



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on
Tuesday, 11 August 2026**

Members present:

Ian Watson (Chair)

Ray Brassington

Patrick Coleman

Nikki Ind (Vice Chair)

Daryl Corps

Paul Evans

David Fowles

Michael Vann

Officers present:

Marie Barnes, Lawyer

Harrison Bowley, Head of Planning Services

Julia Gibson, Democratic Services Officer

Simon Harper, Head of Democratic and
Electoral Services

Tyler Jardine, Trainee Democratic Services
Officer

Helen Cooper, Senior Planning Case Officer

Rebecca McAndrew, Consultant Planner

Julian Pye

Joanne Reeves, Senior Planning and
Conservation Officer

315 Apologies

There were apologies from Councillors Dilys Neill, Julia Judd and Nick Bridges.

316 Substitute Members

There were no substitute Members. Councillor Ian Watson was the Chair and Councillor Nikki Ind was the Vice Chair.

317 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Daryl Corps declared that he was unable to approach the agenda item 8 without predetermination. He would leave the chamber before the debate and would not vote.

Councillor Paul Evans declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 13. He did not know the applicant socially but had accompanied his partner whilst campaigning. Councillor Evans confirmed that he had an open mind for the debate and vote.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

Councillor David Fowles declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 9 and 10, noting that they knew the applicant. He would leave the Chamber and not take part in the debate or vote. He also declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 13. The applicant was married to a member who lived in his ward. He had not engaged with the applicant outside council or town council meetings and had not met socially.

Councillor Fowles declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 12, noting that he and the applicant had both previously been councillors.

Councillor Nikki Ind declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 12. She knew Mr Peter Martin and Mr Steven Keightly, whose wife she had worked with. She had attended an initial Longfield Greens Association meeting as an observer. Following legal advice, she would participate in the debate and vote.

Councillor Ian Watson declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 12. He had not commented on the application or attended any meetings of the Association or other parties and confirmed that they had approached the matter with an open mind.

The Legal Officer declared an interest in agenda item 11, as their home adjoined the development site, and would leave the meeting during the discussion.

318 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 8 July 2026 were discussed. Councillor Ian Watson proposed accepting the minutes and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal which was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee.

RESOLVED: to APPROVE the minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2026.

Minutes 8 July 2026- APPROVE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Paul Evans, David Fowles, Nikki Ind, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	8
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

319 Chair's Announcements

The Chair reminded councillors and members of the public of the meeting procedures.

320 Public questions

There were no public questions.

321 Member questions

There were no Member questions.

322 25/02443/FUL - Land to the West of Fosseway Farm, Moreton-In-Marsh

The proposal was for construction of 10 dwellings.

Case Officer: Rebecca Mc Andrew

Ward Member: Councillor: Councillor Daryl Corps

Recommendation: Permit, subject to confirmation from Gloucestershire County Council Highways that, following review of additional swept-path analysis relating to refuse vehicle manoeuvring within the site, its recommendation of no objection remains unchanged, and subject to the conditions set out below.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application. The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee including:

- The application had been deferred at the previous meeting for a site visit. Further information had demonstrated that a refuse vehicle could be accommodated on site, and the Highways Authority had raised no objection. The recommendation was therefore updated to approve the application, subject to the conditions in the officer report.

Public Speakers

Public speaker – Councillor Eileen Viviani – Town and Parish Council

They raised concerns regarding the proposed 10-dwelling scheme, noting that the emerging Local Plan identified capacity for approximately 20 dwellings on the site. Clarification was sought on the viability and affordable housing provision, and whether the proposal would prejudice future delivery of the site capacity.

Public speaker – Carol Sugrue – Objector

The site's location within the Cotswold National Landscape and existing development boundary was highlighted. Concern was raised about the impact of construction, traffic and loss of the open countryside setting on residents of the adjacent nursing home. Emphasised was placed on the importance of the landscape to residents' wellbeing, dignity and quality of life.

Public speaker – Dale Radford – Agent/Applicant

The speaker highlighted the additional highways information provided following the previous deferral and site visit. The proposal for 10 single-storey homes was addressing housing need, with benefits including biodiversity, accessibility and improved access to the countryside.

Public Speaker – Councillor Daryl Corps – Ward Member

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

The Ward member raised concerns regarding the site being outside the development boundary, its sensitive location adjoining the Cotswold National Landscape, and the impact of development in Moreton-in-Marsh. They questioned that the proposal provided no affordable or social rented housing. They highlighted the neighbouring Esmere Gardens nursing home and its vulnerable residents, including those receiving end-of-life care. A letter from the nursing home's director explained that the Care home had been contractually prevented from commenting on the application.

Cllr Daryl Corps left the Chamber for the rest of the application

Site Inspection Briefing

- The site formed part of a wider pattern of development on the edge of Moreton-in-Marsh
- This particular part of the Cotswold National Landscape was thought to be relatively ordinary and affected by road noise.
- The access route passed close to the nursing home, including a bedroom.
- The site was described as open scrubland, enclosed by trees.
- Several nursing home rooms had balconies overlooking the site, meaning residents using them could see and hear activity associated with the development.
- One of the windows appeared to serve a resident's room and noted the proximity of the nursing home and public footpath to the site.
- Highlighted the impact on nursing home residents and their visitors, particularly those using the balconies and garden and those visiting residents who were seriously ill or receiving end-of-life care.
- The site entrance was particularly tight.
- Noted the loss of two parking spaces serving the care home, with most of the remaining spaces occupied.

Members questions

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

- A letter from the neighbouring nursing home indicated that the home was contractually unable to comment on the application. Legal Services advised that Members should not make assumptions as to the nursing home's position beyond what was stated.
- The proposed footway alongside the access would be approximately 1.8 metres wide. The access would narrow to a single carriageway with a passing space provided. The number of vehicles using the access road in the peak morning hour was expected to be six.
- The viability assessment had assumed a normal developer profit of approximately 15-20%. The assessment had been reviewed with the independent assessor, who confirmed that the site's marginal viability was primarily due to its small scale and the higher costs associated with bespoke development. The applicant's viability assessment had been independently

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

examined and officers were satisfied that the viability evidence could be accepted.

- The draft Local Plan currently carried minimal to no weight, as it had not yet progressed to Regulation 19. The proposed development remained outside the existing development boundary and was therefore contrary to Policy DS4.
- The scheme had been amended so that so that bikes would not use the Monarch's Way footpath.
- There would be no age restriction on the purchase of the bungalows, which would be open-market properties.
- Exceptional circumstances for development within a National Landscape applied only to major development under the National Planning Policy Framework.
- The application site had historically formed part of a single ownership before being subdivided and sold to Aldi and the owners of Esmere Gardens. The applicant had retained legal rights of access across the intervening land, including rights to construct and use an adoptable highway and provide necessary services. The relevant landowners had been served with the required notices.
- Additional construction restrictions would need to be necessary and reasonable, and Officers suggested discussing appropriate measures with the applicant to minimise the impact on the vulnerable residents of the neighbouring nursing home.

Member comments

- The site represented a poor use of land and could potentially accommodate 15–20 dwellings, including approximately 40% affordable housing.
- A Member felt that the impact on nursing home residents would be principally during the construction period and that the presence of new residents could provide activity and connection for those living in the home.
- Members were mindful of the impact on nursing home residents, noting that the potential effects were not limited to vehicle movements, as there would also be deliveries and other activity associated with the development.
- Members deliberated on the fine balance of benefit and harm

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed that the application be permitted, but the proposal was not seconded and therefore fell.

Members debated the following reasons for refusal:

- Impact on residents of the nursing home, with reference to Policies EN1 and EN2 and paragraph 135 of the NPPF concerning residential amenity.
- Inefficient use of the site and lack of affordable housing, with reference to paragraph 129 of the NPPF and Policy H2, on the basis that a more efficient use of the site could potentially provide additional dwellings and affordable housing.

The Head of Planning requested delegation to Officers for the refusal wording.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

Councillor Ray Brassington proposed REFUSING the application and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee

RESOLVED: to REFUSE the application

Meeting adjourned 15:32 – 15:41

25/02443/FUL - Land to the West of Fossey Farm, Moreton-In-Marsh - REFUSE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, David Fowles, Nikki Ind and Michael Vann	4
Against	Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans and Ian Watson	3
Conflict Of Interests	Daryl Corps	1
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

323 25/02960/FUL - Shoecroft Barn, Ablington, Bibury

Councillor Daryl Corps returned to the Chamber.

The proposal was for the conversion of ground floor of existing barns from general storage to cafe with retail area, including amendments to the lean-to and decking/patio area

Case Officer: Rebecca McAndrew

Ward Member: Councillor David Fowles

Recommendation: REFUSE

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee.

- Officers advised that the application had been deferred by the Planning Committee in May for further transport evidence due to concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety and drainage.
- The applicant had submitted a Transport Impact Assessment seeking to demonstrate that the proposed café would generate fewer vehicle trips than the existing permission.
- Gloucestershire County Council Highways had maintained its objection, advising that insufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that safe and suitable access could be achieved for all users.
- Concerns related to pedestrian movement along Ablington Lane, where pedestrians and vehicles shared a constrained carriageway on the route towards the village.

Public Speakers

Public speaker – Cllr Craig Chapman – Bibury Parish Council

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

The Chair of Bibury Parish Council objected to the application on highway safety grounds. Concerns were raised regarding the narrow and constrained nature of Ablington Lane, the lack of dedicated pedestrian provision, existing congestion and conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, and pressure on parking associated with the trout farm and wider tourism. The proposed café would increase vehicle and pedestrian movements, servicing activity and parking pressure, and supported the Highway Authority's view.

Public speaker – Michelle Follet-Holt – Objector

A resident of Bibury and Chair of Bibury Heritage argued that the applicant had failed to demonstrate safe pedestrian access along Ablington Lane, and the objection from Gloucestershire County Council Highways was highlighted. Further concerns were raised regarding the lack of site-specific evidence relating to the commercial kitchen, foul drainage capacity and ecological information.

Public Speaker – Councillor David Fowles – Ward Member

The Ward member raised concerns about congestion and the narrow nature of Ablington Lane, the lack of continuous pedestrian access between the car park, Shoecroft Barn, the trout farm and the village, and the resulting conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. Further concerns regarding ecology, foul drainage and environmental health were noted.

Councillor Fowles left the Chamber for the debate and vote.

Site Inspection Briefing

- Access was considered difficult, with slow-moving and persistent traffic creating evident safety concerns.
- The highway network was heavily used and under significant pressure.

Members questions

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

- The proposed café was an alternative facility to an already permitted café elsewhere on the trout farm site. Although the applicant had argued that this would not result in additional harm, the Highway Authority considered that sufficient information had not been provided to assess how pedestrians and vehicles would interact along the route.
- The proposed café would be open to members of the public and would not be restricted to visitors to the trout farm.
- Planning permission had been granted for a separate car park on the opposite side of the road from the barn. A further car park was understood to be a staff car park, which had been sectioned off, and a live planning application related to the site was noted.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

Member comments

- Members were satisfied that the highway concerns had been acknowledged by Gloucestershire County Council Highways.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed REFUSE the application and Councillor Paul Evans seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee

RESOLVED: to REFUSE the application.

25/02960/FUL Shoecroft Barn, Bibury - REFUSE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Paul Evans, Nikki Ind, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	David Fowles	1
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

324 25/02961/LBC - Shoecroft Barn, Ablington, Bibury

The proposal was conversion of ground floor of existing barns from general storage to cafe with retail area, including amendments to the lean-to and decking/patio area.

Case Officer: Rebecca McAndrew

Ward Member: Councillor David Fowles

Recommendation: CONSENT

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee:

- The application had previously been deferred by the Planning Committee in May to allow further information to be provided regarding the proposed kitchen operations, including extraction, ventilation, flues and ducts, together with clarification of foul sewage and drainage capacity. Additional technical information had been submitted, including details of a cooker hood ducted through the wall of the modern single-storey extension, with extraction terminating in a small external grille. The grille would be coloured to match the timber cladding and positioned between building elements to minimise its visibility.

Public Speakers

Speaker – Councillor David Fowles – Ward Member

Concern was raised that approval of the listed building consent could influence any future planning application. The Committee was therefore asked, if minded to approve

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

the listed building consent, to make clear that the associated planning application had been refused.

Members questions

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

- The proposed works would support the refurbishment and continued use of the building and would help secure its long-term future. No significant overall heritage benefit to the listed building was identified.

Member comments

- Conditions were considered important to ensure that the building could not be used as a café without the necessary planning permission, with rigorous enforcement required.
- A condition could not be attached to the Listed Building Consent. An informative could instead make clear that the Listed Building Consent did not override the requirement for planning permission.
- A breach of Listed Building Consent was a criminal offence but unauthorised use of the building as a café would be a planning enforcement matter.

Councillor Ian Watson proposed PERMITTING the application and Councillor Paul Evans seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

25/02961/LBC Shoecroft Barn, Bibury - CONSENT (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Daryl Corps, Paul Evans, Nikki Ind, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	David Fowles	1
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

325 26/01237/REM - Land South West of Alexander Drive and East of the Maples, Cirencester

16:32 – Marie Barnes (Legal Officer) left the Chamber. Councillor David Fowles returned to the Chamber.

The proposal was Reserved Matters pursuant to outline permission 26/00054/OUT relating to approval of scale, layout, appearance and landscaping for 129 dwellings and four ground floor community use spaces with associated roads, parking and landscaping for Phase 2D associated with outline planning permission 16/00054/OUT. Discharge of outline planning permission conditions 16 (SuDS Schemes for each

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

phase/sub-phase), 17 (Conformity and Maintenance with/of SuDS), 18 (SuDS Maintenance and Management Plan), 48 (Electric vehicle charging infrastructure), 49 (Waste Minimisation and Soil Management), 51 (Phased Arboricultural Reports), 56 (Protection of Biodiversity Compliance wit), 58 (Ecological Construction Method Statement), 60 (Lighting Design Strategy), 61 (Landscape, Ecological and Arboricultural), 65 (Hours of operation), 67 (Hours of operation) and 68 (Noise). Discharge of S106 obligation 2.5 of Schedule 1.

Case Officer: Julian Pye

Ward Member: Councillor Ray Brassington

Recommendation: APPROVAL of RESERVED MATTERS subject to conditions.

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.

The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee including that:

- The scheme had been refined during the pre-application and application process, including amendments to the alignment, layout, parking, amenity areas and detailed design.
- The 31% affordable housing provision was in accordance with the requirements of the outline permission.
- The temporary community use within one of the buildings would provide space, with the permanent community facility to be provided within the neighbourhood centre at a later stage.
- The Conservation and Design objection had been largely resolved, following revisions to the scheme.
- The Designing Out Crime Officer had been consulted further following their initial concerns and no longer objected in principle.
- Highways concerns had been resolved, with no outstanding objection from Gloucestershire County Council Highways.
- Following discussions and refinements, no significant outstanding consultation concerns remained and recommended approval.

Public Speakers

Public speaker – Greg Evans – Agent/Applicant

The proposal built on the first phase of development and had been informed by the approved design codes. The scheme would provide 129 homes, including 40 affordable homes, with new green spaces and landscaping. The design included landmark buildings and a village square, with materials reflecting the local character.

Sustainability measures included solar panels, air source heat pumps and EV charging points for all homes.

Members questions

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

- The proposed affordable housing mix for this phase (3 social rent, 15 shared ownership and 89 market value) was permitted by the outline planning

permission, which allowed for variations in the mix between phases. The overall affordable housing requirement would be considered across the wider development, and the proposed mix for this phase was considered to be in accordance with the permission. Members stated their disappointment that there was not a greater offer of social rent properties.

- There was no requirement or proposal for battery storage as part of the sub-phase despite the comment from Cirencester Town Council.
- The development would remain tenure-blind, including the treatment of front doors, porches and other external features.
- Air source heat pumps would be used extensively throughout the sub-phase. Photovoltaic panels would be provided where suitable, taking account of factors such as orientation and the type of building, including apartment blocks.

17:02 – 17:06 Councillor Corps left the Chamber and did not take part in the vote

Member comments

- Condition 7 should be amended to make the requirements for solar panel placement and rainwater storage more explicit, including provision for rainwater storage.

Councillor David Fowles proposed PERMITTING the application subject to amended conditions and Councillor Paul Evans seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee

RESOLVED: to PERMIT the application.

Break 17:20 – 17:30

26/01237/REM Land South West of Alexander Drive, Cirencester - APPROVE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Patrick Coleman, Paul Evans, David Fowles, Nikki Ind, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	7
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

326 26/00905/FUL - Land South of Longfurlong Lane, Tetbury

Marie Barnes (Legal) returned to the Chamber

The proposal was the change of use of land to Class F 2 (c) areas or places for outdoor sport or recreation.

Case Officer: Helen Cooper

Ward Member: Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson

Recommendation: REFUSAL

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application. The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee and explained the reasons for the recommendation to refuse:

- The required Ecological Impact Assessment had not been completed, and a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment was required as a result of the proposed change of land use.
- A Flood Risk Assessment had not been provided.
- The proposal did not satisfy the criterion listed by Policy INF2 'Social and Community Infrastructure' of the Local Plan and resulted in the loss of agricultural land.

The reference to Flood Zones 2 and 3 was removed from refusal reason 4 as it had been included in error. The site was not identified within these flood zones on the current Environment Agency mapping.

Public Speakers

Public speaker – Steven Keitley – Supporter

The application would protect and preserve the landscape, views and open countryside within the Cotswold National Landscape. The proposal would prevent future development, protect the area for future generations and accord with planning policies relating to nature and the countryside. The emerging Regulation 19 Local Plan did not identify the site for development and approval of the application would protect the land from speculative development.

Public speaker – Peter Martin– Agent/Applicant

The application was intended to protect the site in its current form and would not result in increased traffic, parking, visitors, flooding, development or loss of biodiversity. The level of information requested by officers was disproportionate and any future change of use would require a separate planning application.

Public Speaker – Councillor Laura Hall-Wilson – Ward Member

The Ward Member supported the intention to safeguard the land from residential development and noted strong local opposition to housing on the site. They acknowledged concerns about the application being made on land not owned by the applicant but considered the protection of the land from residential development to be an important local concern.

Members questions

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

- Legal Services confirmed that an applicant could submit a planning application on land they did not own, provided the required notices were served. Officers confirmed that the necessary notices had been served on the landowners and that the application was valid, regardless of the landowner's intentions for the site.

Planning and Licensing Committee

11/August2026

- Granting permission would establish the planning permission for the proposed community use, but implementation would depend on the applicant's ability to use the land.
- Granting the proposed change of use would not prevent the landowner from subsequently submitting a residential planning application. Any future application would be considered on its own merits, and the proposed recreational use would not prevent a future housing proposal.
- The proposed change of use constituted development and therefore triggered the statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirement. The applicant had claimed a de minimis exemption, but officers required further ecological information to establish whether this applied, particularly given the potential presence of priority habitats and proposed mowing of pathways. If BNG were required, it could be delivered on-site, off-site or through the purchase of biodiversity units.

Member comments

- Legal rather than planning considerations were raised. It was noted that approval could set a precedent for similar applications, although the intentions behind the proposal to prevent over-development were acknowledged.

Councillor David Fowles proposed that the application be deferred due to insufficient information to enable the Committee to determine the application. The motion was not seconded and therefore fell.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed that the application be approved. The motion was not seconded and therefore fell.

Councillor Paul Evans proposed REFUSING the application and Councillor David Fowles seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee

RESOLVED: to REFUSE the application.

26/00905/FUL Land South of Longfurlong Lane, Tetbury - REFUSE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Daryl Corps, Paul Evans, David Fowles and Michael Vann	5
Against	Patrick Coleman and Nikki Ind	2
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	Ian Watson	1
Carried		

327 **26/01821/PLP - Land to the South of Manor Court, Eastleach**

The proposal was Permission in Principle application for the erection of 1 x modest single storey dwellinghouse.

Case Officer: Joanne Reeves
Ward Member: Councillor David Fowles
Recommendation: REFUSE

The Chair invited the Case Officer to introduce the application.
The Case Officer shared the application details with the Committee:

Public Speakers

Public speaker – Eastleach Town and Parish Council

The proposal would fail to protect the Cotswold National Landscape and would result in incremental harm to the village character and Conservation Area. Concerns were raised regarding the loss of the transition between the built settlement and open countryside, the change from agricultural to residential use, the lack of affordable housing provision and the absence of details demonstrating satisfactory access from the public highway.

Public speaker – Roderick Wordie – Objector

The proposal was unacceptable in terms of location, land use and amount of development, noting the site's position in open countryside, within the Cotswold National Landscape and adjacent to the East Leach Conservation Area. Concerns were raised regarding harm to the landscape and heritage assets, loss of agricultural land, lack of access rights and the precedent for further residential development.

Public speaker – Peter Lang – Agent/Applicant

The proposal was informed by positive pre-application advice. They considered the site to have an established domestic character rather than being agricultural land and a sensitively designed single-storey dwelling would not harm the landscape or nearby heritage assets. They also disputed concerns regarding access.

Public Speaker – Councillor David Fowles – Ward Member

There were concerns regarding the applicant's lack of engagement with the parish. They considered that the site change from agricultural use to a garden would fail to protect the Cotswolds National Landscape. Concerns were raised regarding access arrangements and an existing covenant, the lack of affordable housing provision, and the potential for irreversible harm to heritage assets and the National Landscape.

Councillor David Fowles left the Chamber and did not vote due to predetermination.

Site Inspection Briefing

The site was described as an agricultural area and historic orchard, with concerns that access was difficult and relied on an existing shared access private drive. The development would be visible across the field and was located close to the manor house.

Members questions

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

- Rights of access were a private legal matter, but the uncertainty over whether the applicant could lawfully use the existing access raised concerns about whether a new access would be required.
- There was uncertainty as to whether the existing access should be included within the application red line. Previous appeal decisions had reached different conclusions on this point, and therefore it was considered that insufficient information had been provided regarding access.
- Officers proposed amending the third reason for refusal by removing the opening sentence so that it began with "insufficient information", making clear that the reason related to the lack of information regarding access. Officers also advised that, in their professional view, the first two refusal reasons carried greater weight, with the third included because of the outstanding uncertainty regarding access.
- The site was separate from the curtilage of the Grade II listed building.

Councillor Daryl Corps proposed REFUSING the application and Councillor Nikki Ind seconded the proposal. The proposal was put to the vote and agreed by the Committee

RESOLVED: to REFUSE the application.

26/01821/PLP - Land to the South of Manor Court, Eastleach - REFUSE (Resolution)		
For	Ray Brassington, Daryl Corps, Nikki Ind, Michael Vann and Ian Watson	5
Against	None	0
Conflict Of Interests	None	0
Abstain	None	0
Carried		

328 Sites Inspection Briefing

Members were advised on a possible SIB on 2 September 2026.

329 Licensing Sub-Committee

19 August – Councillors Ian Watson, Daryl Corps and Nick Bridges

20 August – Councillors Ian Watson, Michael Vann, David Fowles.