



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday,
11 February 2026**

Members present:

Dilys Neill (Chair)	Ian Watson (Vice Chair)	
Nick Bridges	David Fowles	Michael Vann
Patrick Coleman	Joe Harris	Julia Judd
Daryl Corps		

Officers present:

Marie Barnes, Lawyer	Geraldine LeCointe, Assistant Director -
Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services	Planning Services
Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer	Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer
Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services Officer	Andrew Moody, Senior Planning Officer

Guests:

Councillor Juliet Layton, Mike Evemy and Tom Stowe

238 Apologies

There were apologies from Councillor Ray Brassington.

239 Substitute Members

There were no substitute Members.

240 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Coleman declared that in relation to Application 10 and the adjacent residential buildings discussed during the site inspection briefing, they knew a couple living in one of the neighbouring properties through a local choir connection. The legal representative confirmed that, provided the Councillor was satisfied they could consider the matter with an open mind, the connection declared was acceptable and did not prevent participation.

Councillor Corps confirmed that he was the County Councillor but confirmed they didn't have any connection with Bridgewater Racing

241 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 January 2026 were discussed. Councillor Vann proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor Judd seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 5 January 2026.

04. Minutes 14 January 2026 - APPROVE (Resolution)		
For	Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Nick Bridges and Joe Harris	2
Carried		

242 Chair's Announcements

There were no announcements by the Chair.

243 Public questions

There were no public questions.

244 Member questions

There were no Member questions.

245 25/02983/OUT - Land North of Folly View, Willersey

The proposal was for outline permission to erect of up to 30 dwellings with associated means of access, car parking, public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system, and associated infrastructure.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Member: Councillors Tom Stowe and Gina Blomefield

Officer Recommendation: PERMIT subject to completion of a section 106 legal agreement covering financial contributions to secondary education, library services, community transport, the provision of affordable housing and self-built custom housing and financial contributions to Willersey Parish Council for improvements to the village hall recreation ground and cemetery.

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

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/February2026

- The recommendation had been amended to permit the application subject to no objection from the Gloucestershire County Council Lead Local Flood Authority, in addition to the previous conditions.
- Willersey Parish Council had requested £121,150 toward the village hall.
- Updated drainage details had been submitted and were under review by the Lead Local Flood Authority, so the recommendation remained to permit subject to no objections.
- An objection had been received from Folly View residents, which raised concerns that the proposed layout had not provided adequate separation or landscape buffering to protect privacy, and highlighted potential noise intrusion during and after construction. They requested additional measures such as weekend restrictions and no driven piling.
- A local resident shared correspondence from Severn Trent Water regarding foul drainage capacity.

The key points were that:

- Issues were partly due to unmapped surface water connections and infiltration into the wastewater network.
- The system was designed mainly for foul water and should accommodate current connections, but infiltration could undermine performance.
- The pumping station operation was being reviewed to ensure optimal performance.
- Willersey was served by Honeybourne Sewage Treatment Works, which had sufficient treatment capacity, though some upstream network sections had hydraulic constraints.

The Case Officer shared aerial photographs, site plan, photographs from various directions and access points, location of development sites in the town and a drainage scheme strategy.

Public Speakers

Speaker 1 – Willersey Parish Council – Councillor Jane Rintoul

The proposal formed part of two live applications totalling 90 dwellings in a village of 900 people and 495 homes, creating a dense block of 60 houses. It was emphasised that the development lay within a nationally protected landscape, and that the NPPF required exceptional circumstances for major developments, which had not been demonstrated. They raised serious infrastructure concerns, including closed shops, a school at capacity, overstretched GP and acute health services, and limited public transport increasing car dependency. Combined with existing sewage and water capacity issues, the Councillor urged the Planning Committee to reject the application.

Speaker 2 – Objector – Roger Webb

The objector highlighted longstanding flooding and sewage issues in Willersey. They noted that the officer's report confirmed the applicant was still in discussion with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and without agreement, the scheme was

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/February2026

unacceptable. They emphasised that Severn Trent Water and Thames Water had statutory responsibilities and that no development should proceed until their concerns were resolved. The objector urged the Committee to refuse the application or defer until full agreement from the LLFA, Severn Trent, and Thames Water was received to enable an evidence-based decision.

Speaker 3 – Agent – Ed Leeson

The scheme was reduced from 50 to 30 homes in response to pre-application advice and landscape sensitivity. No technical objections had been raised, and matters including ecology, trees, archaeology, and amenity could be addressed through conditions. Drainage and flood risk had been carefully considered with the LLFA and Severn Trent Water, with a robust sustainable drainage strategy proposed. The development included 12 affordable homes and delivered local benefits via a Section 106 agreement.

Speaker 4 – Ward Member – Councillor Tom Stowe

The Ward Member highlighted that around 170 objections had been lodged, demonstrating significant local concern, particularly over longstanding flooding and sewage issues. Residents had experienced raw sewage in roads and gardens, manhole blowouts, and backing up in homes, with Severn Trent Water confirming ongoing investigations but no planned investment. Pre-commencement conditions should be imposed and effectively enforced.

Despite the reduced scheme size, the proposal could still constitute major development under the NPPF, requiring careful consideration of its impacts on the Cotswold National Landscape and refusal unless exceptional circumstances and public interest were demonstrated.

Member Site Inspection Briefing Feedback

- Whilst the site offered impressive views and represented a village expansion next to a modern development, it appeared relatively ordinary itself and not markedly different from other developed sites in the National Landscape.
- The reduction of the scheme from 50 to 30 houses, negotiations between the agent and case officer and with the site being pushed south to protect the footpath, was particularly significant.
- The site was extremely wet, with the field completely saturated despite it not being a rainy day.

Member Questions

Members of the Committee asked a series of questions and noted that:

- Whilst the outline application had raised concerns about drainage, the applicant had had ongoing discussions with the LLFA to develop a drainage strategy ensuring surface water was managed on-site, with flows not exceeding existing

greenfield rates. The detailed schemes and sustainable drainage measures would be secured via conditions.

- Severn Trent Water was responsible for connecting the development to the drainage network and ensuring capacity, and whilst they had raised no objection (subject to conditions), the Council could only enforce measures through planning conditions to prevent occupation until satisfactory solutions were in place. The main issue appeared to be surface water infiltrating the system rather than insufficient foul drainage capacity.
- The Case Officer clarified that the scheme was not considered major development in the Cotswolds National Landscape for the purposes of paragraph 190 of the NPPF. Independent landscape consultants had deemed it acceptable, and that under footnote 67, major development was determined by the decision-maker based on its nature, scale, setting, and whether it would have a significant adverse impact. The residential nature, limited scale of 30 houses, and lack of notable landscape features meant no significant adverse impact was expected.
- Under the current Local Plan, Willersey was designated as a principal settlement and should be treated as such until a new Local Plan was adopted. Its status may change following the ongoing settlement review.
- 40% of the scheme would be affordable housing, including six social rent homes. Current housing needs evidence showed that 55 households in the village or neighbouring parishes required affordable housing.
- The Cotswold National Landscape Board was not a statutory consultee. Its objection and supporting report still carried material weight, and its Management Plan policies were taken into account as material considerations in the assessment of applications.
- Education contributions were relating to secondary provision for 16–18 year olds. Current capacity pressures were at that stage, whilst primary contributions were not being sought at present.
- The number of objections or expressions of support was noted not to be determinative and that the application must be assessed and decided on its planning merits.
- A holding objection had initially been submitted by Severn Trent Water whilst they investigated wider network concerns. Their latest position was no objection subject to condition. An appropriate planning condition had been recommended to secure drainage measures before commencement.
- Concern was raised that the affordable homes were positioned in the site with potential surface water risk and whether this was appropriate. The Case Officer advised the whole site was Flood Zone 1 and that detailed level data indicated mitigation measures, including raised floor levels and sustainable drainage design, could address the risk, subject to confirmation by the LLFA.

Member Comments

- Concerns were raised locally about flooding, drainage and water infrastructure capacity in Willersey. However, planning decisions must be determined in line with policy and the advice of consultees such as the LLFA and Severn Trent Water, within the framework of national guidance and the Cotswolds National Landscape designation.
- The development was considered modest, with housing on two sides, generous green space, a thoughtful and respectful layout, a mix of affordable and social housing, and no expected impact on escarpment views from the footpath.
- The contribution to the Village Hall was still under negotiation between the Parish Council and the developer as the current figure was considered too high.

Councillor Joe Harris proposed and Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal to permit the application. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT subject to no objection from Gloucestershire County Council, the Lead Local Flood Authority, and the completion of a Section 106 agreement securing financial contributions to secondary education, library services, community transport, Willersey Parish Council for the village hall, recreation ground, and cemetery, as well as the provision of affordable and self-built/custom housing.

25/02983/OUT Folly View, Willersey - PERMIT subject to requirements/objections (Resolution)		
For	Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Joe Harris, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Against	David Fowles	1
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Nick Bridges	1
Carried		

246 25/03122/FUL - Wyck Hill Farm Racing Stables, Stow-on-the-Wold

The proposal was to re-locate a stable yard including provision of new access, new buildings and siting of a mobile home.

Case Officer: Martin Perks

Ward Member: Councillor Dilys Neill

Recommendation: To PERMIT subject to completion of S106 legal agreement covering Biodiversity Net Gain

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/February2026

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

- The agent requested flexibility in condition wording and timeframes to allow phased submissions, and delegated authority was proposed for officers to amend the relevant timeframes accordingly.
- The Case Officer shared a map, site contour map, aerial photographs, site location map and site section.

Speaker 1 – Ward Member – Councillor Dilys Neill

The legal representative was satisfied that the Chair had confirmed that they would be able to approach the application openly and transparently.

The proposal supported a long-established equestrian business by modernising stables, converting two redundant barns to housing to fund the business, providing a mobile home for the groom, creating local employment, and improving access with a safer, Council-approved entrance.

Member Questions

- The stone barn qualified for conversion under paragraph 84 as non-designated charity assets, with the Dutch barn's setting enhanced by removal of surrounding buildings and landscaping, and the land already had an equestrian use from a 2004 permission.
- Highways had no objection, noting that the new entrance provided the required 215 m visibility, with average recorded speeds of 57 mph, and they had requested clarification on space and distances which had been addressed.

Member comments

- The development supported a local equestrian business, which was an important contributor to the local economy.
- Changing the entrance was welcomed for existing safety concerns.

Councillor Joe Harris proposed and Councillor Daryl Corps seconded the proposal to permit the application. Delegated authority was proposed for the officer to make minor amendments to condition timeframes, with a Section 106 agreement ensuring monitoring of biodiversity net gain (BNG) over the coming months. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT subject to completion of S106 legal agreement covering Biodiversity Net Gain with delegated to Officers to condition timeframes.

25/03122/FUL Wyck Hill Farm - PERMIT subject to S106/delegations (Resolution)		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

247 24/02513/FUL - Siddington Park, Cirencester

The proposal was the development of land and erection of buildings to expand an existing Integrated Retirement Community (Use Class C2).

Case Officer: Andrew Moody

Ward Member: Councillor Mike Every

Officer recommendation: PERMIT subject to the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement.

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

- The Case Officer shared the site location plan, proposed site block plan, aerial photographs, proposed landscaping, block elevations, shadow diagrams, and site photographs from various directions.
- Additional pages included the applicant's financial viability assessment, along with a review by independent consultants commissioned by the Council, which was referenced during discussions about the approval of affordable housing.
- The appendices included the full needs assessment, as well as the tree survey details from the Site Inspection Briefing.
- The proposed blocks were within acceptable separation distances per the Cotswold Design Code. For two-storey blocks, a minimum of 22 m was required: Block 1 was 42.5 m from Number 2 Preston Leigh and 52m to the side of Number 3; Block 2 is 33m and 46m to the rear of Nos. 3 and 4 respectively. For three-storey blocks, a minimum of 28m was required: Block 3 ranged from 42.5m to 50m to adjacent rear elevations. Block 4, a mix of three and four storeys, also met or exceeded the 28m standard.

Speaker 1 – Objector – Oli Freeling-Wilkinson

Whilst local residents supported reasonable development, the current proposal for six blocks of flats, including three- and four-storey buildings close to their homes, raised serious concerns. He noted the applicant had not meaningfully engaged beyond one pre-application meeting, design revisions remained incomplete according to the

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/February2026

Conservation Officer, and tree mitigation was inadequate due to planned felling and inaccurate shadow reports.

Speaker 2 – Agent

Siddington Park provided purpose-built housing with care for older residents, meeting a documented local need for housing with care. The proposed final phase added communal facilities and had addressed all planning concerns, including tree works approved on health and safety grounds. The development supported the local economy and was considered sensitive, balanced, and appropriate.

Speaker 3 – Ward Member – Councillor Mike Every

The Ward Member raised three main concerns about the application: the accuracy of tree and shadow impact evidence, the absence of any affordable housing provision, and the effect of building scale and proximity on neighbours' amenity at Preston Leigh. They welcomed clarification on tree replacement but questioned the shadow diagrams based on observations. They also requested a viability review to secure a future affordable housing contribution, raised concerns that some blocks may be too large and too close to neighbouring properties, and sought stronger conditions on construction timing and drainage.

Member Site Inspection Briefing feedback:

- Concerns were expressed about the appropriateness of four-storey buildings in Cirencester, particularly in relation to their scale and potential fire engine access difficulties due to building height and narrowing road layout.
- Concerns were also expressed that the proposed large block would create excessive darkness and overshadowing, that parking provision appeared insufficient for the number of apartments, that the amount of usable green space and privacy may be overstated once roads and buildings were in place, and that the overall layout could feel overlooked.
- The Phase 1 accommodation appeared densely packed with Phase 2 designed to be more densely packed.

Member Questions

- The late financial viability assessment had been independently reviewed by consultants commissioned by the Council. They did conclude that the scheme would not generate sufficient profit to support an affordable housing contribution.
- The nearest part of Block Four to Number 6 Preston Leigh was three storeys in height, with the four-storey element set about 29 metres away, and that the closest block elevation would be blank because balconies had been removed following officer concerns about overlooking of neighbouring gardens.

Member Comments

- This was a finely balanced application, with notable design concerns about the height and massing of Blocks four to six, and support resting mainly on the council's low housing land supply.
- Due to the Council's housing land supply being below the required five years, the scheme was being considered more favourably than it otherwise would be, but concerns remained that it conflicted with the local plan and design code. Block 4 was particularly judged to cause heritage harm through excessive scale and massing and to fail key design principles on height, bulk, and human scale.
- The proposal provided zero affordable housing on a 55-unit scheme where up to 40% would normally be expected, meaning that the community gained no meaningful local benefit in return for the identified visual and heritage harm.
- Concerns were raised about the need for additional retirement properties, citing examples of existing sites in the district where units remained unoccupied.
- The site lacked meaningful green space.

Councillor Julia Judd proposed REFUSING the application and Councillor Joe Harris seconded the proposal.

Refusal reasons:

1. Heritage: Impact on the setting of the listed building, conflicting with Local Plan policies EN10 and EN11, and Paragraphs 212 and 215 of the NPPF.
2. Design: Failure to conform with Local Plan policies EN1 and EN2 and the Cotswold Design Code, conflicting with Paragraphs 135 and 139 of the NPPF.

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

RESOLVED: To REFUSE the application.

24/02513/FUL Siddington Park - REFUSE (Resolution)		
For	Nick Bridges, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, David Fowles, Joe Harris, Julia Judd, Dilys Neill, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	9
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

248 Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The purpose of the report was to advise the Planning and Licensing Committee of the current NPPF consultation, agree the consultation response on behalf of the Council

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/February2026

and to seek delegated authority to respond to a second consultation on Design and Placemaking guidance.

The report was introduced by Councillor Juliet Layton, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning, and Geraldine Le Cointe, Assistant Director of Planning Services, who made the following points:

The Government published a draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and was inviting responses by 10 March. The draft introduced significant changes, splitting the NPPF into plan-making policies and development management policies, which made it easier to read.

Key points for local planning:

- Local plan preparation deadlines remain unchanged, with submission planned for December this year under the current NPPF.
- Development management policies in the draft NPPF would take precedence over newly adopted local plan policies.
- Draft policies on settlements and development outside settlements were relevant, particularly given the district's current lack of a five-year housing land supply.
- A new "tilted balance" was proposed, favouring development that met unmet need unless other considerations outweighed it.

Members were invited to review the draft, particularly policies on settlement and unmet need, and provide feedback for the consultation by 20 February 2026.

The Committee discussed the report and voted to APPROVE the recommendations.

249 Sites Inspection Briefing

The Chair advised members to keep 4 March 2026 free for a possible Site Inspection Briefing.

Councillors Dilys Neill (Chair), Ray Brassington, Ian Watson, Daryl Corps, Michael Vann.

250 Licensing Sub-Committee

There was a Licensing Sub-Committee Meeting scheduled for 12 February 2026.

Councillors Dilys Neill, Ray Brassington, David Fowles.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 5.06 pm

Chair

(END)