



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday,
9 April 2025**

Members present:

Ray Brassington (Chair)	Patrick Coleman (Vice Chair)	David Fowles
Dilys Neill	Julia Judd	Daryl Corps
Mark Harris	David Fowles	

Officers present:

Helen Blundell, Interim Head of Legal Services	Amy Hill, Senior Planning Officer
Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services	Geraldine LeCointe, Assistant Director - Planning Services
Nickie Mackenzie-Daste, Senior Democratic Services Officer	Helen Martin, Director of Communities and Place
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Joanne Reeves, Senior Planning and Conservation Officer
Malcolm Jones, Gloucestershire County Council Highways	

114 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor Michael Vann.

115 Substitute Members

There were no substitute Members.

116 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Mark Harris informed the Committee that he had been acquainted with one of the speakers from the Parish Council.

Councillors Mark Harris and David Fowles declared their candidacy for the County Council division relevant to the first application.

Councillor Daryl Corps declared his candidacy for the County Council division relevant to the second application.

117 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2025 were discussed. Councillor Ray Brassington indicated for the Chair and Vice-Chair positions to be labelled in the Members present list.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed accepting the amended minutes and Councillor Mark Harris seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE the amended minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2025.

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 March 2025. (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Mark Harris, Julia Judd and Dilys Neill	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

118 Chair's Announcements

The Chair, on behalf of the Committee, thanked Gary Selwyn who had recently stepped down as a Councillor, for his dedicated service, attention to detail, and valuable contributions. His diligence in reviewing minutes and planning applications had been greatly appreciated, and he would be missed.

Helen Martin was introduced as the new Director of Communities and Place, alongside Geraldine LeCointe, Assistant Director for Planning Services. The Chair welcomed them both and extended best wishes for their time at Cotswold District Council.

The Chair informed Members that a training session titled "five-year housing and land supply" was scheduled for 14 May 2025 at 12pm.

The Chair announced that, after nearly four years of service, he would be stepping down as Chair of the Committee. Councillor Brassington's final Planning and Licensing Committee meeting as Chair would take place in May.

Questions were asked by Mr Geoff Tappern, Deputy Chair of the Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan, a former Parish Councillor and resident of Down Ampney.

Question 1

Mr Tappern extended an invitation to the Chair and all committee members to visit Down Ampney, where three developments were currently underway. He highlighted issues arising from poor planning decisions in recent years, resulting in long-term problems such as serious flooding. He emphasised the need for collaboration to address these concerns and offered to demonstrate how poor site layout, decision-making, and lack of enforcement had negatively impacted the village. He asked whether the invitation would be accepted?

It was noted that the Chair would consult the Legal Department to determine whether approval could be given.

Question 2

At the Planning and Licensing Committee meeting on 12 March 2024, an application for 13 affordable houses near the football club was approved. Concerns were raised that the Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan had not been given sufficient weight in the decision, with policies such as Cotswold District Council (CDC) Local Plan Policy H1 and Neighbourhood Plan Policy HP2 reportedly overlooked.

Issues relating to housing density were also highlighted, with the Parish Council having proposed a lower number of dwellings. While the village supported development, it was emphasised that planning decisions should align with the Neighbourhood Plan, CDC policies, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Further concerns were raised about the handling of sewage and surface water issues, as well as the underrepresentation of resident objections.

A question was raised as to why key planning documents, including the CDC Local Plan, Down Ampney Neighbourhood Plan, Design Guide, and NPPF, had not been fully considered in the decision-making process, and whether this set a precedent for future applications.

The Chair responded that all relevant factors are taken into consideration when making a decision including local plans, the NPPF and design codes. Each application was judged on its own merits and decisions were not based on precedent.

Councillor Fowles declared that he knew the public speaker as a Parish Councillor.

A written response was offered to Mr Tappern who declined the offer.

120 Member questions

There were no submitted Member questions.

121 24/03864/FUL Grove Piece Duntisbourne Leer Cirencester

The application was to convert an existing stable building to a two-bedroom residential dwelling.

Case Officer: Joanne Reeves

Ward Member: Councillor Julia Judd

Original Recommendation: PERMIT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application:

- There were no additional pages nor updates provided.
- Various location maps, aerial photographs, plans of existing and proposed barn, elevations and planting scheme, and site photographs were shared.

Public Speakers:

Public Speaker 1

Jane Edwards – Parish Council Chair.

Duntisbourne Parish Council maintained its strong objection to this application on the following grounds:

- The building, constructed in 2015 for equestrian use, was neither redundant nor disused. Its proposed residential conversion raised concerns about the original intent and was seen to set a worrying precedent for development in open countryside.
- The structure had not been built in accordance with its original planning permission, and no retrospective application had been submitted. Its lawfulness was therefore in question.
- In 2020, a storage barn was approved due to fire safety concerns, requiring separation of horses and equipment. The current claim that this barn met all equestrian needs undermined the application.
- No lawful rural enterprise existed on-site; therefore, the applicant's stated need to live on the premises for equestrian welfare was not considered a valid planning justification.
- The proposal constituted a change of use and conflicted with the NPPF which discourages isolated homes in the countryside. The design, particularly the large glass facade, was considered domestic in character and visually intrusive, with a negative impact on views from the Grade II listed Nutbeam.

Planning and Licensing Committee

09/April2025

- The development increased vehicle traffic on narrow lanes and further eroded the landscape character of this part of the Cotswolds National Landscape, which formed an important part of the approach to the historic village of Duntisbourne Leer.
- Claims that the proposal would “tidy the site” were not considered valid planning reasons.

Given the building’s short lifespan, its deviation from approved plans, and inconsistencies in the application’s justifications, the Parish Council expressed concerns that the proposal may represent an incremental strategy to secure residential development, contrary to established planning policy.

Public Speaker 2

Claudia Jones – Agent

The applicant sought to live on-site to provide continuous care for her horses, which had ongoing health issues requiring frequent attention.

The horses had been relocated to an approved storage barn elsewhere on the site, rendering the stable building surplus to requirements. The building was reported to be structurally sound and capable of conversion without significant alteration or extension. The proposal made use of existing openings to create a modest two-bedroom home using locally appropriate materials.

The speaker stated that the principle of development was supported by Policy EC6 and the NPPF, both of which allowed residential conversions of existing rural buildings. The design was said to comply with the Cotswold Design Code, incorporated energy-efficient measures, and was supported by a Landscape Mitigation Strategy demonstrating no harm to the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Although the Highways Authority had objected on grounds of sustainability and pedestrian safety, the representative noted that Policy EC6 did not require demonstration of site accessibility, and that national policy permitted development in isolated rural areas.

It was stated that all other planning matters, including ecology, heritage, and amenity, had been addressed. The proposal was described as sustainable development that reused existing resources and met a local housing need.

The applicant requested that planning permission be granted.

Ward Member

Councillor Julia Judd

The Ward Member referred to the Highways Authority’s objection to the application, citing repeated and hazardous incidents involving HGVs on Crabtree Lane, often misdirected by satellite navigation from the A417. The lane was described as narrow, steep, and hazardous and particularly dangerous in winter, with multiple documented instances of lorries reversing uphill, posing serious risk to pedestrians.

The route was also noted as part of two popular circular walks used regularly by local residents, dog walkers, cyclists, and horse riders. It was felt that additional residential traffic would further increase these risks.

The Ward Member raised concerns regarding the cumulative impact of residential development within the Cotswolds National Landscape. The site was located near several listed buildings, and it was noted that existing equestrian development had already impacted the setting. It was argued that the introduction of further domestic features, such as garages, bins and children's toys would erode the rural character of the area.

Additional concerns were raised about inconsistencies in the original use of the stable and the potential for a gradual change of use beyond what had initially been permitted.

The Interim Head of Legal Services questioned the Ward Member's ability to consider the application impartially. The Ward Member confirmed that they would assess the information presented by the Case Officer in an unbiased and open-minded approach.

Feedback from Site Inspection.

Members noted the following points:

- Although the lane was narrow, very few cars were observed during the site visit.
- There were limited passing places along the single-track road.
- The most striking feature of the site was the beauty of the Cotswold National Landscape.
- No other dwellings were visible from the site.
- Horses were present on the land, confirming its use for equestrian purposes.
- The footprint of the building remained unchanged
- The original stable building did not contain any internal partitions.
- The stable building was set back from the road.

Gloucestershire Highways Officer Feedback:

- The Highways Officer highlighted that the road was narrow with steep banks, making it hazardous for pedestrians. It was noted that the area experienced higher pedestrian traffic than expected due to nearby walking routes.
- It was observed that existing traffic associated with horse care might decrease if residents were to live onsite. However, in the absence of a personal consent condition, the property could potentially be sold, and horse-related traffic might continue.
- The Highways Officer acknowledged the presence of conflicting policies within both the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Local Plan. While certain policies emphasised the importance of accessibility by walking and cycling, others supported the conversion of existing rural buildings.
- From a transport sustainability perspective, the site was considered to lack adequate access to walking, cycling, and public transport options.
- It was noted that the definition of "unacceptable impact on highway safety" remained subjective. The officer expressed concerns about changes in the

nature of traffic, including a potential increase in deliveries and pedestrian activity.

- The Highways Officer concluded that the overall situation was fundamentally unsafe, regardless of the projected scale of traffic increase, and emphasised the importance to balancing the relevant policy considerations.

Members Questions

Members asked questions of the Gloucestershire Highways Officer, who responded as follows:

- The Highways Officer was not aware whether refuse and postal deliveries currently used the road.
- The Highways Officer explained that residential use of the site traffic may not lead to more traffic at the applications site but there may be more vulnerable road users.
- The Highways Officer was unsure whether conditions regarding vehicular user visibility or the property surface could be added.

Members asked questions of the Case Officer, who responded as follows:

- The traffic that used the road at present included the horse owner resulting in four journeys per day, a limited bus service and a small refuse collection lorry. Crabtree Lane was noted as one of the main routes into Duntisbourne Leer from the A417.
- The Case Office explained that the existing stable building, constructed in 2015, replaced an earlier structure from the late 1990s. A riding arena received planning permission in 2018, followed by a storage barn in 2020, indicating incremental development over time. They explained that due to the site's topography, the modest scale of the building, and existing planting, the wider visual impact was considered limited. The site was reported to be contained, with no encroachment into the surrounding landscape beyond the existing built form.
- The Case Officer clarified that any future application to convert the storage barn into a dwelling would be assessed on its own merits.
- The Case Officer agreed that the self-build exemption would permit the applicant to sell the property on the open market after occupying it as a principal residence for three years.
- It was explained that the application site was outlined in red on the site location map. If planning permission was granted for the conversion of the stables to a dwelling, conditions were recommended to remove permitted development rights within the red outline.
- The Case Officer noted that, were permission to be granted, an equestrian tie could have been considered. This would have restricted occupancy to individuals connected with the established equestrian use on the site, similar to an agricultural worker's tie.

- The Case Officer acknowledged that there would be limited planning control over the placement of moveable garden paraphernalia and domestic planting.
- It was confirmed that the condition could be added requiring the provision of Swallow nesting cups.
- The Case Officer agreed that there was potential for light spill from the proposed glazing, though the impact was considered minimal due to the building's modest size. A condition was recommended to prevent the installation of roof lights, thereby minimising upward light spill.
- The Case Officer confirmed that a new-build dwelling in this location would not have been permitted.
- The Head of Planning explained that residential curtilage was tightly drawn around the building and the extent of the garden was tucked away to the side, behind the building. Whilst this was not considered to cause harm to the National Landscape, it would nevertheless alter its character.

Member Comments:

Members made the following comments on the application:

- Members expressed concern that the terms redundant and disused could present a potential loophole in policy interpretation.
- There was acknowledged difficulty with the interpretation of Local Plan Policy EC6, as the building in question had received planning permission in 2015 as a stable block and was therefore not considered redundant.
- It was noted that the Highways Authority had issued an unusual recommendation for refusal based on safety concerns.
- Officers had advised that the proposal would inevitably have an impact on both the Cotswold National Landscape (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and the nearby Conservation Area.
- Whilst Members expressed sympathy regarding the reported instances of crime on the site, it was acknowledged that rural crime was not unique to this location.

The Head of Planning referenced paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which required the Council to favour approval unless certain criteria were met. Two key exceptions were identified:

1. Where the proposal would impact a protected area, such as the National Landscape, this may still provide a clear reason for refusing an application.
2. Adverse impacts relating to highways safety would need to be considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of permitting the application.

Further reference was made to paragraph 115 of the NPPF, which emphasised the importance of sustainable transport and the provision of safe and suitable access for all users. The Head of Planning acknowledged that concerns had been raised regarding highway safety, particularly due to the limited support for walking and cycling infrastructure in the area.

Councillor Mark Harris proposed refusing the application against the officer recommendation, and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

Resolved: To REFUSE the application

24/03864/FUL Grove Piece Duntisbourne Leer Cirencester - Refuse. (Resolution)		
For	Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Mark Harris, Julia Judd and Dilys Neill	5
Against	Ray Brassington	1
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Patrick Coleman	1
Carried		

122 24.03740.FUL Land Parcel Adj To 10 De Havilland Road Upper Rissington

The application was for the erection of a 5 bed, two-and-a-half-storey detached dwellinghouse, including new entranceway.

Case Officer: Amy Hill

Ward Member: Councillor Andrew Maclean.

Original recommendation: PERMIT – Subject to completion of S106 legal agreement to secure self-build.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application:

- There were no additional pages or updates provided.
- Various location maps, aerial photographs, plans of existing and proposed elevations, planting scheme, site photographs were shared.

Member Questions:

Members asked questions of the Case Officer, who responded as follows:

- A previous application on the site had been approved and was noted to be similar in terms of planning constraints.
- No comments had been received from the Parish Council regarding the current application.
- It was confirmed that planning conditions could not be applied to control the length of time required to complete the building.
- The Case Officer noted that there were minimal concerns regarding parking and highway safety, as on-site parking was provided and residential traffic was expected to travel at low speeds.

Planning and Licensing Committee

09/April2025

Councillor David Fowles proposed accepting the officer recommendation to permit the application, and Councillor Daryl Corps seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

Resolved: To Permit the application subject to the completion of S106 legal agreement to secure self-build.

24/03740/FUL Land Parcel adj. to 10 De Havilland Road Upper Rissington - Permit (Resolution)

For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Mark Harris, Julia Judd and Dilys Neill	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

123 Sites Inspection Briefing

There were no site inspection briefing planned.

124 Licensing Sub-Committee

A meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee (Taxis, Private Hire and Street Trading Consent) was expected to be required on 24 April 2025.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 3.36 pm

Chair

(END)