



Minutes of a meeting of Council held on Wednesday, 12 August 2026

Members present:

Mark Harris	Ray Brassington	
Gina Blomefield	David Fowles	Tom Stowe
Claire Bloomer	Laura Hall-Wilson	Jeremy Theyer
Naomi Bloomer	Paul Hodgkinson	Craig Thurling
Nick Bridges	Nikki Ind	Michael Vann
Patrick Coleman	Angus Jenkinson	Jon Wareing
Daryl Corps	Juliet Layton	Ian Watson
David Cunningham	Mike McKeown	Len Wilkins
Tony Dale	Andrea Pellegram	Tristan Wilkinson
Paul Evans	Tony Slater	
Mike Evemy	Lisa Spivey	

Officers present:

Angela Claridge, Director of Governance and Development (Monitoring Officer)	David Stanley, Deputy Chief Executive and Chief Finance Officer
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Matt Abbott, Head of Communications
Simon Harper, Head of Democratic and Electoral Services	Marie Barnes, Lawyer
Nickie Mackenzie-Daste, Senior Democratic Services Officer	Geraldine LeCointe, Assistant Director - Planning Services
Helen Martin, Director of Communities and Place	Andrew Maxted, Interim Head of Planning Policy and Infrastructure
Jane Portman, Chief Executive Officer	

122 Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dilys Neill, Councillor Helene Mansilla, and Councillor Julia Judd. Councillor Naomi Bloomer had advised that she might arrive late.

Council

12/August2026

123 Declarations of Interest

The Chair invited Members to declare any interests in matters on the agenda.

Councillor Andrea Pellegram stood and declared that she was a retired professional planner and director of Andrea Pellegram Limited, a planning consultancy. She advised that this interest was recorded in her Register of Interests and that the company provided planning services to a range of clients, including town and parish councils.

Councillor Pellegram acknowledged that there could be a perception of overlap between her professional role and her responsibilities as a Councillor. She confirmed that she maintained a clear separation between those roles, did not use her position as a councillor to promote the interests of her company or its clients, and did not use or disclose confidential Council information for business purposes.

She informed the Council that, in relation to the draft Local Plan, her company had provided planning support to Honeybourne Parish Council during the Regulation 18 consultation. Honeybourne Parish Council, whilst outside the Cotswold District, was a statutory consultee. She advised that the work had been undertaken by another consultant within the company and that she had had no involvement in preparing or submitting the representations or in seeking to influence their consideration by the Council.

Councillor Pellegram further confirmed that neither she nor her company held any land interest affected by the draft Local Plan or any financial interest dependent upon its outcome. Having considered the matter carefully and taken advice from the Monitoring Officer, she advised that she had also agreed with her business partner that her company would not accept any commission from within Cotswold District to prepare representations on the draft Local Plan.

Councillor Pellegram confirmed that she had spoken with the Monitoring Officer and was satisfied she did not have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest or any other interest requiring her to withdraw from the meeting and therefore remained in the meeting, participated in the discussion and voted on the item.

The Leader of the Council invited any further declarations of interest. No further declarations were made.

124 Announcements from the Chair, Leader or Chief Executive

The Chair made the following announcements:

Members were asked to be disciplined in their contributions, avoid repetition and keep their remarks succinct, to maximise the use of the available time. It was noted that the

Council

12/August2026

meeting was capped at four hours and that, after three hours, a vote would be taken on whether to continue for the final hour. Every effort would be made to complete the business at the meeting; however, any outstanding business would be adjourned and the meeting reconvened at 6.00 pm on Thursday, 13 August 2020.

The Chair welcomed Mimi Johnson, a GCSE student from Deer Park School who was assisting Democratic Services and attending the meeting to observe the democratic process.

The Chair reported that Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson had advised that her resident, Tom McEwen, was representing Great Britain at the FEI World Eventing Championship in Aachen. The Council's best wishes were conveyed to him.

In advance of the Local Plan debate, the Chair acknowledged the frustration felt by Members and the public regarding the Government's housing requirements, which had significantly increased the Council's previous target. The Chair noted that the Council had formally challenged the decision on three occasions and that local MPs had made representations on the matter, but the increased targets remained.

The Chair emphasised that, while the Local Plan presented difficult choices, adopting a plan would enable the Council to retain greater control over development, including design, infrastructure, green spaces, net zero requirements and affordability. Rejecting the Plan would create a planning vacuum and reduce the Council's ability to influence development. Members were therefore asked to consider the long-term implications of the Plan, which would run to 2043, and to focus on managing growth and providing homes for future generations.

The Chair acknowledged the extensive work undertaken by officers across multiple disciplines, in consultation with other agencies and communities and supported by substantial evidence. Members were reminded that the debate should remain respectful and that personal attacks on officers or Members would not be permitted.

The Chair announced that a 30-minute adjournment would be taken between 7.00 pm and 7.30 pm to allow Members and attendees to observe the partial solar eclipse. Members of the public were asked not to engage with Councillors or officers regarding the Local Plan during the adjournment, in order to maintain the integrity of the decision-making process and avoid any perception of undue influence or prejudice. Any comments or representations on the Local Plan were to be made through the appropriate consultation process and in accordance with the meeting procedures. For health and safety purposes, attendees were reminded that the eclipse should only be viewed using safe, certified solar eclipse glasses or other appropriate solar viewing equipment. Those without suitable equipment were advised not to look directly at the sun. Members who did not wish to observe the eclipse were invited to use the group rooms during the adjournment.

Council

12/August2026

The Chair then invited the Leader to make any announcements.

The Leader noted that Councillor Claire Turner had resigned from the Council on Monday 10 August 2026 and he publicly thanked her for her three years of service to the Council and the residents of Blockley Ward. Particular recognition was given to her contribution to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, where her insightful and focused questions had made a valuable contribution to the committee's work.

The Leader formally appointed Councillor Tristan Wilkinson as the Council's Armed Forces Champion. Members were asked to direct any Armed Forces-related matters to Councillor Wilkinson.

The Chair then invited the Chief Executive Officer to make any announcements.

There were no announcements from the CEO.

125 Public Questions

The Chair then moved to public questions.

1. Councillor David Eglise - Down Ampney Parish Council

Councillor David Eglise, Chair of Down Ampney Parish Council, asked how the proposed allocation of 1,658 homes to Down Ampney, a historic rural village of approximately 231 dwellings, could be reconciled with the Council's commitment to protecting the Cotswolds landscape, heritage and community character. He also asked whether the Council would publish the evidence relating to flood risk, drainage and sewage capacity, aircraft implications and transport. He stated that residents were concerned about the scale of development and its potential impact on infrastructure, flooding, heritage, landscape and village identity, and sought assurance that the allocation would be based on robust evidence, transparent assessment and meaningful community engagement.

Councillor Mike Evely responded that the Government had required the Council to plan for 1,000 homes per year, compared with the fewer than 500 currently planned. As land had been put forward by landowners in Down Ampney, officers had been required to consider it seriously and had produced evidence to support the allocation. He stated that the Regulation 19 consultation would provide an opportunity for the community to challenge the evidence and that any deficiencies identified would be considered by the Inspector. He emphasised that decisions had to be based on evidence and that the Plan would need to be found sound through the examination process.

2. Councillor Chris Cottam - Mickleton Parish Council

Councillor Chris Cottam, Chair of Mickleton Parish Council, asked how the proposed phasing of development would operate in practice, given existing infrastructure pressures and three live applications to the west of the village totalling approximately 350 homes. In particular, he asked whether the proposed new primary school would be prioritised alongside the initial developments, or whether development would be

Council

12/August2026

delayed until appropriate infrastructure was in place, and what would happen to the existing primary school.

He also asked how local people would have control over the use of developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds to ensure that spending reflected local priorities. He expressed concern that, without appropriate infrastructure and services, Mickleton could become a dormitory settlement requiring residents to travel for healthcare, secondary education, employment and other services.

Councillor Juliet Layton responded that infrastructure would need to be considered alongside future development and that planning could not allow infrastructure conditions to worsen. She acknowledged the difficulties caused by speculative development and stated that these issues should be raised through the Regulation 19 consultation for consideration by the Inspector.

Councillor Layton also noted that the Neighbourhood Development Plan was recognised in the Local Plan and that Section 106 contributions would support infrastructure. She stated that communities could receive more CIL funding where a Neighbourhood Development Plan was in place and would have an opportunity to work with the Council on local infrastructure priorities.

3. Henry Kilworth - Driffield Resident

Henry Kilworth, a resident of Driffield, referred to amendments made by the Cabinet to the Plan and asked whether the Council would apply the approach used at Kempsford to the Driffield allocation, locating housing on plot R644 and recreational green space on plot R657.

Councillor Mike Every responded that this would be considered as part of any future master planning for the Driffield site. He explained that indicative master plans could be amended and that representations could be made on them. He considered that the potential for locating more open space closer to the village and housing further away from the existing village could therefore be examined.

Mr Kilworth then asked whether, given the proposed development of currently undeveloped greenfield sites and the creation of a new settlement at Driffield, it would be more responsible to reject the Plan and allow the successor authority to prepare a Plan following full and meaningful consultation.

Councillor Every responded that the area was already open to development because the Council had lost its five-year housing land supply. He stated that the issue was therefore whether development would be planned or unplanned. He supported planned development through the Local Plan. He explained that the successor unitary authority would be required to prepare a new local plan for the whole of Gloucestershire by 2033, whereas the current Plan could potentially be examined in the

Council

12/August2026

following year and adopted before the District Council ceased to exist. He stated that adopting the Plan would provide greater control over development and that waiting for the successor authority could result in a further five years of speculative development without the infrastructure required by communities.

4. Stephen Andrews - Kempsford

Stephen Andrews asked whether the Council had requested the Ministry of Defence's Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Department to undertake a full JSP418 environmental protection assessment based on B-1B operations from RAF Fairford, including an aviation noise contour assessment, so that the suitability and viability of proposed development sites in the vicinity of RAF Fairford could be assessed.

Councillor Juliet Layton confirmed that the Council had been in communication with RAF Fairford and that discussions were ongoing. Given the specific and technical nature of the question, she requested that Mr Andrews provide a copy of the written question to Democratic Services so that a written response could be provided.

5. Councillor Richard Harrison - Fairford Town Council

Councillor Richard Harrison asked whether the proposed development constituted sustainable development and whether the Cabinet could allow additional time for issues identified in the draft Plan and supporting documents to be considered before the consultation commenced. He raised concerns regarding highway capacity through Fairford, assumptions concerning modal shift and aircraft noise, noting that site assessments and development frameworks did not refer to aircraft noise. He described the impact of B-1B aircraft noise in Fairford and surrounding villages and asked whether the viability of the proposed Down Ampney allocation had been assessed having regard to aircraft noise.

Councillor Mike Evemy responded that, if the Council agreed to proceed to Regulation 19 consultation, Fairford, Down Ampney and other communities would have an opportunity to raise these issues through the consultation. He acknowledged the aircraft noise issue and stated that officers had begun discussions with the Ministry of Defence regarding sites that could potentially be affected by RAF Fairford. He added that the evidence supporting the Plan would be tested through the Regulation 19 process and the subsequent examination in public.

6. Councillor Eileen Viviani - Moreton-in-Marsh

Eileen Viviani asked how the proposed allocation of 2,217 new homes in Moreton-in-Marsh could be supported by sustainable economic growth when the five hectares of employment land previously identified had been removed as a drafting error. She referred to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework concerning the provision of sufficient employment land and infrastructure and asked whether the Plan provided for a sustainable future for Moreton-in-Marsh.

Councillor Juliet Layton confirmed that the employment land allocation had appeared in the Regulation 18 Plan in error and had subsequently been removed. She acknowledged the difficulty of securing employment uses in some areas but noted changes in working patterns since the COVID-19 pandemic, including increased home working and reduced office and manufacturing requirements. She stated that manufacturing businesses wishing to locate in Moreton-in-Marsh could be accommodated through the planning application process. She encouraged the submission of these concerns through the Regulation 19 consultation for consideration by the Inspector.

7. Neil Roberts - Driffield Resident

Neil Roberts asked whether the Council would undertake the modelling of ordinary watercourses identified as necessary in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment before the Plan was submitted in December, rather than leaving this to the planning application stage.

He also asked how the Driffield allocation could comply with Core Policy 64 where the Water Cycle Study indicated that development at Ampney St Peter could cause a deterioration in water quality and that further improvement at the relevant works was not theoretically available, and what mitigation the Council considered available.

Given the technical nature of the questions, Andrew Maxted, Interim Head of Planning Policy and Infrastructure, proposed that a written response be provided.

8. Councillor Adam Crawford - Down Ampney Parish Council

Councillor Adam Crawford asked what specific noise mitigation measures the Council considered capable of protecting future residents of the proposed 1,658-home Down Ampney development from military aircraft noise associated with RAF Fairford. He referred to reported daytime and night-time take-off noise levels and the limitations of standard acoustic glazing and asked how the Council justified residential development of this scale in the location given the potential impact of aircraft noise.

Councillor Juliet Layton stated that, given the level of detail in the question, a written response would be provided. She acknowledged the significant noise generated by military aircraft and expressed sympathy with communities affected by it. She explained that land put forward for development had to be assessed by the Council for its suitability and viability but noted that the Council had not yet received the full detail requested from Fairford USAF. The Chair confirmed that a written response would be provided and again encouraged the submission of the detailed concerns through the Regulation 19 consultation.

Council

12/August2026

9. Charlie Tuck-Hastings - Driffield

Mr Tuck-Hastings referred to the Chair's earlier statement that the Plan was supported by substantial evidence and stated that approximately 20 questions submitted two weeks previously remained unanswered, despite having been referenced to specific parts of the Plan and supporting documents. The speaker questioned whether the Plan could be considered sufficiently researched and asked whether Councillors could support its progression to Regulation 19.

Councillor Mike Every acknowledged that a large number of questions had been raised by parish councils and members of the public and stated that Members had also been seeking information from officers to inform their decision. He said that he could not comment on the specific unanswered questions without knowing their detail, but that officers had been doing their best to respond to the volume of enquiries.

Councillor Every explained that, if the Council agreed to proceed to Regulation 19 consultation, there would be further opportunities for questions and public meetings for communities affected by strategic sites. He stated that the Plan contained a substantial body of evidence and that he considered it to be capable of being found sound. He emphasised the importance of ensuring that development was supported by appropriate infrastructure including schools and roads.

126 Member Questions

The Chair invited questions from members. There were no member questions.

127 Local Plan

The purpose of the report was to seek approval for the publication of the Cotswold Local Plan 2026–2043 Regulation 19 document for a six-week consultation, its subsequent submission to the Government for independent examination, and delegated authority for minor corrections and preparation of any required modification schedule. The Plan, once adopted, would replace the existing 2018 Local Plan and provide the policy framework for planning decisions in the District.

Councillor Mike Every, Leader of the Council, introduced the item and proposed the recommendations. He explained that the Government's changes to the method for calculating housing need had more than doubled the District's annual requirement, resulting in a requirement for nearly 18,000 homes between 2026 and 2043. He stated that the Council had challenged the requirement but that the Government had maintained its position. The loss of the Council's five-year housing land supply had increased the risk of speculative development and reduced the Council's ability to defend refusals at appeal.

Council

12/August2026

Councillor Every stated that the Plan would provide greater local control over growth, infrastructure, affordable housing, design, landscape and environmental standards than would be possible through unplanned development. He acknowledged that the Plan was not perfect but considered it preferable to allowing development to proceed on a speculative and uncoordinated basis.

At 7.05 pm the meeting was stopped to give those present the chance to see the eclipse.

Councillor Naomi Bloomer arrived at 7:08 pm

The meeting reconvened at 7:25 pm

The Chair asked whether there were any questions for clarity.

Questions sought clarification on the Council's engagement with the Ministry of Defence regarding aircraft noise affecting proposed development at Down Ampney, Driffild and Fairford, and on how representations made by residents and parish and town councils during the meeting would be considered as part of the Regulation 19 process.

Councillor Every advised that officers had been in discussion with the Ministry of Defence and that those discussions would continue. He noted the increased significance of aircraft noise in recent months and confirmed that the Member of Parliament for South Cotswolds had also sought a noise map. He explained that, if the Plan proceeded to Regulation 19 consultation, residents and communities would have the opportunity to submit their concerns formally and those representations would be available to the Inspector as part of the examination.

The Chair sought a seconder for the proposal.

Councillor Juliet Layton seconded the proposal and chose to speak in support of the recommendations.

Councillor Layton explained that the Plan had been developed over several years and informed by three major consultations, which had generated more than 14,000 comments. She stated that feedback had informed policies relating to infrastructure, affordable and smaller homes, landscape and heritage protection, flooding, wastewater, active travel, public transport and design.

She highlighted the Plan's proposed provision of affordable housing, including a 40% requirement on developments of 10 or more homes, and its requirements for energy efficiency, renewable energy, green infrastructure and net zero carbon homes in operation. She also highlighted the infrastructure proposed across the strategic sites, including new and expanded schools, community hubs, transport improvements, recreation space and utility upgrades. She considered the proposed delivery trajectory

Council

12/August2026

to be realistic and emphasised that the Plan sought to create sustainable communities rather than isolated housing estates.

The Chair then moved to the debate and invited Members to speak.

Councillor Tom Stowe expressed strong opposition to the Plan. He considered that the Government-imposed housing requirement was excessive and that the Plan would place unsustainable pressure on communities. He raised particular concerns about the scale of development proposed at Mickleton, including the impact on infrastructure, employment and the road network, and considered that the Plan should be revisited.

Councillor Paul Hodgkinson thanked officers for their work but remained concerned about the scale of the housing requirement and its suitability for a district with significant landscape constraints. He supported the principle of infrastructure-led development and raised concerns about roads, healthcare, schools, public transport, water and sewage infrastructure, particularly in Moreton-in-Marsh and Mickleton. He stated that he would continue to raise these matters during consultation.

Councillor Craig Thurling stated that he was not opposed to development or to having a Local Plan, but was concerned that development was being proposed before there was certainty that the necessary infrastructure and services would be delivered. He raised particular concerns about Moreton-in-Marsh, including education, traffic, flooding, transport, healthcare and facilities for older residents, and concluded that he could not support the Plan in its current form.

Councillor Tristan Wilkinson acknowledged that the decision was difficult but considered that the Council had to choose between proceeding with the Plan or facing further unplanned development. He referred to previous development in Fairford and Lechlade and the difficulties caused by the lack of an up-to-date Plan. He supported proceeding to consultation, while highlighting concerns about the cumulative impact of development along the A417 and the impact of aircraft noise around Fairford.

Councillor Mike McKeown stated that the housing requirement was too high and inappropriate for the District, but considered that the immediate issue was whether the Council should manage that growth through a Plan or without one. He supported proceeding to Regulation 19 and emphasised the importance of the Plan's climate and environmental standards.

Councillor Daryl Corps thanked officers for their work but opposed the Plan because of the scale of development proposed at Moreton-in-Marsh. He considered that the proposed infrastructure, including the proposed spine road, would not adequately address existing traffic problems and expressed concern about the lack of employment land. He also questioned the process by which housing allocations could be removed from the Plan.

Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson expressed concerns about the overall impact of the housing requirement on the District and considered that development should be considered across the District rather than on an individual ward basis. She questioned whether sufficient infrastructure could be provided and raised concerns about roads, schools, healthcare, drainage, water services and the deliverability of the Plan. She also considered that the forthcoming local government reorganisation provided an opportunity to consider housing numbers across a wider area. She did not support the Plan.

Councillor David Fowles expressed strong concerns about the existing pressures on infrastructure in Moreton-in-Marsh, Fairford, Cirencester, Down Ampney and Driffield. He considered that the proposed infrastructure was not realistically deliverable and stated that he would vote against the Plan. He also emphasised that opposition to the Government's housing requirement had previously been a collective position among Members.

Councillor Lisa Spivey acknowledged the importance of having an up-to-date Local Plan and the risks associated with speculative development, but considered that this did not mean the Council should support a Plan which she believed was inappropriate for the District. She raised concerns about the proposed allocations at Down Ampney and Driffield and the impact on Fairford, Moreton-in-Marsh and Mickleton. She also expressed concerns about infrastructure delivery, sewage capacity and the potential loss or reduction of affordable housing through viability assessments. She concluded that she could not support the Plan.

Councillor Nikki Ind expressed discomfort with the housing requirement and the constraints imposed by the Cotswolds National Landscape. She supported the principle of infrastructure-first development and referred to previous experience in Tetbury where infrastructure had not kept pace with housing. She considered that the Regulation 19 consultation would provide an important opportunity for residents to make their views known and stated that, although the Plan was unpalatable, having a robust Local Plan could provide greater control over development and help secure affordable housing and infrastructure.

Councillor Patrick Coleman supported proceeding with the Plan. He referred to previous periods when the Council had not had an up-to-date Plan and considered that the resulting unplanned development in Tetbury, Fairford and Moreton-in-Marsh had demonstrated the risks of having no Plan. He considered that the Council should learn from that experience and support an up-to-date Plan despite the high housing requirement.

Councillor Gina Blomefield thanked officers and Members for their work but expressed strong concerns about the Government's housing requirement and the impact on

Council

12/August2026

communities, particularly Mickleton. She questioned whether the infrastructure identified in the Plan would be delivered and raised concerns about funding, Section 106 commitments, affordable housing and employment opportunities. She concluded that she could not support the Plan as it stood.

Councillor David Cunningham stated that his opposition was not primarily to the number or location of homes, but to the lack of confidence that the proposed infrastructure would be delivered. He expressed concern that viability assessments could result in infrastructure commitments being reduced and considered that the Plan did not provide sufficient guarantees for the creation of sustainable communities. He favoured waiting and allowing the future unitary authority to take a more holistic approach.

Councillor Angus Jenkinson acknowledged that the housing requirement was much greater than Members would have wished but focused on the need to ensure that future development was properly managed. He referred to previous failures to secure infrastructure and compliance with planning obligations and asked the Leader and Cabinet to bring forward a motion to address these issues systematically, with appropriate resources and systems.

Councillor Andrea Pellegram acknowledged that nobody wanted development on the scale required but considered that rejecting the Plan would not prevent the housing from being built and could result in poorer outcomes for communities. Drawing on her professional planning experience, she referred to the previous development at the St Peter's Road/Cirencester area as an example where substantial infrastructure had been delivered alongside development. She supported the Plan and considered that the examination process would allow the evidence and sustainability of individual sites to be properly tested.

Councillor Len Wilkins expressed doubts about whether refusing the Plan would produce a better outcome. He considered that proceeding would still allow Members and residents to challenge development and influence its outcome, whereas approval of the Plan could give developers greater certainty. He remained concerned about the effect on residents and was not persuaded that supporting the Plan was the right course.

The debate reflected a shared concern about the scale of the Government-imposed housing requirement and the ability of existing communities and infrastructure to accommodate the proposed growth. Members differed, however, on whether those concerns were best addressed by proceeding with the Plan and using the consultation and examination processes to seek improvements, or by delaying or rejecting the Plan.

The Chair invited the proposer, Councillor Mike Every, to sum up.

Council

12/August2026

Councillor Every acknowledged that the decision had been difficult and that Members would have preferred a lower housing requirement. He reiterated that the Government had maintained the requirement despite the Council's representations and stated that a Plan with fewer homes would not be found sound by an Inspector.

He emphasised that the decision was whether to proceed to Regulation 19 consultation rather than whether to approve the construction of the proposed homes. He stated that proceeding would give residents and communities a formal opportunity to comment and provide evidence, which would then be considered by the Inspector. He considered that abandoning the Plan would leave the District exposed to speculative development while awaiting the new unitary authority and would result in less control over development and infrastructure.

Councillor Every concluded that, although the Plan was not perfect, it provided a better basis for managing development than having no up-to-date Plan.

The Chair then moved to the vote on the recommendations proposed by Councillor Mike Every and seconded by Councillor Juliet Layton.

Voting record

17 For, 11 Against, 2 Abstentions.

To APPROVE the recommendations of the Local Plan report (Resolution)

RESOLVED that Council:

1. Agree that the Cotswold Local Plan 2026 – 2043 (Regulation 19) Document, including the material changes as agreed at Cabinet ([Supplement B](#)) and other changes ([Supplement C](#)) be published for six weeks consultation from 24 August 2026 to 5 October 2026.
2. Agree that thereafter, the Cotswold Local Plan 2026 – 2043 (Regulation 19) document be submitted to government for independent examination.
3. Provide delegated authority for the Director of Communities and Place in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning, to make any minor corrections prior to consultation, including for typographical and formatting purposes AND following the Regulation 19 consultation to prepare an 'Additional Modifications' Schedule for submission if required.
4. Note the technical supporting evidence in preparation for publication alongside the Cotswold Local Plan 2026 – 2043 for consultation.

For	Claire Bloomer, Naomi Bloomer, Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Tony Dale, Paul Evans, Mike Every, Mark Harris, Nikki Ind, Angus Jenkinson, Juliet Layton, Mike McKeown, Andrea Pellegram, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Tristan Wilkinson	17
Against	Gina Blomefield, Daryl Corps, David Cunningham, David Fowles,	11

Council
12/August2026

	Laura Hall-Wilson, Tony Slater, Lisa Spivey, Tom Stowe, Jeremy Theyer, Craig Thurling and Len Wilkins	
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Paul Hodgkinson and Jon Wareing	2
Carried		

128 Next meeting

The next meeting was confirmed as being on 23 September 2026 at 6:00 pm.

The Meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 8.25 pm.