



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on  
Wednesday, 13 May 2026**

Members present:

Dilys Neill (Chair)	Julia Judd (Vice Chair)	
Nick Bridges	David Fowles	Michael Vann
Patrick Coleman	Nikki Ind	
Paul Evans	Juliet Layton	

Officers present:

Marie Barnes, Lawyer	Nickie Mackenzie-Daste, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services	Amy Hill, Senior Planning Officer
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer
Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services Officer	
April Paintain, Environmental Health Officer	

**273 Apologies**

There were apologies from Councillors Joe Harris, Ian Watson, Ray Brassington and Daryl Corps.

**274 Substitute Members**

Councillor Juliet Layton substituted for Councillor Ray Brassington and Councillor Paul Evans substituted for Councillor Joe Harris. Councillor Julia Judd substituted as Vice Chair.

**275 Declarations of Interest**

Members were advised that one of the landowners was Mr Lynden Stowe, a former Councillor.

Councillor Nikki Ind had met with Newland Homes but had had no discussion regarding the application. As a former Council Chair, she had attended an initial planning information meeting with the RAU but did not amount to pre-determination.

## Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

Councillor Patrick Coleman declared that a senior officer of Newland Homes was a constituent within their ward but did not consider this to create a conflict.

Councillor Juliet Layton confirmed previous professional acquaintance with Mr Lyndon Stowe through council service. She had previously visited Newland Homes properties in a professional capacity but confirmed this was unrelated to the current application.

Councillor David Fowles declared a personal interest in the Mickleton application due to a long-standing personal friendship with Mr Lynden Stowe, and confirmed they would withdraw from the meeting and take no part in the discussion or vote. Councillor Fowles also declared an additional interest in agenda items 10 and 11. He would speak as Ward Member but withdraw from decision-making due to prior involvement and an acknowledged lack of an open mind on those applications.

Councillor Julia Judd declared prior knowledge of Mr Lynden Stowe and also the Town and Parish Council representative for Bibury, but confirmed that these are historical or limited contacts.

The public speaker, Andy Farmer was known to various Members of the Committee.

The legal representative was satisfied that it did not bias the Members' decision making

### **276 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 April 2026. Councillor Fowles proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Coleman seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and accepted by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 8 April 2026.

<b>Approve the minutes if the Committee held on 8 April 2026 (Resolution)</b>		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Nikki Ind, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	6
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Paul Evans, Julia Judd and Juliet Layton	3
<b>Carried</b>		

### **277 Chair's Announcements**

An all-Member hybrid Planning Committee training was planned for 3 June 2pm.

### **278 Public questions**

There were no public questions.

### **279 Member questions**

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

There were no Member questions.

## **280 25/03351/OUT - Land North of Tops Nursery, Mickleton**

Councillor David Fowles left the Chamber.

The proposal was for Outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and for up to 95 dwellings with associated access and infrastructure.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Members: Councillors Gina Blomefield and Tom Stowe

Recommendation: PERMIT subject to no objection from Biodiversity Officer and the completion of a S106 legal agreement covering affordable housing, self-build/custom build housing, financial contributions to Biodiversity Net Gain monitoring, secondary education and library services.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

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

- Councillor Tom Stowe declared an interest on 20 November 2025 due to his father's partial ownership of the application site.
- A contribution request had been received from Gloucestershire County Council for school transport, which the applicant had not objected to. The Case Officer advised that, if permission was granted, it was recommended that this contribution be secured through the Section 106 agreement.
- An updated bat survey and Biodiversity net gain information were received shortly before the meeting and would be reviewed.
- Biodiversity net gain matters were capable of resolution, with further clarification needed on whether they would be secured via Section 106 agreement or condition (e.g. habitat management plan)

Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee.

### Public Speakers

Speaker 1 – Councillor Chris Cottam - Mickleton Parish Council

Concerns were raised that further development would bring limited local benefits and could increase pressure on existing infrastructure. Support was expressed for delivering affordable housing, but concerns were raised about the scale and type of market housing. It was noted that cumulative growth could expand Mickleton and risk harming the character of the village and its setting near the Cotswolds National Landscape. The Parish Council concluded that no further significant development should proceed until infrastructure needs are properly addressed.

Speaker 2 – Andy Crump – Objector

## Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

The proposal would not deliver any infrastructure improvements and that existing deficiencies in employment, health, social, and transport infrastructure would remain unresolved. The development would increase reliance on car use, with limited public transport provision.

### Speaker 3 – Catherine Shepherd – Agent

The site was largely brownfield with being well located to local services and public transport, with separation distances to neighbouring properties and over one third of the site as open space. Biodiversity and environmental enhancements had been proposed, including ecological corridors, hedgehog highways, bat and bird boxes, tree and shrub planting, and a mix of on-site and off-site biodiversity net gain.

Sustainability credentials were highlighted, including zero-carbon homes using air source heat pumps, solar PV, high insulation standards, and EV charging infrastructure.

### Speaker 4 – Ward Member – Councillor Gina Blomefield

Concern was raised regarding cumulative housing growth in Mickleton. The village had grown in recent years without infrastructure improvements, including education, healthcare, retail, and leisure provision. Education capacity was already constrained, with local schools reportedly full or oversubscribed.

Highways and transport impacts were highlighted, including reliance on private cars, increasing traffic, road safety concerns, and potential additional pressure from nearby large-scale developments.

Capacity issues were raised in relation to water supply and wider utilities, alongside concerns about limited local employment leading to increased commuting. If approved, conditions should be applied relating to landscape impact, lighting, highway adoption, and mitigation of infrastructure impacts including education, health, employment, and retail provision.

### Members questions

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

- Thames Water had identified potential water supply pressure issues and requested a condition requiring a phased infrastructure plan to be agreed with the applicant to ensure any necessary upgrades are delivered.
- Thames Water has a statutory duty to provide potable water supply and had raised no objection beyond the requested condition relating to infrastructure upgrades and water pressure management
- The site was not classified as previously developed land due to its horticultural use, which is why the proposal provided 40% affordable housing.
- Concern regarding the cumulative impact of potential future housing growth in Mickleton were acknowledged with the need for supporting infrastructure, including highways, drainage, schools, employment, and retail provision.
- There was a need for smaller homes, and a condition was proposed requiring 80% of the development to be three-bedroom properties or smaller.

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

- The Parish Council would receive 15% of CIL receipts, alongside increased council tax income, and would also be able to bid for Section 106 contributions.
- Any nearby large-scale development in adjacent areas cannot be given weight in the determination of the current application.

Member comments

- Support was noted for the developer’s approach to low-carbon housing, including solar panels and air source heat pumps, with a request that greater battery storage provision be considered.
- Request was made for enhanced accessibility standards, including a higher proportion of M4(3) wheelchair-accessible homes. Clarification was sought on whether such requirements and housing mix (including the 80% smaller homes provision) could be secured at reserved matters stage.
- Positive comments were made regarding the treatment of the woodland, including the protection of the footpath and provision of a cycle route.
- A condition was requested to require the reserved matters application to include an energy and sustainability statement and to exceed standard building regulations where appropriate.
- The Section 106 agreement should include school transport contributions and any requirements recommended by the biodiversity officer.

Councillor Juliet Layton proposed PERMITTING the application subject to no objection from Biodiversity Officer, an Energy and Renewable Energy Statement at reserved matters stage and the completion of a S106 legal agreement covering affordable housing, self-build/ custom build housing, financial contributions to Biodiversity Net Gain monitoring, secondary education and school transport and library services and Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

<b>25/03351/OUT - Land North of Tops Nursery, Mickleton (PERMIT) (Resolution)</b>		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	8
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	David Fowles	1
Abstain	None	0
<b>Carried</b>		

---

**281** 25/01623/FUL - Land at Grid Reference 401975 198339 - Spratsgate Lane , Siddington

## Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

The proposal was the installation of solar farm, associated infrastructure and grid connection cable.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Member: Councillor Mike Every

Recommendation: PERMIT subject to no objection from the Biodiversity Officer and the Environment Agency and the completion of a S106 legal agreement covering a Biodiversity Net Gain monitoring fee.

Councillor David Fowles returned to the Committee meeting.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

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

- One additional objection was received regarding orientation and drainage.
- The applicant will use the district licensing scheme for Great Crested Newts.
- The battery storage had been temporarily removed from the application to allow further assessment of bat impact, and transformers have been repositioned away from hedgerows to reduce potential disturbance.
- Biodiversity net gain matters remain under review with the biodiversity officer. The issues were expected to be resolved through discussions and appropriate conditions.

### Public Speakers

Public Speaker 1 – Andy Farmer – supporter

They expressed conditional support for the solar farm, subject to appropriate controls during construction regarding noise, dust, and protection of neighbouring residents. Support was given on environmental grounds, citing potential biodiversity benefits, soil recovery from long-term intensive farming, and the suitability of lower-grade agricultural land for solar use. Potential community benefits, including business rates contributions to the local authority and opportunities to address existing drainage issues were highlighted.

Speaker 2 – Agent – Harry Singh-Judd

The scheme aligned with local and national climate and energy policy, contributing to renewable energy generation, energy security, and reduced reliance on fossil fuels, with the site also prioritised for grid connection before 2030. 79% of the site would be taken out of intensive farming during the operational period to allow soil recovery. Additional landscaping, infrastructure reconfiguration, and drainage improvements, evolved through community engagement

A surface water drainage strategy was secured by condition, alongside an annual community benefit fund of £10,000. The development was temporary and reversible, with decommissioning and material reuse/recycling at the end of its operational life.

### Member Questions

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

- Solar panel orientation (east–west tracking) did not undermine the visual impact assessment.
- Additional landscaping and buffering had been agreed along parts of the southern boundary to increase separation and reduce visual impact. Whilst maintenance access and hedgerow management would be needed, a 3.5m buffer was considered acceptable.
- A Surface Water Drainage Strategy and Flood Risk Assessment had been submitted, designed to ensure post-development runoff would not exceed existing greenfield rates.
- The Environment Agency was reviewing additional information relating to climate change allowances.
- The Lead Local Flood Authority had confirmed it was satisfied that the proposal would not increase surface water flow rates.
- Existing hedgerows around the site was generally substantial and provide year-round screening. Additional landscaping was proposed along the southern boundary to strengthen visual mitigation.
- Proposed equipment and storage/transformer units were distributed across the site rather than concentrated on the boundary, with some repositioned to reduce impacts on hedgerows, bats, and noise.
- Approximately 18% of the site was Grade 2 quality and 18% was Grade 3A, with the remainder largely lower-grade land.
- A decommissioning condition would ensure the solar panels and associated infrastructure were removed within six months of the cessation of use and the land restored.
- The site would be enclosed by low-key deer-proof mesh fencing.

April Paintain, Environmental Health Officer for Noise and Amenities confirmed that a noise assessment and a noise management plan had been reviewed for the site. No significant noise concerns were identified following the relocation of inverter units. A planning condition was recommended requiring a revised noise management plan to be submitted within six months of completion of development

### Member comments

- The proposal was considered to make effective use of exhausted agricultural land.
- The importance of both energy security and food security was highlighted.
- The development was reversible and the site could be restored in the future.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed PERMITTING the application subject to no objection from the Biodiversity Officer and the Environment Agency and the completion of a S106 legal agreement covering a Biodiversity Net Gain monitoring fee

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

and Councillor Nick Bridges seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

<b>25/01623/FUL - Spratsgate Lane, Siddington (PERMIT) (Resolution)</b>		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, David Fowles, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
<b>Carried</b>		

## **282 25/02960/FUL - Shoecroft Barn, Ablington, Bibury, Cirencester Gloucestershire**

The proposal was the conversion of ground floor of existing barns from general storage to cafe with retail area, including amendments to the lean-to and decking/patio area, and associated alterations.

Case Officer: Amy Hill

Ward Member: Councillor David Fowles

Recommendation: PERMIT subject to securing a legal agreement

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee including

Additional pages:

- There had been a minor error in the application red line plan, which had omitted a small corner of one barn. It was considered that the error did not prejudice determination of the application, as the extent of development was clear from the wider submitted plans.
- If permission was granted a limited re-consultation exercise would be required, with any new issues raised.

### Public Speakers

Speaker 1 – Bibury Town and Parish Council – Councillor Craig Chapman

An objection was raised on highways safety grounds, with reference to concerns from a local group, Bibury One, addressing wider tourism-related parking and traffic issues.

Ablington Lane was described as a narrow rural lane already under significant pressure from visitors, with limited pedestrian provision and reports of congestion, verge damage, and conflict between road users.

## Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

The Highway Authority was referenced as raising concerns that the proposal could not be adequately assessed due to insufficient information. The proposed café and retail use would become a destination, increasing traffic, parking demand, and pedestrian activity and potentially leading to overspill parking onto surrounding roads and verges.

### Speaker 2-Michelle Follett-Holt- Objector

Concern was raised that insufficient weight had been given to local harms, including highways safety, landscape character, environmental impacts, and increased tourism pressure. There was no demonstrated local need for an additional café. Concerns were made regarding tourism pressure in Bibury and the sensitive location within the Cotswolds National Landscape and Conservation Area.

Assumptions regarding visitor behaviour, infrastructure capacity, and pedestrian access were not supported by evidence. Pedestrian access arrangements were unsafe.

Environmental concerns were raised regarding drainage and recent reports of untreated sewage entering the River Coln.

### Speaker 3- Councillor David Fowles - Ward Member

It was noted that there was no pedestrian access into the centre of the village.

Concerns were raised regarding access and highway safety. The café would provide additional catering facilities in addition to existing on-site and other nearby café provision within the village with existing venues already serving similar demand. The access route was described as a narrow rural lane subject to existing use pressures. Highways officers had raised concerns that it would not be practical to control traffic movements and the provision of 15 parking spaces was considered insufficient. It was noted that 102 objections were received with no letters of support. Reference was made to the Bibury One group, involving GCC, the district council, police, and local tourism and business representatives, established to address wider traffic and tourism impacts.

Councillor Fowles left the chamber.

### SIB Feedback

- There were concerns about pedestrian safety. A direct footpath into the village became narrow, uneven and difficult to navigate, with a hazardous bend and limited visibility for both pedestrians and vehicles. Members had narrowly avoided a collision with a double-decker coach, highlighting dangers for pedestrians along the route.
- Vehicle movements in the area were frequent and at times difficult to manage, with limited clarity over appropriate parking arrangements and instances of informal or overspill parking.
- In relation to the barn, members noted that it had been significantly and unsympathetically altered through modern interventions, including window replacements, roof alterations, and large glazed additions, which were considered to have affected its historic character and significance.

### Member Questions

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

- The main car parks associated with the trout farm included a historically established main car park, a regularised northern car park, and an unregulated overflow car park.
- The proposed café would be accessible both to visitors to the trout farm and to those visiting Bibury more generally.
- The Case Officer proposed that the café would not materially increase traffic generation. The proposal was considered more likely to serve existing visitors already on site rather than create a significant number of additional trips. The Case Officer acknowledged that this interpretation differed from that of objectors.
- The Highway Authority had raised concerns in relation to the potential for the café to become a destination in its own right. Members queried whether any quantification or modelling had been provided regarding potential café-generated traffic. It was confirmed that no formal traffic impact assessment had been submitted as part of the application.

### Member Comments

- Concern was expressed that there was insufficient evidence available to assess the transport impacts of the proposal, noting the Highway Authority's view that a formal traffic impact assessment had not been provided.
- It was stated that while policy EC1E supports sustainable tourism, the Member's view was that the application does not meet the requirements of that policy.
- It was confirmed that the recommendation was to permit the application subject to a legal agreement. The legal agreement would link to a previously approved 2023 permission for a café and gift shop near the main car park. The agreement would prevent both schemes operating simultaneously, limiting development to either the previously approved café or the current proposal, but not both.

Councillor Michael Vann proposed PERMITTING the application and Councillor Patrick Coleman seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote but did not pass.

This development had the potential to increase the number of trip generations down that road. Members felt that there was not sufficient information to make an assessment as to whether or not it would have an impact on the highway safety.

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

RESOLVED: to DEFER the application to request that a traffic impact assessment.

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

Councillor Paul Evans left the Chamber.

<b>25/02960/FUL - Shiecraft Barn, Ablington (PERMIT) (Resolution)</b>		
For	Juliet Layton, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	3
Against	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans and Nikki Ind	4
Conflict Of Interests	David Fowles	1
Abstain	Julia Judd	1
<b>Rejected</b>		

<b>25/02960/FUL - Shoecraft Barn, Ablington (DEFER) (Resolution)</b>		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton and Michael Vann	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	David Fowles	1
Abstain	Dilys Neill	1
<b>Carried</b>		

### **283 25/02961/LBC - Shoecraft Barn, Ablington, Bibury, Cirencester**

#### Proposal

Conversion of ground floor of existing barns from general storage to cafe with retail area, including amendments to the lean-to and decking/patio area, and associated alterations.

#### Case Officer

Amy Hill

#### Ward Member

Councillor David Fowles

#### Recommendation

CONSENT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee.

#### Public Speakers

Speaker 1 – Michelle Follett-Holt – Objector

The applicant's past treatment of listed buildings had raised concerns. The building was described as a sensitive heritage asset within Bibury Conservation Area, forming part of the village's historic identity. The proposal represented a significant change of use from a rural/residential building to a large-scale commercial café, with associated operational impacts such as servicing, lighting, waste, and visitor pressure. Heritage

## Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

harm arose not only from physical alterations but also from changes in use and character.

Speaker 2 – Councillor David Fowles – Ward Member

Shoecroft Barn was identified as a Grade II listed building, requiring special regard to its preservation and enhancement. National policy was referenced, including the importance of viable uses for heritage assets, their contribution to sustainable communities, and the need for development to respect local character and distinctiveness. Weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and that any harm must be clearly justified and weighed against public benefits.

### Member Questions

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

- The Conservation Officer raised no objection to the proposal following amendments. The amendments primarily related to revisions to the lean-to structure, including changes affecting the flooring and associated detailing.
- The kitchen was located within the lean-to structure and included a serving hatch. Concern was implied that the absence of identified extraction infrastructure made it unclear how cooking operations would be accommodated in practice within the listed building.

### Member comments

- Concern was expressed that insufficient detail had been provided on how the development would manage sewage and drainage impacts, particularly in light of existing reported issues at the site
- The barn appeared in need of repair and improvement. It appeared as a mixture of inconsistent architectural alterations with a generally tired appearance.

It was proposed to defer the application to obtain clarification of kitchen-related infrastructure such as flues, extraction systems, and ventilation arrangements. Further information was also requested regarding foul drainage and sewage capacity, particularly in relation to how increased usage from a café would be managed within the listed building.

Councillor Juliet Layton proposed DEFERRING the application and Councillor Patrick Coleman seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to DEFER the application to obtain clarification of kitchen-related infrastructure such as flues, extraction systems, and ventilation arrangements.

Councillor Juliet Layton – left the meeting.

### **25/02961/LBC - Shoecroft Barn, Ablington (DEFER) (Resolution)**

For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Juliet Layton,	7
-----	--	---

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

	Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	David Fowles	1
Abstain	None	0
<b>Carried</b>		

**284 25/03713/FUL - Hill Farm, Main Road, Oddington**

Proposal

Replacement park conversion and remodelling of existing general heavy industrial buildings site with a rural business hub, including associated landscaping and consolidated parking.

Case Officer

Amy Hill

Ward Member

Councillor David Cunningham

Recommendation

PERMIT

Councillor David Fowles returned to the chamber.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee.

Public Speaker

Mark Godson – Agent

The proposal was a redevelopment of an existing B2 employment site into a more modern, lower-impact rural business use. The scheme would reduce the intensity of existing industrial activity and manage impacts through planning controls and sustainability measures.

National and local policy supported rural employment growth, including the acceptability of sites outside settlements where appropriate. The proposal was described as locally led, supporting jobs and the rural economy, with a largely local workforce. Additional benefits cited included Biodiversity Net Gain, landscape improvements, and design quality.

Member Questions

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

- The proposed barn height was approximately 8.8m, compared to an existing height of around 8.4m. This was a marginal increase in height.

## Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

- Past permissions and established lawful uses form part of the “fallback position” that must be considered when assessing current traffic impacts. It was clarified by the Head of Planning, that this context may affect the weight given to a highways objection, depending on whether additional traffic generated by the proposal was materially different from what was already permitted.

### Member comments

- Few significant highways concerns had been raised.
- The employment units were welcomed as a positive addition.
- The proposal was considered a good use of the site/land.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed to PERMIT the application and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

Councillor David Fowles left the meeting.

<b>25/03713/FUL - Hill Farm, Oddington (PERMIT) (Resolution)</b>		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
<b>Carried</b>		

### **285 24/01143/OUT - The Royal Agricultural University, Stroud Road, Cirencester**

The proposal was for Outline planning application with all matters reserved except for access, for a mixed-use development associated with the Royal Agricultural University comprising up to 24,012 sqm of floorspace for office (Use Class E(g)(i)), research and development (E(g)(ii)), education (F1(a)), conferencing (F1(e)), and café (E(b)) uses, Including the conversion of Trent Lodge to café use, associated parking, access and highway works, landscaping, public realm, utilities, and all ancillary works and structures. The development is known as The RAU Innovation Village and forms part of its wider masterplan, supporting research and innovation in food production, climate change, and land management.

#### Case Officer

Ceri Porter

#### Ward Member

Councillor Mark Harris

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

Recommendation

That the application be PERMITTED subject to:

- i. legal agreement(s) between the Applicant and the District Council and Gloucestershire County Council prior to the decision notice being issued;
- ii. agreement of the draft conditions set out in the report together with any draft conditions as may be agreed by Members at Planning & Licensing Committee;
- iii. delegated authority being given to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning & Licensing Committee, to amend and/or add to the suggested draft conditions where such amendments would not deviate significantly from the purpose of the draft conditions.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

Harrison Bowley presented the application in Ceri Porter's absence.

Updates:

- Active Travel England had recommended deferral, but following discussions with Gloucestershire County Council Highways, the proposed active travel measures were considered acceptable as part of wider committed infrastructure, subject to existing Grampian-style conditions.
- An air quality consultation was ongoing due to revised transport assessment data

Public Speaker

Speaker 1 - Alex O'Dell – Objector

The close proximity to existing homes was highlighted, particularly the location of plot 4B near residential boundaries, with concerns raised about privacy, noise, outlook, and sense of enclosure. Concerns were raised about increased pedestrian activity near residential boundaries, with potential impacts including disturbance, overlooking, and loss of privacy. Mitigation was requested through landscaping, screening, lighting control, and path design. A detailed Construction Management Plan was requested covering programme timing, working hours, construction traffic routes, dust and noise control, and ongoing communication with residents during construction.

Speaker 2 – Mr Peter McCaffery – Applicant's representative

The Innovation Village brought together industry, farmers, landowners and researchers to develop practical solutions for sustainable agriculture and biodiversity recovery, whilst supporting rural resilience and skills development.

It was expected to attract investment and generate significant local economic benefits, including increased employment and opportunities for young people to remain in Gloucestershire.

The development was designed as a landscape-led, low-carbon campus that set high standards for sustainability, nature recovery and environmental performance, supporting the university's mission to equip future graduates to address global challenges.

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

Member questions

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

- The Innovation Village was not expected to directly increase student numbers requiring accommodation in the local area. A wider Estate Masterplan had been developed which sought to provide further student accommodation, but this required planning permission in its own right and would need to be subject to a separate application.
- All detailed design matters, including layout and building design, are reserved for future approval through reserved matters applications. Concerns raised, particularly regarding Plot 4B, have been noted and considered at this stage. The current parameter plans already indicated that this plot would be limited to a single-storey building.

Member comments

- Strong overall support and positive summary of the scheme.
- The development was considered beneficial for Cirencester and the wider Cotswolds.
- Concerns highlighted around the junction due to mixed users, including pedestrians, cyclists, school children, buses and caravans. A request was made for a 20mph speed limit to improve safety.

Councillor Julia Judd proposed to PERMIT the application D subject to: i. legal agreement(s) between the Applicant and the District Council and Gloucestershire County Council prior to the decision notice being issued; ii. agreement of the draft conditions set out in the report together with any draft conditions as may be agreed by Members at Planning & Licensing Committee; iii. delegated authority being given to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning & Licensing Committee, to amend and/or add to the suggested draft conditions where such amendments would not deviate significantly from the purpose of the draft conditions. Councillor Nikki Ind seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

<b>24/01143/OUT - Royal Agricultural University (PERMIT) (Resolution)</b>		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	6
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
<b>Carried</b>		

---

Planning and Licensing Committee

13/May2026

**286 Response to Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government  
Consultation: Fees for Planning Applications**

Purpose

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) is consulting (23 March–18 May 2026) on reforms to planning application fees in England, to better resource Local Planning Authorities (LPA) and improve timeliness and quality of decision-making.

Accountable Member

Councillor Juliet Layton

Report author

Harrison Bowley

The Government had asked 22 questions. The Head of Planning explained that the draft responses had been prepared, and members were invited to raise any comments or queries either now or by email.

Written comments can be submitted by Friday 15 May, ahead of a required response to Government on Monday.

A Member strongly urged the Government to review Permission in Principle (PIP) applications and consider their abolition, citing concerns that PIP had created uncertainty and difficulties for committees, communities and officers.

Recommendations

That the Planning and Licensing committee resolves to:

1. Agree to the consultation response and;
2. Delegate authority to the Head of Planning Services to respond to the consultation on behalf of Cotswold District Council.

Councillor Michael Vann proposed to agree the recommendations and Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to AGREE the recommendations.

<b>To agree and delegate to Head of Planning the response to MHCLG consultation (Resolution)</b>		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Nikki Ind, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	6
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
<b>Carried</b>		

**287 Sites Inspection Briefing**

The Chair advised members to keep the 3 June 2026 free for a possible Site Inspection Briefing.

Councillors Dilys Neill (Chair), Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Julia Judd, Michael Vann.

**288 Licensing Sub-Committee**

There were no licensing sub-committees planned.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at Time Not Specified

Chair

(END)