



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday,
10 September 2025**

Members present:

Dilys Neill (Chair)	Julia Judd (Vice-Chair)	Daryl Corps
Nick Bridges	David Fowles	Michael Vann
Patrick Coleman	Juliet Layton	Tristan Wilkinson

Officers present:

Leonie Woodward, Head of Legal	Jasper Lamoon, Principal Planning Policy Officer
Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services	Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer
Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer	Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic Services Support Assistant
Amy Hill, Senior Planning Officer	Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services Officer

176 Apologies

There were apologies for absence from Councillors Ian Watson, Ray Brassington and Andrew Maclean.

177 Substitute Members

Councillor Juliet Layton substituted for Councillor Ian Watson. Councillor Julia Judd acted as Vice-Chair.

178 Declarations of Interest

Councillor David Fowles declared non-pecuniary interests in relation to Item 8, as the Clerk, John Dooley, was a parish councillor in one of the parishes they represented. Councillors David Fowles and Julia Judd declared that in relation to Item 11, Councillor Bella Amory was a friend. The Members confirmed that, having taken advice from the Legal Representative, they would take part in the debate.

179 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 August 2025 were discussed. Councillor David Fowles proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Patrick 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 13 August 2025.

180 Chair's Announcements

It was announced that the first item on the schedule of applications, relating to land north-east of Mickleton, had been withdrawn.

181 Public questions

There were no public questions.

182 Member questions

A Member noted that the Planning and Licensing Committee had always operated on a non-political basis and suggested mixing the seating of groups at the next meeting.

183 25/01621/OUT - Land North East of Mickleton

This application had been withdrawn.

184 25/01194/OUT - Land Parcel North of Olimpik Drive

The proposal was for outline application for residential development of up to 30 dwellings.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Members: Cllrs Gina Blomefield and Tom Stowe

Original recommendation: REFUSE

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

- Additional pages included confirmation that the concerns in Refusal Reason 3, relating to Great Crested Newts, had been addressed through the applicant's licensing report reviewed by Nature Space, and that this refusal reason was no longer pursued.
- It was confirmed that County Council Highways raised no objection to the application, subject to conditions.

Planning and Licensing Committee

10/September2025

- One additional objection had been received, relating to the loss of greenfield land and drainage.
- Site location maps, photographs of the site and the indicative layout were shared.

Public Speakers

Speaker 1 - Chipping Campden Town Council

John Dooley (Town Council Clerk) explained that Chipping Campden Town Council opposed the application due to ongoing flooding concerns, noting that previous development at the site had inadequate flood mitigation measures that were not resolved, and they sought guarantees that the existing flooding issues would be properly addressed.

Speaker 2 – Objector

David Jennings-Riley raised concerns that the Sequential Test omitted guidance on cumulative flood risk, noting that previous development at Leasows One had increased flood risk to nearby areas, and that the proposed cut-off ditches for Leasows Two could worsen downstream flooding due to omissions in the plans. These concerns were supported by the 2023 Cotswold District Council Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and local flooding evidence.

Speaker 3 - Agent

Wendy Hopkins noted that the Council's five-year housing land supply shortfall was the key consideration. She stated that landscape impact concerns were likely exaggerated, and that previous refusals were outdated or untested. She argued that applying the tilted balance meant the landscape harm was insufficient to justify refusal.

Speaker 4 – Ward Member

Councillor Tom Stowe, the Ward Member, supported refusal of the application, citing inadequate flood mitigation, significant landscape harm within the Cotswold National Landscape, and conflict with Local Plan policies and statutory duties. They concluded that adverse impacts outweighed any benefits.

Member questions

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

- The detailed drainage scheme would be secured by condition if approved in order to manage hillside flooding. Indicative proposals included a capture trench to control flows and protect existing properties. Previous drainage issues at Olimpik Drive had been addressed, and technical consultees were satisfied that, the measures would prevent flooding to the development and surrounding areas, including Park Road.
- The Officer explained that the assessment drew on experience, site history, and an independent landscape consultant's review, resulting in a refusal recommendation. The decision also reflected changes in legislation, which

Planning and Licensing Committee

10/September2025

placed weight on conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of national landscapes.

- The Officer explained that the site itself did not flood, as it was sloping and water flowed over it to lower areas, where flooding has occurred in the past. A potential issue was whether development would exacerbate these problems by diverting water or increasing surface runoff. With the proposed drainage measures, including capture drains and attenuation features requested by the Lead Local Flood Authority, such impacts could be managed.
- The Officer explained that, under paragraph 11(d)(i) of the NPPF, a lack of a five-year housing land supply required weight to be given to housing supply, but harm to a nationally designated landscape could provide a reason to refuse a planning application.
- The Officer explained that previous flooding to properties backing onto the River Cam was caused by surface water, not the river itself. The proposed development would include on-site attenuation to store and release water at controlled rates.
- The Officer explained that the public right-of-way crossed the site and formed part of a route linking Chipping Campden to the surrounding area. Whilst it was not part of the Cotswold Way, the footpath is used by pedestrians, and the proposed development would affect users.
- It was clarified that the proposed development would not extend onto the Olimpik Drive site, except for use of the access road. However, the development would impact the intended function of the green corridor north of Stickler Place.

Member Comments

In discussing the application, Members made the following comments:

- Concerns were expressed regarding the agent's comments on housing targets, emphasising that government targets do not allow unrestricted development and that the Committee had a duty to ensure housing is directed to suitable locations whilst protecting the National Landscape.
- The site was highly sensitive, elevated, and visually prominent. They considered that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the landscape, local character, and tourism value, and noted a potential flooding risk.
- The refusal reasons were supported by the National Landscape Trust policies and stated that the application provided no public benefit under the tilted balance.

Councillor David Fowles proposed REFUSING the application and Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal. This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to REFUSE the application.

25/01194/OUT - Land Parcel North of Olimpick Drive - REFUSE (Resolution)		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Tristan Wilkinson	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

185 25/01717/FUL - Land West of Hatherop Road

The proposal was for erection of 98 dwellings.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Members: Cllr Michael Vann

Original recommendation: PERMIT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

- The Officer explained that there was sufficient water supply capacity for up to 50 dwellings without reinforcement, with a condition restricting occupation above this until works were completed. For sewage infrastructure, a condition was recommended that no more than 87 dwellings should be occupied until capacity was in place, to be agreed with Thames Water, based on the fall back position of the 87 dwellings already permitted.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority had raised no objection subject to conditions incorporated into the decision. The Case Officer requested delegated authority to amend a few conditions, such as access and a construction management plan.
- The Case Officer shared maps, photographs including the Public Right of Way, Site and Elevation plans.

Public Speaker 1 – Fairford Town Council

Councillor Richard Harrison noted that the proposal aligned with the Fairford Neighbourhood Plan, would meet local housing needs sustainably, and offered improved housing mix and energy efficiency. He claimed that minor tree-planting concerns could be addressed via the Biodiversity Gain Plan, while sewage treatment capacity must prevent pollution or flooding.

Public Speaker 2 - Objector

Rod Hill raised concerns over sewage capacity, potential illumination of Lovers Lane, and insufficient car parking, particularly given school-related congestion. The increase from 86 to 98 dwellings was considered likely to worsen these issues.

Matthew Jeal highlighted the community engagement undertaken and noted that the site already had planning consent. The application proposed 11 additional units, including four affordable homes, along with an improved housing mix and footpath upgrades. He confirmed that conditions on foul and water connections, as well as additional tree planting along the northern boundary, were accepted. Upgrades to Lovers Lane and sensitive lighting would be carefully managed to protect bat habitats, and the proposal provided over 150 car parking spaces, meeting County Council standards.

Public Speaker 4 – Ward Member

Councillor Michael Vann noted that the site lay outside of the Conservation Area and the Cotswold National Landscape and was allocated for housing in the Fairford Neighbourhood Plan. He explained that the plan required connection to the sewer network only where capacity exists or is planned, and Thames Water had confirmed capacity for 50 dwellings now, with reinforcement works needed for additional units.

Members Questions

Members asked questions of the officers, which were responded to in the following way:

- The Case Officer confirmed there was sufficient school capacity, with no education contribution required other than £19,208 for libraries. No issues had been raised by the NHS regarding GP capacity.
- It was confirmed that the Environment Agency was not a statutory consultee; any discharge into watercourses would fall under their separate licensing and permit controls.
- The Case Officer explained that assurances on upgrades rested with Thames Water under the Water Industry Act. The developer must secure agreement from Thames Water for connection, and if upgrades are delayed, occupation of the houses could not proceed as it would potentially conflict with building regulations.
- The Case Officer explained that solar panels had not been proposed as the applicant was pursuing a "fabric first" approach, focusing on insulation and other thermal efficiency measures.
- In response to concerns about parking capacity, the Case Officer confirmed that the scheme provided around 225 spaces.

Members comments

In discussing the application, Members made the following comments:

- Members welcomed the developer's comments about landscaping, noting that additional planting would enhance the approach into Fairford.

Planning and Licensing Committee

10/September2025

- Concern was expressed about the lack of a response from the County Council on the impact on schools and queried whether the Town Council was confident that the local school and doctor's surgery could cope with additional demand.
- Support was given to ongoing engagement with Thames Water, highlighting the need for firm commitments to safeguard local infrastructure schemes.
- Members commended the developer and Fairford Town Council for their cooperative and constructive approach.
- Members recognised the strengths of the scheme, including its provision of smaller units and affordable housing.

Councillor David Fowles proposed accepting the Case Officer's recommendations to ACCEPT the application with Delegated authority to amend conditions and Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal. This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application subject to the completion of S106 legal agreement(s) covering affordable housing, custom/self-building housing, Biodiversity Net Gain monitoring, financial contribution to North Meadow and Clattinger Farm Special Area of Conservation, provision of public open space, access connection to field to west, financial contributions to library services, public transport and travel plan.

15:55 – 16:08 break

25/01717/FUL - Land West of Hatherop Road - PERMIT (Resolution)		
For	Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Tristan Wilkinson	8
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Nick Bridges	1
Carried		

186 25/01970/PLP - Land At Ethans Orchard

The proposal was Permission in Principle for the erection of 1 self-build dwelling.

Case Officer-Amy Hill

Ward Member-Cllr Paul Hodgkinson

Original Recommendation - PERMIT subject to agreement of appropriate assessment by Natural England.

The Case Officer introduced the report explaining that additional pages contained comments in support and objection and also acceptance of the appropriate assessment from Natural England.

Comments from the Parish Council had been received which raised concerns about limited facilities in Chedworth and poor bus services. There were also concerns about the site being outside of the village envelope. The Case Officer clarified that Chedworth is a non-principal settlement and that the conservation area was not the village envelope.

The Case Officer highlighted the principles behind a Planning in Principle planning decision for Committee Members.

Public speaker 1

Councillor Bella Amory from Chedworth Parish Council explained that there was strong local opposition, citing harm to the conservation area, National Landscape, and settlement character. There were also concerns raised over the lack of facilities, the reliance on private cars, and minimal housing need.

Public speaker 2 - Objector

Jenny Wigley argued that the site was highly sensitive being within the conservation area and National Landscape and the close setting of listed buildings. She felt that the Case Officer recommendation relied on mitigation outside the application site, which she stated was undeliverable and legally flawed.

Public speaker 3 – Applicant

Mr George Charnick explained that the proposal sought a modest, carefully designed self-build dwelling, with removal of the garage and improvements such as a treatment plant, landscaping, and restored orchard.

Speaker 4 – Ward Member

Councillor Paul Hodgekinson stated that the site lay within the Chedworth Conservation Area and the Cotswold National Landscape, both of which were highly protected, and that there was a history of refusals. There were concerns raised that development would cause harm to heritage and landscape, including the loss of an important rural gap and intrusion into key views. It was noted that the proposal conflicted with statutory duties, national and local policies, with no clear public benefit to outweigh the identified harm.

Member Questions

Members asked questions of the officers, which were responded to in the following way:

- In clarifying what was being considered in this application, the Case Officer explained that the application asked whether residential development could be justified on this site but not to approve detailed design or layout. As the site was located within a conservation area, the National Landscape, and close to listed buildings, any future development would require careful design.

Planning and Licensing Committee

10/September2025

- In a response to a question regarding the value of the hedging and stone wall, the Case Officer explained that the existing hedgerows contained some native species and provided ecological value but also limited views across the valley.
- The Conservation Officer explained that the eastern part of the site was dominated by a garage, hard standing, and altered topography. The key heritage benefit would be removing these structures and restoring the land to a rural paddock/orchard.

Recommendation

The recommendation was changed to DEFER the application due to a Site Inspection Briefing being requested. The basis for the Site Inspection Briefing was to judge the setting and surroundings.

Councillor Tristan Wilkinson proposed deferring the application and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal. This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to DEFER the application.

25/01970/PLP - Land At Ethans Orchard - DEFER (Resolution)		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Tristan Wilkinson	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

187 Sites Inspection Briefing

An all-Member Site Inspection Briefing was required for 1 October 2025.

188 Licensing Sub-Committee

There were no licensing sub-committees planned.

Chair

(END)