



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday,
11 June 2025**

Members present:

Dilys Neill (Chair)	Ian Watson (Vice-Chair)	Michael Vann
Ray Brassington	David Fowles	Len Wilkins
Nick Bridges	Andrew Maclean	Patrick Coleman
Patrick Coleman	Michael Vann	

Officers present:

Geraldine LeCointe, Assistant Director - Planning Services	Helen Cooper, Senior Planning Case Officer
Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services	Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Helen Martin, Director of Communities and Place
Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic Services Support Assistant	Marie Barnes, Lawyer
Angela Claridge, Director of Governance and Development (Monitoring Officer)	Rachael White, Communications Officer

Observers:

Councillor Juliet Layton

137 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Julia Judd and Daryl Corps.

138 Substitute Members

Councillor Len Wilkins substituted for Councillor Daryl Corps.

139 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Fowles noted, in relation to the first item on the agenda, that the supporter, Mr Harris was the former Council leader and was known to Members of the Committee and that the Agent for the third application previously worked at the Council planning department. He declared that these were working relationships and he had no pecuniary interests.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/June2025

Councillor Neill noted a past acquaintance with the applicant for item three, including a prior visit for building advice and past donations made by the applicant to a village fête. The member confirmed no pecuniary interest and no recent contact.

Councillor Patrick Coleman declared that he had been a member of the Cirencester Town Council Planning Committee that had submitted a view on the first planning Application.

140 Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2025 were discussed.

Councillor David Fowles proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Andrew Maclean seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2025.

Minutes (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill and Ian Watson	6
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Nick Bridges, Michael Vann and Len Wilkins	3
Carried		

141 Chair's Announcements

There were no Chair's Announcements.

142 Public questions

There were no public questions.

143 Member questions

There were no member questions.

144 24/02854/OUT - Land West of Kingshill Lane, Cirencester.

Proposal

Residential development for up to 280 dwellings.

Case Officer

Martin Perks

Ward Member

Councillor Mike Evemy

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/June2025

Recommendation

PERMIT subject to no objection from Gloucestershire County Council Highways and completion of S106 legal agreement covering provision of affordable housing, self-build/custom build plots, highway improvements works (if required), Public Open Space management and maintenance, Biodiversity Net Gain, financial contributions to libraries and North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer introduced the application:

- The additional pages published on 6 June contained an objection from a resident that was later withdrawn which was explained in the Additional pages on 10 June. Further objections were included in the additional pages on 10 June along with the response from Gloucestershire Highways consultation with no objection to the application.
- A further objection was received, stating that the proposal would significantly alter the character of Preston village. Key concerns included the risk of urban sprawl, increased traffic at the Swindon Road junction, flooding issues, insufficient provision for pedestrian and cycle access, and inadequate local infrastructure.
- Various location maps, aerial photographs, site master plan, footpath plan, and the 3 options for linking to the local schools were shared.

Public Speakers:

Public Speaker 1

Preston Parish Council - Mrs Julie Tomblin

- The Chair of Preston Parish Council outlined concerns about the proposed development's impact on the village's rural character and identity.
- The site separated Cirencester and Preston, raising fears of urban sprawl.
- The Parish Council requested that the development include a green buffer along Kingshill Lane.
- Support was expressed for Active Travel England's recommendation to refuse the application without adequate walking and cycling infrastructure.
- Suggestions included:
 - Extending pedestrian and cycle routes
 - Creating a footpath to link with schools
 - Implementing safe crossing at Preston Toll Bar
- The Parish Council requested that the application comply with the Preston Neighbourhood Development Plan, regarding sustainable transport and protection of village character.

Public Speaker 2

Supporter – Mr Joe Harris

- Reference was made to current housing waiting lists: Cirencester (794), Siddington (262), and Preston (15).

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/June2025

- The scheme would deliver 280 homes, including 112 affordable units (40%) across social rent, shared ownership, and First Homes.
- The site was described as well-located, with a layout sensitive to surroundings and commitments to biodiversity and active travel improvements.
- It was noted that following changes to national policy in December 2023, the Council now had a 1.8-year housing land supply, triggering the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Ward Member

Councillor Mike Every

- Acknowledged objectors' and parish council concerns regarding:
 - Loss of farmland
 - Impact on Preston's historic character
 - Effect on the setting of the listed Forty Farm
 - Loss of key views into Cirencester (as in a 2023 refusal)
- Noted that the site is not allocated in the local plan and was previously refused, but national policy changes and a 1.8-year housing land supply now shift the balance to committee decision.
- Recognised benefits including 112 affordable homes.
- Supported the proposed foot/cycle path behind the football club for safer school access.
- Raised safety concerns over Kingshill Road and the need for improved crossing at Preston Toll Bar

Member questions

A member requested a site visit, noting the significance of the proposed development and its impact on Cirencester. They raised concerns about morning traffic congestion, the existing green buffer between settlements, and stressed the importance of seeing the site first-hand, particularly in relation to the scale of development and conditions at the A417 junction.

A member sought officer guidance on whether the application could be considered premature, given the ongoing local plan review process.

A member asked for clarification on the weight that should be given to neighbourhood development plans, specifically in relation to the Preston plan

An officer clarified that, under paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council's local plan development strategy (DS) policies were currently considered out of date. As such, applications must be assessed under the "tilted balance" approach, weighing benefits against harms. The application was not considered premature, as the local plan review was still some way from submission or examination.

It was confirmed that the Preston Neighbourhood Plan held equal weight to the local plan and, while not prohibiting development, set expectations to preserve rural character and village identity, to be addressed through future planning conditions and a strategic masterplan.

A member expressed concern that proposed cycling infrastructure along the main road may be unsuitable. They emphasised the importance of prioritising strong walking and cycling links from the development to the town centre and amenities.

The Case Officer clarified that matters relating to internal connectivity, including pedestrian and cycle routes, would be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage. The aim would be to ensure routes would be suitable for use by non-car modes of transport.

The Highways Officer advised that installing a signal-controlled pedestrian crossing on the main road may not be feasible due to existing traffic delays but confirmed it would be explored as part of further discussions. Priority was given to routes serving the primary and secondary schools, as these had the greatest usage by vulnerable road users. Options for route placement, either alongside the carriageway or behind the hedge, were being considered relating to safety, lighting, and landscaping.

A member questioned the placement of green space along the southern edge of the site, suggesting that a central location, within the development could better serve the community.

The Case Officer explained that the latest scheme included more green space along the central hedgerow to avoid a harsh, urban feel. While the southern edge would be used for green space to buffer the village and listed building and to accommodate drainage needs, efforts had also been made to introduce greenery within the heart of the development.

A member questioned the feasibility of extending the bus route to include this part of town. They also inquired whether there was any guidance on the minimum bus contribution required within a sustainable transport plan.

The Case Officer advised that there was no specific guidance on a minimum bus contribution in this case. Contributions to public transport were usually guided by Gloucestershire County Highways. The footpath to the south improves connectivity to nearby bus stops within walking distance. Further details on sustainable transport measures would be addressed in the required travel plan.

A member expressed concerns regarding flooding, noting that although the site lies within Flood Zone 1, runoff drains into Flood Zones 2 and 3. Recent incidents included main road flooding due to river surcharging and sewer surcharging from excessive water inflow.

They referenced a condition requiring all foul water network upgrades to be completed before accommodating additional flows but questioned the enforceability of this condition, citing past delays by Thames Water in lining sewers and implementing mitigation works.

The Case Officer explained that the condition regarding foul water upgrades was recommended by Thames Water, the statutory undertaker responsible for connecting developments to the water system under the Water Industry Act. Thames Water must ensure that infrastructure can support new developments and would assess submitted details accordingly.

Regarding surface water, Gloucestershire County Council as the lead local flood authority, had reviewed drainage reports and was satisfied, subject to conditions requiring onsite infiltration basins and sustainable drainage systems.

A Member sought clarification from the Case Officer regarding Active Travel England's recommendation to refuse the application on the grounds that it did not comply with paragraphs 109, 115, 117, and 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Case Officer noted that, given local constraints such as flood risk, landscape designations, and existing permissions, viable sites in Cirencester were extremely limited. The proposed development was considered to be in a sustainable location, with further improvements planned to pedestrian and cycle routes. Officers highlighted the importance of balancing sustainable transport concerns with the district's significant housing delivery requirements.

A member queried whether any highway improvements were planned.

The Case Officer explained that Junction 7 (Preston Toll Bar) was already over capacity, but the additional impact from the development was not considered "severe" under national policy, so it could not be considered grounds for refusal. Traffic queuing was limited to short morning peak periods.

A question was raised about the urgency of this new application given that the nearby Steadings site already had permission for 2,350 homes, including affordable units. Concern was expressed about slow delivery on that site and how it related to current housing pressure and the local housing waiting list.

The Case Officer explained that the current local plan (2018) only supported delivery of around 100 affordable homes per year, well below the identified need of 150. Maximising affordable housing from all available sites remained crucial.

A query was raised about whether dialogue had taken place with local schools and doctor surgeries to ensure they could support an increase in pupil numbers and pressure on local infrastructure.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/June2025

Gloucestershire County Council had confirmed that local primary and secondary schools had sufficient capacity and had not requested funding. No response was received from the NHS regarding GP provision.

Member comments

Members discussed the proposal of an all Member Site Inspection Briefing due to the proposed number of houses and various points of concern raised by Committee Members and the Preston Parish Council.

Councillor David Fowles proposed an all Member Site Inspection Briefing and Councillor Patrick Coleman seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: to REFUSE a Site Inspection Briefing.

Site Inspection briefing (Resolution)		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles and Len Wilkins	4
Against	Ray Brassington, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	5
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Rejected		

Members requested that a Construction Management Plan be implemented to limit noise and dust effects to existing properties.

Councillor Andrew Maclean proposed accepting the Officer recommendations and Councillor Ian Watson seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT subject completion of S106 legal agreement covering provision of affordable housing, self-build/custom build plots, highway improvements works (if required), Public Open Space management and maintenance, Biodiversity Net Gain, financial contributions to libraries and North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation and a condition requiring the submission of this construction management plan to be agreed.

Delegated authority for minor amendments to Section 106 conditions.

24/02854/OUT - Land West of Kingshill Lane. To Permit (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins	6
Against	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman and David Fowles	3
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

Proposal

Removal of stables, erection of a dwelling.

Case Officer

Helen Cooper

Ward Member

Councillor Len Wilkins

Recommendation

PERMIT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer introduced the application:

- An error in the report, paragraph 10.45 should have read 'Greenbank Cottage' rather than 'Wayside'
- There was a typing error in paragraph 10.60. It should have read 'a new site access is proposed and the access arrangements have been reviewed by highways who have raised no objection.'
- Additional pages were submitted containing public comments.
- A site location plan, ariel photo, original proposal and amendment layout plans, site photographs, road view and access were shared.

Public Speakers

Public Speaker1

The Temple Guiting Parish Council Member, Councillor Liza Hanks, made the following points:

- The proposed building (6.6m high) was considered too tall and overpowering for the plot.
- It was out of keeping with local character; conflicted with Cotswold Design Code.
- Driveway access was steep, narrow, and unsafe for vehicle manoeuvring.
- There was no public benefit; not affordable housing.
- There would be a 57% biodiversity loss.
- The application failed to meet five Cotswold Local Plan policies:
 - DS3 – Not proportionate or supportive of local character.
 - EN2 – Disregards area's distinctiveness.
 - EN4 – Conflicts with historic landscape character.
 - EN10 – No public benefit to outweigh heritage harm.
 - EN5 – Does not conserve or enhance the AONB.
- They requested refusal or, alternatively, a committee site visit.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/June2025

Public Speaker 2

Mr James Emtage, Objector, made the following points:

- The site was situated outside the established village envelope and the application was contrary to Local Plan Policy DS3.
- The proposed dwelling was tall and elevated, making it visually intrusive in the rural landscape and harmful to the character of the Cotswolds National Landscape.
- The scheme included no affordable housing. A covenant for local occupancy and a scaled-down, single-storey design were suggested to make it more suitable for local families.

Public Speaker 3

The agent, Mark Pettit, made the following points:

- The proposal aligned with Local Plan policy allowing small-scale housing in non-principal settlements and contributed to housing supply.
- The scheme was revised following officer feedback and was supported by the Conservation Officer. The barn-style design was considered appropriate for the village edge and used local materials.
- The proposed dwelling was modest in height and well-positioned to minimise visual impact.
- The proposal supported village vitality and aligned with NPPF aims to sustain rural services.
- No objections were raised by highways, ecology, the tree officer, or rights of way.

Councillor Len Wilkins, Ward Member, made the following points:

- The proposed dwelling was significantly larger and taller than the existing stables, visually dominant, and out of keeping with the surrounding village and nearby listed buildings.
- The current stables provided value to the wider community, including disadvantaged children.
- The proposal conflicted with Local Plan policies (DS3, EN1, EN2, EN10) by failing to protect local character, landscape, and heritage assets.
- High biodiversity loss and relocation of the pond may harm local wildlife and disrupt existing natural corridors.

Having addressed the Committee objecting to the application as the Ward Member, Councillor Wilkins left the Committee Room at 15:41 and did not take part in the determination of the application.

Members questions

A Member questioned why this new-build "barn-style" dwelling was treated differently from a similar nearby application in Temple Guiting, which was refused for being inappropriate to the Cotswold landscape.

The Case Officer explained that the proposed barn-style design reflected the rural setting and existing built form, including a stable block and nearby agricultural buildings. Following consultation, no objections had been raised by the Conservation and Design Officer.

The Head of Planning explained that the application depended on the success of the design, which was considered to be of a quality that appropriately reflected and fitted within the context of this part of the village.

A Member asked that given the current status of policy, which was becoming outdated, whether this application aligned with the recent policy changes.

The Case Officer explained that the site was still considered a sustainable location, as the plan prioritised development in principal and non-principal settlements while directing it away from open countryside. This aligned with policy DS3. Although the policy was somewhat out of date, no direct conflict was identified with the local plan or the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 11).

Members questioned the scale of the design and whether it complemented the existing settlement, as required by policy DS3. Questions were posed about the current policy status and how the design fitted within the largely historic character of the area. The Case Officer explained that an earlier design raised concerns, but after collaboration with the applicant, the revised proposal now meets the design code.

Members asked what the existing and proposed building heights were. The proposed height was approximately 8 meters with a single storey building being 3-4 meters.

A Member asked if there were any material planning considerations why should this application should not be permitted. The Case Officer explained that the recommendation was that the application be permitted.

A Member explained that some objections raised concerns about light pollution due to the large glazed barn doors. It was asked whether there were measures to control light emissions from these glazed areas?

The Case Officer explained that there was a recommended condition controlling external lighting. However, internal lighting could not be controlled by this condition.

Member Comments

Members made the following comments:

- Concerns were raised over the building height.
- A Proposal was received for a Site Inspection Briefing to judge the location concerns.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/June2025

Reason – to judge the height of proposed building against status quo. To have a 'feel' for architectural context for the non-principal settlement.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed a Site Inspection Briefing and Councillor David Fowles Seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE a Site Inspection Briefing.

16:03 Councillor Len Wilkins returned to the Chamber

Site Inspection Briefing (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	Len Wilkins	1
Abstain	Andrew Maclean	1
Carried		

146 25/00045/FUL - Land North East of Braecroft, Upper Oddington.

Proposal

Erection of a new self-build dwelling.

Case Officer

Helen Cooper

Ward Member

Councillor David Cunningham

Recommendation

PERMISSION subject to the completion of a unilateral undertaking.

Councillor Dilys Neill left the Chamber at 16:04

The Vice-Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer introduced the application:

- A site location plan, aerial photo, planting plan, site photographs highlighting the development of building over the last 30 years were shared

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/June2025

Public Speakers

Deborah Smith, Agent, made the following points:

- The proposal was acceptable in principle under Policy DS3, as the site was within the village envelope and allowed for small-scale open market housing.
- The site fell within an existing garden where domestic features were expected.
- A nearly identical annex was approved on the same footprint and scale.
- Minor layout changes which were not considered overdevelopment.
- There were no objections from the Highways Officer with regards to access and safety.
- The scheme met sustainability policy requirements, and the necessary legal undertaking was in progress.

Councillor David Cunningham, Ward Member, made the following points:

- The current application contradicted the rationale for the earlier permission, which restricted the use to ancillary purposes.
- Concerns were raised about suburbanisation of a rural ridge-line site through domestic features (e.g. sheds, garden furniture) and more intensive residential use.
- The site was highly visible from public footpaths; the proposed dwelling would increase visual intrusion and light pollution, undermining landscape character (contrary to EN4, EN5, and NPPF paragraph 189).
- The addition of one dwelling was not considered to outweigh the harm caused to the landscape and setting.
- At approximately 25m from the host property, the dwelling raised concerns about compliance with EN2.

Feedback from Site Inspection Briefing.

Members noted the site's prominent position and viewed it from multiple vantage points, including the access road and nearby public rights of way. It was observed that visibility of the proposed building from the road would be limited due to land levels. Members acknowledged the need to assess the material difference between the current proposal and the extant permission already granted.

Member Questions

A member questioned whether there were any valid planning grounds to refuse the application, given its location within an existing garden.

The Case Officer recommend approval, finding the proposal policy compliant with acceptable access.

Members asked whether the Case Officer was satisfied there was no unacceptable impact in terms of light pollution.

Councillor Andrew Maclean proposed accepting the officer recommendation to permit the application, and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/June2025

Resolved: To PERMIT the application subject to the completion of a unilateral undertaking.

25/00045/FUL - Land North East of Braecroft, Upper Oddington. To Permit (Resolution)

For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Andrew Maclean, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins	8
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	Dilys Neill	1
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

147 21/01892/FUL - Outbuilding to the East of Poplars Barn, Evenlode, Moreton-In-Marsh.

Proposal

Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a new dwelling.

Case Officer

Charlotte Van De Wydeven

Ward Member

Councillor David Cunningham

Recommendation

PERMIT

Due to the Ecological Appraisal having expired, the Head of Planning Services proposed that the planning application be deferred to a later meeting.

The recommendation was changed to DEFER consideration of the case of planning application 21/01892/FUL due to the Ecological Appraisal having expired.

Proposed by Councillor Ray Brassington and seconded by Councillor David Fowles.

RESOLVED: To DEFER the application

21/01892/FUL - Outbuilding to the East of Poplars Barn, Evenlode, Moreton-in-Marsh. To Defer (Resolution)

For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

148 Sites Inspection Briefing

The following Members were advised that a Site Inspection Briefing would be required for the 2 July 2025:

Councillors Dilys Neill, Ian Watson, Daryl Corps, Andrew Maclean and Ray Brassington.

149 Licensing Sub-Committee

There were no licensing sub-committees planned.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 4.43 pm

Chair

(END)