



PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE – TUESDAY 11 AUGUST 2026

ADDITIONAL PAGES

Agenda Item No 12

26/00905/FUL - Land South of Longfurlong Lane Tetbury Gloucestershire

A further supporting statement has been received from the applicant on the 4th August 2026 – please see attached

In summary the applicant disputes the officer's recommendation and says the proposal is for a community nature area, with Class F2(c) used only because no more specific use class exists. They maintain sufficient information has been submitted, the BNG de minimis exemption applies, and there are no highways or LLFA objections. They argue ownership, economic viability and agricultural land loss are not determinative, as the land could be managed by agreement, hay cutting would continue, woodland is not agricultural land, and the use could revert. They state public access already exists via footpaths, no parking is proposed, and letters of public support clearly outweigh objection letters, with some objections said to relate to separate potential residential development.

Comments for Planning Application 26/00905/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: 26/00905/FUL

Address: Land South Of Longfurlong Lane Tetbury Gloucestershire

Proposal: Change of use of land to Class F 2 (c) Areas or places for outdoor sport or recreation|cr|

Case Officer: Helen Cooper

Customer Details

Name: Mr Christopher Giles (Longfurlong Greenfields Association)

Address: 40 Longfurlong Lane Tetbury GL8 8TJ

Comment Details

Commenter Type: General Comments

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Response to officer's officers report recommending refusal of consent for application 26/00905/FUL

Report published in error 20th July and subsequently removed from Planning Portal

Applicants are concerned the report does not accurately reflect the information given in the application document and that it contains errors and material not relevant to the decision. Our concerns are outlined below.

Class F2(c) designation - Areas or places for outdoor sport or recreation (not involving motorised vehicles or firearms)

- We are not responsible for how this is written or what it implies.
 - We have no choice but to use what is in the legislation.
 - There is no specific Land Use Class for a community nature area.
 - It is disingenuous to claim our application implies other forms of development included in F2(c).
- Officer's objections are un-evidenced, meritless speculation and all their given examples would, in any case, require new applications.
- Each application must be decided on its own merits and the application documents (Appendix A) clearly indicate what the intentions and scope of the application are.
 - We have proposed restrictive conditions but have not had any suggestions from officers or a chance to discuss them as meeting requests have been denied.

Officers claim 'Insufficient information'

- We have provided all the information needed to process this application.

- We have provided additional site layout plans (Heritage & Nature) with clear indications of boundaries, access points and details of trees, buildings etc.
- Officers are requesting additional information that would not materially affect granting or refusing the application. It is simply for a change of use.
- The BNG de minimis exemption clearly does apply in this case. We have set this out clearly by email, quoting directly from the legislation. LGA is happy to restate this at Appeal.
- Officers position on the de minimis exemption is a circular argument i.e. they claim 'not enough information to determine' but the whole point of the exemption is that 'no impact' means the information is not required. We are clearly not proposing any impact on biodiversity.
- Officers have not provided any indication of why the BNG exemption does not apply, simply that it is their 'opinion' and LGA is happy to test that at Appeal.
- No objection from Highways or LLFA (flooding), so clearly these issues do not necessitate further information and are therefore not valid reasons for refusal.
- Officers have not, to our knowledge, conducted a site visit.
- Despite many requests, officers have refused to meet with us in person to discuss the details of our application.

Ownership, economic viability and local need.

- It is clear we are not (yet) the owners of the land but Planning legislation does not require us to be, so the issue is irrelevant in determining this application.
- It is possible to operate the site as a community nature area via a management agreement, not necessarily through ownership.
- We are clearly not proposing any economic activity so it's irrelevant in determining this application
- Site will be managed 'as appropriate' should we succeed in acquiring an interest in both parcels of land.
- Economic 'viability' is therefore not a material consideration in a change of use application.

Potential loss of agricultural land

- The woodland elements of the application site and fields are owned by two different parties.
- The current meadowland has only been used for cutting hay for the last 6+ years, which is exactly what the application proposes to continue.
- As the proposal is to retain the calcareous grassland and woodland, then the land will not be 'lost' as any future owner can easily revert to agricultural use. Nothing will be lost.
- The two areas of woodland on the application site are not agricultural and have an area of approx 0.838 ha.
- The remaining agricultural fields have a gross area of 8.743 ha (1977 1:2500 Ordnance Survey map) which includes hedgerows, areas of copse, trees, ponds and barns.

Public access concerns

- The site already has unlimited public access via the definitive public footpath network.
- The site already receives many visitors, sometimes in large numbers as it links to Westonbirt and

the Monarch's Way.

- Access by car and parking via Longfurlong Lane already exists and is already a naturally limiting factor which the proposal wouldn't alter i.e. people won't try if they know they can't park.
- The proposal deliberately excludes extra parking.

Letters of support clearly outweigh letters of objection

- No objection has been received from the landowner of the two woodland areas (The King's Foundation).
- The planning portal lists letters of objection from only eight parties excluding CDC officers. However, there is confusion in some of these letters of objection, with several objecting to potential residential development by Miller Homes, which was only a rumour at the time.
- Turley Associates made an application for the Miller Homes scoping report (26/01167/SCOPE) on part of the site shortly after our application was submitted. Some of the objections received relate to their application, not this one. CDC is aware of this issue.
- A letter of objection has been received from Turley Associates on behalf of Miller Homes and the land agent acting for one of the landowners that has entered into an option agreement with Miller Homes. Both have a clear vested interest in opposing this use, which is not relevant in determining this application.

The planning portal lists 70 public letters of support, not including those from statutory consultees.