COTSWOLD
District Council

Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday, 8 October 2025

Members present:

Dilys Neill (Chair)	Ian Watson (Vice Chair)	Patrick Coleman
Ray Brassington	David Fowles	Len Wilkins
Nick Bridges	Julia Judd	Michael Vann

Officers present:

Marie Barnes, Lawyer	Jasper Lamoon, Principal Planning Policy Officer
Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services	Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer
Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer	Geraldine LeCointe, Assistant Director - Planning Services
Amy Hill, Senior Planning Officer	Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic Services Support Assistant
Justin Hobbs, Tree Officer	
Jordan Hawes, Career Grade Planner	

Observers:
Councillor Paul Hodgkinson and Clare Turner

189 Apologies

There were apologies for absence from Councillors Daryl Corps, Tristan Wilkinson and Andrew Maclean.

190 Substitute Members

Councillor Len Wilkins substituted for Councillor Daryl Corps.

191 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

192 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2025 were discussed. Councillor Fowles proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Patrick Coleman seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2025.

Approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2025 (Resolution)		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Dilys Neill and Michael Vann	5
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Ray Brassington, Julia Judd, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins	4
Carried		

193 Chair's Announcements

There were no announcements.

194 Public questions

There was one public question.
Nicholas Arbuthnot raised concerns about the ongoing commercial use of Rendcomb Airfield, despite assurances under the Section 106 agreement that no commercial or circuit flying would occur. They highlighted that wing-walking flights were operating at low altitudes, causing noise disturbance for nearby residents. The speaker requested clarification on when the Airfield's response to the Planning Contravention Notice (PCN) would be made public and when enforcement action would begin if the response proved inadequate.

The Chair advised that an oral response could not be provided as enforcement investigations are confidential and not for discussion in a public forum. However, a written response would be issued within two weeks.

195 Member questions

There were no Member questions.

196 25/01036/OUT - Land East Of Cotswold Business Village

The proposal was for outline application for up to 195 dwellings.

Planning and Licensing Committee
08/October2025
Case Officer: Martin Perks
Ward Member: Cllr Angus Jenkinson
Original recommendation: REFUSE
The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application who made the following points:

- The applicants confirmed they were exploring the purchase of biodiversity net gain units; however, this would require inclusion in a Section 106 agreement with no formal mechanism to secure this.
- Representations were received from Councillor Jenkinson, the final response from GCC Highways and a copy of the Environment Agency's response.
- Location maps, aerial photographs, potential building plan, photographs of location from different areas showing views from different approaches were shared.
- A summary of 2 further objections from local residents was presented.

Public speaker 1 - Moreton in Marsh Town Council - Cllr Eileen Viviani
The Town Council objected to the development as it lay outside the town boundary and should be considered windfall. The Town Council supported the officer's recommendation for refusal and raised concerns about unclear financial contributions. They also highlighted the need for co-ordinated, sustainable planning to address cumulative development, infrastructure needs, and potential garden village proposals near the parish boundary.

Public Speaker 2 – Objector – Cllr Simon Randall
The Chair of Shipton Under Wychwood Parish Council had spoken in support of refusal, highlighting shared flooding concerns along the River Evenlode, which linked Moreton-in-Marsh and downstream villages. He noted that additional development could worsen sewage discharge and flooding.

Public Speaker 3 – Agent Bloor Homes – Jonathan Brown
Bloor Homes stated that the site was sustainable, outside protected landscapes, and supported the Council's corporate plan by addressing the affordable housing shortfall. The proposal included up to 195 homes (78 affordable), green infrastructure, biodiversity net gain, PV panels, EV charging, and a new active travel corridor. Bloor Homes argued that the scheme resolved infrastructure concerns and represented a sustainable development for the district.

Ward Member – Cllr Angus Jenkinson
The Ward Member noted that while some elements, such as landscaping, tree planting, and bus stop design, were positive, the overall scheme was flawed. Key concerns included the site's isolation outside the town boundary, inadequate infrastructure for waste, foul water, medical services, and highways, potential safety issues with cycle lanes, road noise and pollution, and the strain on local services.

Planning and Licensing Committee
08/October2025

Member Questions

Members asked questions of the officers, who responded in the following way:

- The majority of the site lay within Flood Zone 1, with areas in Flood Zones 2 and 3 at the eastern part of the site.
- The application did not fully meet the NPPF criteria as highlighted by the Town Council.
- The Primrose Court treatment works and the treatment works next to the current site were interconnected, but the Environment Agency's focus had been on the capacity of the latter, where the waste ultimately flows. Rising capacity issues had led to water being discharged into watercourses. Thames Water had recommended a condition that no occupation occurred until necessary upgrades were completed, and the local authority must be satisfied that these issues can be addressed.
- The Air Quality Officer agreed that the Nitrogen Oxide air levels would be below the objectives whilst also recognising that any increase in traffic would affect air pollution levels.
- The adjacent employment site comprised of a mix of B1, B2, and B8 use (storage and distribution). Noise surveys had been carried out, identifying an exclusion zone around the western part of the application site within which housing would be restricted.
- The application was considered not to be sustainable for a number of reasons including the cumulative impact of development on the town, transport, poor integration with the existing settlement, car dependence, air quality, congestion, sewage provision and landscape impact.
- The risk of foul water discharged into a watercourse was a material consideration and must be adequately mitigated. Thames Water had recommended a condition preventing occupation of the development until the necessary upgrades had been completed.

Members Comments

In discussing the application, Members made the following comments:

- That simply building more homes did not improve affordability of homes and that affordability in the Cotswold District had continued to worsen.
- Members applauded the inclusion of 40% affordable housing within the scheme.
- The proposal created a piecemeal, standalone enclave of housing that integrated poorly with both the existing settlement and the surrounding landscape.

Councillor Julia Judd proposed REFUSING the application and Councillor Ray Brassington seconded the proposal. This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

Recommendation: to REFUSE the application.

25/01036/OUT - Land East of Cotswold Business Village - REFUSE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

---

197 25/01970/PLP - Land At Ethans Orchard

The proposal was for Permission in Principle for the erection of 1 self-build dwelling.

Case Officer-Amy Hill
Ward Member-Cllr Paul Hodgkinson
Original Recommendation: PERMIT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application who made the following points:

- A late comment raised concerns about flooding, ecology, heritage, and landscape impact.
- There was a recap of location maps, aerial photographs and photographs from various directions.

Public speaker 1 – Objector – Sarah Calder
The objector argued that development would harm the landscape, conflict with the Cotswold Landscape Strategy, and breach duties under the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 to protect the AONB.

Public speaker 2 – applicant – George Charnick
The applicant claimed that the scheme would enhance the site's appearance, hide vehicles, and improve drainage, whilst offering an innovative, energy-efficient home of architectural quality. They stressed that design details would be reviewed to ensure it preserved the conservation area.

Ward Member
Councillor Paul Hodgkinson stated that the site lay within the Chedworth Conservation Area and the Cotswold National Landscape, both of which were highly protected. There were concerns raised that development would cause harm to heritage and landscape, including the loss of an important rural gap and intrusion into key views. It was noted that the proposal conflicted with statutory duties, national and local policies, with no clear public benefit.

Planning and Licensing Committee
08/October2025

Site Inspection Briefing Feedback

Following the Site Inspection Briefing the following observations were made:

- The site's open landscape was a distinctive and important feature of Middle Chedworth.
- The hedging was quite tall and the existing garage structure was lower down the slope.
- The existing hedge now blocked the valley view and there was consideration as to whether removing the garage and hardstanding and landscaping the right-hand side of the site would offset the visual impact of a dwelling.

Member Questions

Members asked questions of the officers, which were responded to in the following way:

- If permission was granted, the applicant must submit a technical details application, which could return to committee if ward members request it.
- The Council cannot control the existing hedges indefinitely. At the technical details stage, a landscaping condition could require the applicant to submit a scheme and maintain hedges for five years, after which control would revert.
- The existing hedges were a material consideration for the landscape, including the Cotswold National Landscape, but they were not permanent and could be removed at any time.
- The eastern half of the site could be considered more prominent and visible from the public right of way.
- Past advice stated that any building permitted on the site must not block the view.
- The site was not within a Site of Special Scientific Interest.
- In consideration of whether the site was "in" or "abutting" the village under policies DS3 and DS4, it was explained that the land was currently agricultural and if developed it would read as part of the village.

Member Comments

In discussing the application, Members made the following comments:

- The existing hedge was being used as a bargaining tool and granting Planning in Principle on the left-hand side could result in unacceptable development.
- Members questioned whether an acceptable design could be achieved, noting that features like a grass roof alone would not address broader impacts.
- The openness and punctuated housing pattern on the lower side of the road was an important feature of the community's landscape.
- A Member noted that to achieve an acceptable building would be a challenge but believed these conditions could be met.

Councillor Julia Judd proposed to REFUSE the application against the Case Officer's recommendations and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal.
Reasons for refusal included:

- The site lay within the Chedworth Conservation Area, which required special attention to preserve or enhance its character.
- The site provided a valuable open space which linked the village to surrounding agricultural land and reinforced the village's development pattern, with differences in density across the site.
- A dwelling with domestic paraphernalia would materially alter the character and appearance, causing harm to the conservation area.
- Any harm could not be sufficiently mitigated or outweighed by public benefits.
- The proposal was contrary to Local Plan Policies EN2, EN10, EN11 and MPPF Chapters 2, 12, 16.
- The site was within the Cotswolds National Landscape, requiring consideration for conserving and enhancing natural beauty.
- The site provided open space linking the village to agricultural land, reinforced rural character and contributed positively to the character and appearance of the National Landscape.
- The construction of a dwelling would detrimentally impact the site's character and appearance and even with sensitive design, the site would no longer form an integral part of the countryside.
- The proposal failed to conserve and enhance natural beauty, contrary to Section 85A1 of the Countryside Rights of Way Act, Local Plan Policies EM1, EM2, EM4, EM5, MPPF Paragraphs 187 and 189, and the Cotswold Landscape Management Plan.

This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.
RESOLVED: to REFUSE the application.

25/01970/PLP - Land at Ethan's Orchard - REFUSE against Officer recommendations. (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins	8
Against	Patrick Coleman	1
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

14:55 – 15:03 break

198 25/02584/TPO - Abbey Grounds

The proposal was for Tree T32 – London Plane. To reduce back to previous pruning points and crown thin by 10%.
Case Officer – Jordan Hawes
Ward Member – Councillor Mark Harris
Original recommendation: PERMIT

The Case Officer to introduce the application showing aerial and side photographs and site maps.

Member Questions
Members asked questions of the officer, which were responded to in the following way:

- Periodic cutting of the trees was undertaken every three years to prevent subsidence or overhanging branch damage to nearby buildings.

Member Comments
In discussing the application, Members made the following comments:

- These trees formed an important buffer within the historic landscape, including near the Norman Arch.
- Their preservation was supported, with reliance on tree officers to ensure health amid local flooding conditions.

Councillor Ray Brassington proposed accepting the Case Officer recommendation to PERMIT the application and Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal. This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.
RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

25/02584/TPO - Abbey Grounds - PERMIT (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

---

199 25/00002 - Tree Preservation Order - Mill Close, Blockley

The proposal was for the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) at Mill Close, Blockley.

Case Officer – Justin Hobbs
Ward Member – Councillor Clare Turner
Original Recommendation: to CONFIRM the TPO.

The Case Officer introduced the proposal showing aerial and side photographs and site maps. It was confirmed to Members that their options were to confirm the TPO, confirm subject to modification or to not confirm the TPO.
The Case Officer explained that there was no significant structural or physiological risk features apparent and described the health of the trees as expected for the age.

Public Speaker – Ward Member – Councillor Clare Turner:

- The trees provided significant amenity value at the village centre, were highly visible, and met the threshold for protection whilst also contributing to local biodiversity. Their preservation was supported, in line with Blockley Parish Council's action plan.

Member Questions

- The TPO allowed for emergency works; if a limb breaks or dies, it could be removed with a five-day notice under the legislation.
- The two trees formed a near-continuous canopy, so removing one would expose the other to unfamiliar wind, which was inadvisable.
- No evidence of structural damage had been provided but any future submission would be considered in subsequent applications.
- As summer branch drop had happened once, that would not make it more likely to happen again.

Councillor Ray Brassington proposed accepting the Case Officer recommendation to CONFIRM the Tree Preservation Order and Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal. This proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.
RESOLVED: to CONFIRM the Tree Preservation Order.

25/00002 - Tree Preservation Order - Mill Close, Blockley - PERMIT (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann, Ian Watson and Len Wilkins	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

200 Sites Inspection Briefing

The Chair advised members to keep the 5 November 2025 free for a possible Site Inspection Briefing.
Councillors Dilys Neill (Chair), Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, David Fowles, Julia Judd.

201 Licensing Sub-Committee

There were no licensing sub-committees planned.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 4.28 pm