briefing.

314 Licensing Sub-Committee

Members for 9 July 2026

Councillors Ian Watson (Chair), Michael Vann, Ray Brassington

Members for 14 July 2026

Councillors Ian Watson (Chair). Paul Evans, Michael Vann

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 5.19 pm