



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

Members present:

Dilys Neill (Chair)	Ian Watson (Vice-Chair)	
Ray Brassington	Daryl Corps	Andrew Maclean
Nick Bridges	David Fowles	Michael Vann
Patrick Coleman	Julia Judd	Tristan Wilkinson

Officers present:

Leonie Woodward, Head of Legal	Kristina Carter, Career Grade Planner
Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services	Helen Cooper, Senior Planning Case Officer
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer
Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic Services Support Assistant	Graham Smith, Planning Case Officer
Marie Barnes, Lawyer	

150 Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

151 Substitute Members

There were no substitute Members.

152 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Fowles noted that the Town and Parish speaker for the first application was a former Cotswold District Councillor and a member of the Conservative Party. He declared that he had no pecuniary interest.

153 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2025 were reviewed. It was noted that there had been a duplicate attendance entry for Councillor Michael Vann.

Planning and Licensing Committee

09/July2025

Councillor Brassington proposed that the amended minutes be approved. This was seconded by Councillor Fowles and, following a vote, the Committee agreed the proposal.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE the amended minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2025.

Minutes (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	8
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Daryl Corps and Tristan Wilkinson	2
Carried		

154 Chair's Announcements

The Chair announced that the agenda for the afternoon was full and reminded Members to be brief and to the point. Members were asked to avoid repeating comments already made.

The Chair advised that votes on the applications would be taken electronically to ensure the results were visible. In the event of a technical failure, voting would revert to a show of hands.

155 Public questions

There were no public questions

156 Member questions

There were no Member questions.

157 24/03501/OUT - Land North of The Wern, Lechlade

Proposal

The proposal was for the residential development of up to 54 residential dwellings at Land North of The Wern, Lechlade.

Case Officer : Martin Perks

Ward Members: Councillor Helene Mansilla and Cllr Tristian Wilkinson

Original recommendations : REFUSE

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

- Additional pages containing further information on biodiversity net gain were received. Although this information was under review, the current recommendation remained one of refusal.
- Various supporting documents were presented, including location maps, extracts from the Local Plan, photographs of neighbouring land and roads, the site location plan, a roadworks plan, the Design and Access Statement, details of listed buildings, photographs of recent flooding, and information on recently refused applications.

Public speakers

Speaker 1

Councillor Steve Trotter – Lechlade on Thames Town Council.

He stated that Lechlade is a small principal settlement with limited infrastructure, and that the Local Plan strategy supports only small-scale development within the defined settlement boundary. It was noted that a previously allocated site within the boundary, controlled by the same landowner, remained undeveloped.

Councillor Trotter expressed concern that speculative applications outside the settlement boundary undermined both the Local and Neighbourhood Plans. He advised that the site had a history of applications, one withdrawn and two refused and continued to raise significant landscape, ecological, heritage, and drainage issues. The current application had attracted strong objections from three councils and approximately 100 residents.

While acknowledging the housing land supply position, he emphasised that the NPPF allowed refusal where the harms outweighed the benefits. He noted that proposed community infrastructure benefits had been reduced or removed in successive applications, while adverse impacts, including flooding concerns and harm to the setting of a Grade II listed building and the conservation area remained significant. He urged the Committee to support the officer's recommendation for refusal, in order to uphold the integrity of local planning policy and avoid setting a precedent for speculative development in the countryside.

Speaker 2

Alick Kitchen – Objector

A local resident, living in a listed building near the proposed site, spoke in objection to the application and raised eight main concerns:

1. The proposal breached the housing limits set out in the Lechlade Neighbourhood Plan (2016–2031), undermining its purpose and potentially opening the door to further greenfield development.
2. CDC's 2021 SHLAA highlighted the need to preserve the rural character of Lechlade's western approaches.

Planning and Licensing Committee

09/July2025

3. Lechlade already faced issues with traffic, limited parking, and overstretched services. The town lacked key infrastructure such as a secondary school, railway station, and major employers.
4. Development on the Thames floodplain posed increased flood risk, especially in light of recent severe flooding and climate change.
5. Despite ecological assessments, the speaker reported recent illegal habitat destruction on the site, allegedly under investigation.
6. The landowner had not developed nearby sites with existing permission, raising concerns about motives and delivery.
7. With all matters reserved, there was no detail on housing numbers, parking, or design, making it unclear what was actually proposed.
8. The application was materially identical to previously refused schemes, with the latest objection deadline having fallen on Christmas Day.

The speaker urged refusal.

Speaker 3

On behalf of Councillor Helene Mansilla – Ward Member

The Ward Member supported Lechlade Town Council's objections and the Case Officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

She stated that the proposal was fundamentally incompatible with both the adopted Cotswold District Local Plan and the Lechlade Neighbourhood Plan. It proposed major housing development on a greenfield site outside the settlement boundary, with no allocation, demonstrated local need, or overriding justification.

She noted that the officer's report identified clear conflicts with Local Plan policies DS2, EN6, and H1, as well as Neighbourhood Plan policy H2. The proposal was considered to cause unjustified harm to the rural landscape, adversely impact heritage assets, and failed to demonstrate the required biodiversity net gain.

Councillor Mansilla emphasised that previous applications for the site had already been refused, most recently application 23/02917/OUT. She stated that the current proposal had not addressed the previous reasons for refusal and that additional concerns had since emerged, including flood risk and the absence of a secured Section 106 agreement.

She concluded by stating that planning decisions should support long-term sustainability rather than speculative development that strained infrastructure, lacked integration, and failed to meet policy objectives. She urged the Committee to uphold the officer's recommendation and refuse the application in order to maintain the integrity of the planning system and public confidence.

Members questions

A Member queried the proposed housing density of the site, noting that the Design section had described it as very high. They asked what the proposed density was and what level would be considered unacceptable.

The Case Officer explained that while housing density figures can be misleading the proposed density of over 20 dwellings per hectare was relatively high for a rural edge-of-settlement location. By comparison, the allocated site to the south, just over half the size, had been agreed at nine dwellings. The Case Officer noted that accommodating 54 dwellings on the current site would represent a significant increase and would be difficult to deliver without harming the site's context, especially given its proximity to a listed building.

A Member asked how much consideration could be given to potential revised layouts due to the application being an outline application. The Case Officer explained that the applicant had submitted an indicative layout in an updated Design and Access Statement but this had not addressed Officer concerns about the level of development being proposed and its impact on the area, including the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

A Member inquired how much of the site would be located within Flood Zone 3. The Case Officer confirmed that none of the proposed residential development would be within Flood Zone 3.

A Member asked what the use class of the allocated employment land was. The Case Officer explained that it was Class E(g), which would be compatible with nearby residential properties.

The Conservation Officer outlined serious concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on the setting of Butler's Court, a high-status listed farmhouse. They explained that the building was historically surrounded by open countryside, but that development to the east in 2005 had already compromised its setting. The remaining open aspect to the west, where the proposed site is located was the only side retaining a meaningful rural relationship. If developed, the listed building would be enclosed by suburban housing, with its approach altered to a road through a housing estate. This, the Officer advised, would cause significant harm to its setting and could affect its long-term viability as a single dwelling.

A Member raised concerns about the predicted traffic movements, noting that only 27 vehicle movements had been forecast despite the site being at the opposite end of Lechlade from the school. They highlighted the lack of proposed cycle provision and limited footpath access, suggesting that the development would likely lead to greater car dependency and traffic impact.

The Case Officer responded that the applicant had been asked to undertake further movement studies to assess access routes into the town centre. Several walking options had been identified, and Gloucestershire County Highways had reviewed the data and found it acceptable. Highways officers considered the site to offer reasonable pedestrian and cycle access to local facilities, with distances of around one kilometre

falling within acceptable thresholds under national guidance. The site was therefore not considered unsustainable in terms of accessibility.

Members comments

Members made the following comments on the application:

- One Member expressed support for the Town Council's objection, emphasising the importance of adhering to the Lechlade Neighbourhood Plan.
- Another Member described the proposal as a misuse of the planning process, suggesting it lacked planning merit and appeared to rely on persistence rather than substance.
- A further Member commented that the proposal did not integrate with the existing village and welcomed the Committee's stance in supporting the officer's recommendation and the objections raised by the parish councils.

Members discussed the nature of the applications coming before the Committee and whether some applications were seeking to manipulate constitutional proceedings around major applications.

A proposal to REFUSE the application in line with the officer recommendations was proposed by Councillor Judd and seconded by Councillor Fowles.

This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

24/03501/OUT - Land North of The Wern - Refuse (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Tristan Wilkinson	11
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

158 25/00650/FUL - Land at Nos. 26 To 48 Austin Road Cirencester

Proposal

The proposal was for the demolition of existing 12 flats and construction of 14 new houses and flats at Land at 26 – 48 Austin Road, Cirencester, GL7 1BT

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Member: Councillor Claire Bloomer

Original recommendation: PERMIT

Planning and Licensing Committee

09/July2025

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

- Late papers were received containing comments from Gloucestershire Archaeology, who raised no objections.
- The Case Officer shared location maps, site location, various photographs of the existing buildings, similar local developments and elevation drawings.

Public Speaker

Millie Nicholls Agent – Bromford Housing.

The speaker addressed the Committee in support of the application to redevelop the existing flats at Austin Road.

They stated that the current buildings did not meet modern building regulations and were not viable for refurbishment. The block experienced high levels of antisocial behaviour, which affected staff resources and negatively impacted resident wellbeing. The physical condition of the buildings required substantial ongoing investment to maintain basic standards.

The speaker noted that similar blocks in the vicinity had already been successfully redeveloped. The proposed scheme would deliver 100% affordable housing, using a fabric-first design approach to improve energy efficiency and reduce heating costs. Bromford, the applicant, highlighted their strong track record, financial capacity, and continued investment in affordable housing across the Cotswolds. The application was presented as an opportunity to replace substandard housing with high-quality, sustainable homes that met current standards and supported long-term community wellbeing.

Member Questions

A Member asked about the anticipated timescale for the proposed development. The Case Officer and the Chair advised that, based on their experience of similar Bromford developments, completion was typically achieved within a relatively short timescale.

A Member questioned whether the proposed scheme could accommodate a greater number of homes, suggesting that the site appeared to have capacity for additional units.

The Head of Planning advised that the Committee could only consider the application as submitted.

A Member welcomed the replacement of the existing block but raised a concern about the environmental impact of demolition. They asked whether any provision had been made for managing waste materials.

The Head of Planning explained that, although the District Council did not have a specific waste minimisation policy, the County Council did. The applicant would be responsible for managing demolition and construction waste, with the disposal of materials governed by separate legislative frameworks.

Planning and Licensing Committee

09/July2025

A Member asked whether progress was being made on completing the Section 106 legal agreement relating to biodiversity net gain.

The Case Officer confirmed that the agreement was in progress and would be completed shortly.

Member Comments

A Member welcomed the applicant's commitment to high energy performance standards and expressed support for the scheme, highlighting the benefit of providing energy-efficient homes for people on lower incomes in the centre of Cirencester.

A proposal to PERMIT the application in line with the officer recommendations was proposed by Councillor Brassington and seconded by Councillor Fowles.

This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the committee.

25/00650/FUL - Land at Nos. 26 - 43 Auston Road, Cirencester - Permit (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Tristan Wilkinson	11
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

159 24/03111/FUL - The Saddlery, Kineton, Guiting Power

Proposal

Removal of stables, erection of a dwelling.

Case Officer: Helen Cooper

Ward Member: Councillor Len Wilkins

Original Recommendation: PERMIT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to present the application:

- The Case Officer shared site location plan, aerial photograph, original and revised design and layout, existing building, surrounding views and surrounding highways.

Public speakers

Speaker 1

Councillor Liza Hanks – Temple Guiting Parish Council

The Parish Councillor spoke in objection, describing the site as a well-maintained, cherished green space, not a brownfield or neglected plot. They noted that 74% of the

Planning and Licensing Committee

09/July2025

hamlet's residents had submitted formal objections, fearing loss of this valued landscape.

The speaker argued that the proposed development did not reflect local building traditions or landscape character, disrupting the village's historic pattern. They referenced relevant local plan policies that call for proportionate and respectful development, stating the proposal was out of scale and context.

The speaker acknowledged the challenge of meeting housing targets but urged the Committee to protect the site and refuse the application.

Speaker 2

James Emtage – Objector

The speaker highlighted that the site was small, with the proposed development nearly three times the height of the existing stables and was prominently visible from the road, especially if a large tree screening the site were removed. The speaker expressed concern that the new building would dominate the area, leaving little space for parking or gardens.

They requested that if development were permitted, it should be limited to a bungalow matching the current stables' height and footprint to preserve the character of the site. The stables had been rented by the speaker's parents for over 35 years and had served as an open, community-focused space used by local families, children with special needs, and others to engage with animals and nature. The speaker questioned whether replacing this valued community asset with housing that might increase patronage at a local pub truly benefited the community. They urged the Committee to protect the stables as an important rural asset rather than allowing an out-of-character, dominant new build.

Speaker 3

Mark Pettit – Agent

The Agent described the site as a natural infill plot within Kineton's built-up area, proposing one additional dwelling on previously developed land amid a housing land supply shortage.

The speaker noted that the scheme had been refined through officer engagement and no statutory consultees, except the parish council, had objected. The proposed dwelling, though larger than the existing stables, was consistent in scale with nearby properties and was designed in a traditional barn-like style using local materials to blend with the area.

They highlighted the scheme's alignment with Local Plan policies allowing small-scale development, its lack of adverse impacts on landscape, amenity, or heritage, and the applicant's willingness to accept recommended conditions. The speaker requested the Committee approve the application in line with officer recommendation, emphasising its positive contribution to the rural community.

Speaker 4

Councillor Len Wilkins – Ward Member

The Ward Member, representing Kineton, objected to the proposal, clarifying that Kineton was a hamlet with limited amenities; a pub and a saddlery. They stated the proposed building was out of scale and dominant, located on a prominent high bank. The Ward Member emphasised the breach of Cotswolds National Landscape policies, the loss of a much-loved stable used by local children and visitors, and potential negative impacts on biodiversity, including loss of trees, a pond, and wildlife movement. They also raised concerns about light pollution and the design being out of character with the area.

They noted the proximity of the development to a 700-year-old listed building and the resulting loss of privacy. The Ward Member highlighted narrow local roads and limited parking as further issues. Overall, they urged the Committee to consider conservation policies and to protect the hamlet's character and natural environment.

Site Inspection Briefing

Councillors Corps, Vann, Maclean, Brassington, Watson

- The site was located on the edge of the village, located between tall farm buildings and an existing house. It was considered that a dwelling on the site would neither overlook nor be overlooked by neighbouring properties, as hedges provided screening from the adjacent house.
- Kineton was described as a village that blended naturally into the landscape. It was noted that the existing saddlery sat gently within the hillside, partially screened by trees, and harmonised with the surrounding Cotswold stone buildings. From the nearby footpath, Members observed that the proposed development would appear significantly larger and more prominent than the existing structure at the village entrance.
- The proposal involved demolition of the existing stables and the construction of a new build barn conversion designed to resemble a traditional barn conversion. Members also observed nearby redundant-looking modern farm buildings, expressing concern that approving this application might set a precedent for future development on adjacent sites.
- The existing stables were currently well screened by trees and vegetation when approaching the village from both the south and the north. A new, taller building positioned further forward on the plot would be significantly more prominent from multiple viewpoints, including from the nearby footpath.

Member questions

A Member asked whether the Conservation Officer could comment on how the design related to policies EN2 and EN4, particularly in terms of respecting local character, landscape quality, and tranquillity. Additional questions were raised regarding the acceptability of the design as it was still perceived to be a "fake barn conversion" rather than a traditional dwelling. Members asked the Officer to explain why this style was considered acceptable in a small village such as Kineton.

The Case Officer confirmed that, following consultation with landscape and conservation officers, the design was considered acceptable and not harmful to the landscape.

The Conservation Officer clarified the reasoning for supporting the proposed design:

- Kineton was not a conservation area, and the application site was not close enough to listed buildings to significantly affect their setting. The existing stable was not considered a non-designated heritage asset.
- Whilst the proposal was for a new build, the design approach taken had been to reflect the agricultural character of the site. The Cotswold threshing barn was considered to preserve the rural character which remained notably agricultural and open.
- Although the gable appeared tall, the house was effectively 1.5 storeys high. The design included minimal fenestration and modest materials to reduce its visual impact.
- A bungalow might have been lower in height but was considered to have a more domestic appearance, which was regarded as less appropriate in this rural setting.

The Conservation Officer concluded that, if a dwelling were to be permitted on this site, an agricultural-style design approach was considered appropriate.

A Member asked the Case Officer to clarify what was meant by “modest benefits” in the context of the proposal.

The Case Officer explained that the “modest benefits” referred to in the report included the provision of an additional dwelling, contributing to the housing supply, and the associated economic benefits from construction activity.

Members asked for clarification on the height of the existing and proposed buildings. The Case Officer explained that the existing stable was estimated to be 3.5 metres high, while the proposed new dwelling would be 8 metres to the ridge and 4.2 metres to the eaves.

In terms of floor space, the existing stable measured approximately 6.5 metres by 16.5 metres. The proposed dwelling measured approximately 8 metres by 18 metres and also included an additional storey, resulting in an increase in internal floorspace.

A Member questioned the location of the tree proposed for removal.

The Case Officer was unable to access the Arboricultural Survey, however, the Arboricultural Officer had advised that the proposal would result in the removal of one tree of low quality and a replacement tree could be secured by the recommended landscaping condition.

Member Comments

Members made the following comments:

- This was not considered a modest Cotswold home, but rather a large, high-value property unlikely to serve local needs. It was felt it risked becoming a second

home, offering little benefit to the community, while resulting in the loss of a much-loved amenity.

- Some Members expressed surprise that Corpus Christi College had supported the removal of trees and a valued community amenity, suggesting that the proposal appeared to be motivated by profit rather than community interest.

The Case Office informed Members that the Saddlery could not be considered a community facility, as its planning history related solely to use as a stable block.

A Member expressed the view that the proposed development was contrary to several key Local Plan policies:

- **Policy EN1:** It was considered that the proposal failed to promote the protection, conservation, and enhancement of the historic and natural environment. The removal of an established community amenity and its replacement with a large, incongruous dwelling was seen as undermining these objectives.
- **Policy EN2:** Members felt that the design did not reflect high-quality architecture or respect the distinctive character and appearance of the local area. Evidence from the site visit, local representations, and the parish council suggested that the scale, height, and visual prominence of the new building would result in a building which was out of keeping with the traditional rural form of the settlement.
- **Policy EN4:** The development was considered to have a detrimental impact on the local landscape. In particular, concerns were raised about its elevated and prominent position, the loss of rural openness, the removal of a tree, and the erosion of the quiet, countryside character of the hamlet.

These combined factors led Members to conclude that the proposal did not meet the standards set out in the Local Plan for development in sensitive rural locations.

A Member stated that the application did not support the vitality of the local community and it was not of a proportionate scale with regards to Local Plan Policy DS3. Officers referred Members to paragraph 11 of the NPPF, which was of relevance due to the Council's housing land supply position, and advised that any adverse impacts of granting permission would have to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the framework.

Another Member added concerns around the sustainability of the proposal stating that the village was largely inaccessible without a car and lacked modern services. There were also biodiversity concerns, especially large windows that could cause light pollution and disrupted wildlife corridors used by bats and other animals, contrary to Policy EN8. Members were advised that the Biodiversity Officer had raised no objection to the proposal.

A Member found no grounds to oppose the Case Officer's recommendations finding no material planning considerations.

Councillor Corps proposed REFUSING the Case Offers recommendation and Councillor Fowles seconded the proposal.

The Case Officer summed up the reasons that had been given for refusal:

The site occupied an elevated and prominent position within the street scene on the approach to the village of Kineton. Due to its design, scale, and form of the proposed development it failed to protect or enhance the existing natural assets and their settings, contrary to policy EN1A. The design quality failed to respect the character and distinctive appearance of the locality and had a significant detrimental impact on the natural landscape and character of the village, contrary to Policies EN1 e), EN2 and EN4 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031 and Section 12 of the NPPF.

The proposal to refuse the application was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To REFUSE the application

24/03111/FUL - The Saddlery, Kineton, Guiting Power - Refuse (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Andrew Maclean, Michael Vann and Tristan Wilkinson	8
Against	Patrick Coleman and Ian Watson	2
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Dilys Neill	1
Carried		

16:02 – 16:14 break

Councillor Judd did not return to the Chamber

160 25/01020/FUL - Duchy Home Farm, Tetbury

Proposal

Demolition of existing agricultural shed and redundant silage pits. Replacement calf shed with solar panels.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Member: Councillor Laura Hill-Wilson

Recommendation: PERMIT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to present the application:

- The Case Officer presented the additional pages from Tetbury Upton Parish Council in support of the application.
- The Case Officer presented the site location map, proposed elevations, photographs of existing shed.

Public speaker 1

Anthony Wright – Agent

The Agent explained how the proposed Agile Shed at Broadfield Farm was essential for improving calf housing, animal welfare, and environmental sustainability.

The farm, run by Mr. Gay under a long-term tenancy from His Majesty the King, was a flagship organic dairy operation producing 1.3 million litres of milk annually.

The new shed enhanced disease prevention, animal well-being, and growth by providing a clean, ventilated environment for around 200 dairy calves born each year. It was backed by DEFRA's Farming Investment Fund and the Waitrose head vet. Rooftop solar panels were planned to supply renewable energy and support the farm's ambition for carbon neutrality.

Carefully designed to fit within the existing farmyard and to reflect the rural character of the Cotswolds, the building replaced outdated structures and avoided greenfield development. It represented a model for modern, high-welfare, environmentally responsible farming.

Public speaker 2

Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson – Ward Member

The Ward Member stated that having reviewed the application and noting no objections from the Parish Council or local residents, she supported this proposal.

Duchy Home Farm had identified the need to improve calf housing and was addressing it with a design that enhanced animal welfare and included rooftop solar panels for renewable energy.

The Ward Member endorsed that the application also demonstrated strong environmental credentials, with a 72.74% biodiversity net gain, well above the 10% requirement. Duchy Home Farm was transparent and informative about its practices.

Councillor Maclean proposed accepting the Case Officer's recommendation to PERMIT the application and Councillor Brassington seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT the application.

25/01020/FUL - Dutchy Home Farm, Tetbury - Permit (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Tristan Wilkinson	10
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

161 25/01049/FUL - Compton Farm, Compton Abdale

Proposal

Demolition of existing building and erection of replacement building for the storage of logs.

Case Officer: Graham Smith

Ward Member: Councillor Paul Hodgkinson

Recommendation: PERMIT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to present the application:

- The Case Officer shared the site location map, existing and proposed elevations, photographs of existing shed, floor plan.

Member Questions

A Member asked for clarification on the liability for Biodiversity Net Gain for this application. The Case Officer explained that the site was already developed with hard standing and therefore this did not apply.

Members asked for clarification on the employment use of the site. The Case Officer confirmed that the operation was employment use B2 with ancillary B8, but the B2 uses were all undertaken elsewhere on the site.

Councillor Maclean proposed accepting the Case Officer's recommendation to PERMIT the application and Councillor Corps seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

25/01049/FUL - Compton Farm, Compton Abdale (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Tristan Wilkinson	10
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

Councillor Judd did not vote on the application.

162 National Scheme of Delegation

The Head of Planning introduced the report setting out the Council's responses to the questions posed within the Reform of planning committees: technical consultation, published by The Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) in May 2025. The technical consultation would end at the end of July 2025:

Planning and Licensing Committee

09/July2025

Members were invited to comment:

A Member questioned whether, given that second-tier authorities were due to be abolished, third-tier authorities might be more involved in planning decisions going forward.

The Head of Planning responded by saying that the consultation applied to district-level Planning Committees. If Cotswold District Council was succeeded by a unitary authority, the context would change. The National Scheme of Delegation would apply to all planning authorities whether district, borough, or unitary.

A Member enquired whether Planning Committee Members would need certification. The Head of Planning explained that a national certificate would be acceptable if it covered the basics of the planning system. However, it must not replace locally focused training and guidance.

Members agreed to submit any suggestions to the Head of Planning by 15 July for consideration by the Chair and Vice-Chair.

Councillor Coleman proposed accepting to delegate the response to the Head of Planning with consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair and Councillor Maclean seconded the proposal.

16:46: Councillor Judd returned to the Chamber.

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the delegated response of the Head of Planning with consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair

To delegate authority to the Head of Planning following Member consultation - Permit (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Andrew Maclean, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Tristan Wilkinson	11
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

163 Sites Inspection Briefing

The Chair advised members to keep the 6 August 2025 free for a possible Site Inspection Briefing.

Councillors Dilys Neill, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Michael Vann

Planning and Licensing Committee
09/July2025

164 Licensing Sub-Committee

There were no licensing sub-committees planned.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 4.51 pm

Chair

(END)