

MICKLETON PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of Mickleton Parish Council held on Wednesday 25 February 2026, in King George's Hall, at 7.00pm.

Mickleton Parish Council (MPC)
Gloucestershire County Council (GCC)
Cotswold District Council (CDC)

PRESENT:

Councillors Joanne Piper-Bourn (JPB) (chairman), Chris Cottam (CC), Kevin Fletcher (KF), Andy O'Neill (AON), Mike Brain (MB), Phil Britt (PB) and Anna Scott (AS)
County Councillor Tom Bradley (TB) and the clerk, Elaine Fuoco-Lang (EFL), were also in attendance
Plus 1 member of the public

Business to be transacted:

01. To receive apologies for absence: apologies to be accepted/not accepted by council
District Councillor Gina Blomefield and Tom Stowe gave their apologies.
Councillor Jerry Arnull (JA) gave his apologies, which were accepted by the council.

02. Declarations of interest:

a. To make declarations of interest on the items on the agenda
CC declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of Mickleton Against Inappropriate Development (MAID).

b. To consider any dispensation requests
MPC RESOLVED to agree that CC remain for the discussion.

03. To confirm the minutes of the extraordinary parish council meeting held on 28 January 2026

It was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the parish council meeting held on 28 January 2026 as a true and accurate record of that meeting, accepted and signed by the chairman.

EFL

JPB brought item 13 on the agenda forward for discussion at this point as it involved TB.

4. To receive the clerk's report

MATTERS ARISING

Website

The website now has email addresses for all councillors. Please send website blurb (MB) and a photo and blurb (PB) to the clerk.

MB/PB

Training

AON has registered Being a better councillor 1 training in March. Newly co-opted councillors to identify their training dates and send to the clerk (GAPTC policy).

MB/PB/AS

Mickleton Parish Council

Initialed.....

The issue of overhanging trees at the community games area has been passed to TB for advice.

JPB/EFL

A reminder for councillors to please liaise regarding the removal of tree lights on the plantation.

CC/KF

The Community Speed Watch report for January's meeting has been received today (25.02.2026), and will be included in these minutes (Appendix D).

A broken slab at the churchyard has been fixed.

The register of interests forms for MPC's three new councillors have been received and sent to CDC within the statutory requirement of 28 days, and these are now online.

A defibrillator was duplicated on The Circuit and this has now been resolved by The Circuit team. JA is now also a guardian on all defibrillators, along with JPB.

CLERK'S REPORT

The internal audit has been submitted (to GAPTC) today (25.02.2026).

MPC has liaised with GCC regarding the speed sign relocation. GCC is ordering a pole. Councillors will need to check the camera in storage to ensure it is ready for operation.

JPB/KF

The precept requirement was submitted to CDC on 30 January 2026, prior to the deadline.

To note that at January's meeting: item 16. To set the precept requirement for 2026/2027 MPC agreed that the precept requirement for 2026/2027 is confirmed as £50,950, an increase of 12.44%, and will cost a Band D property approximately £51.20 for the year [the 2025/2026 Band D figure of £45.51 was read out in error at the meeting, as this figure is provided by CDC on its precept form].

As noted at November's meeting, £62,124.57 requires funding, so the remainder is from reserves.

ROSPA safety checks for the community games area and junior playing field have been booked for April, MPC is not given a specific date. MPC is to provide them with a code for the courts, and the clerk has requested codes from JPB and will send a reminder later this month.

JPB/EFL

The following have been reported to GCC:

Painted warning signs in the roads in Back Lane and Chapel Lane leading to the school have almost faded completely.

The bus stop sign on Stratford Road is bent back into the hedge and is hidden from the road.

BT misadvised regarding the broadband/phone package price increases, so MPC has been given a credit of £53.76 (ex VAT). Temporary payments of £12 per month for diversion direct to the

Initialed.....

mobile to bypass the app (as the app is still not working when people call the parish office number) have been credited.

An issue with a step at St Lawrence's Church has been raised and the clerk asked the church if they could confirm that this falls under Table 1 List A – Matters which may be undertaken without a faculty and without the need for consultation A7 (2), and this has been confirmed today (25.02.2026). Our contractor is looking at this in the interim to advise further.

Village hall funding information was sent to the King George's Hall chairman.

Some items that were circulated to councillors included:

Mickleton Community Archive has invited MPC to an exhibition in the King George's Hall on 07.03.2026.

GAPTC information sharing event: Understanding CIL and S106 for Parish & Town Councils on 26.02.2026.

CDC's final letter to government, which included MPC's response, as mentioned at January's meeting.

GCC's free webinar on Local Government Reorganisation on 05.03.2026.

Some additional items which were posted on MPC's website/Facebook page:

Government consultation on local government reorganisation, item 12 on this agenda.

New call for road users to help save lives on Gloucestershire's roads.

05. Finance:

- a. To receive the financial statement (signed by chairman)

Approved by council.

EFL

- b. To approve payments (signed by two councillors and to note authorised signatory)

The following are to be approved at the meeting, the full list is at Appendix A.

*National insurance/PAYE – Feb payroll	477.92	BACS	LGA 1972 s112
*Clerk salary – Feb payroll	1638.51	Standing order	LGA 1972 s112
*Hall hire – Jan	102.00	BACS	LGA 1972 s134(4)
*Smart Cut power washing community games area	810.00	BACS	Open Spaces Act 1906 ss9-10
*Contractor T Small	150.00	BACS	Open Spaces Act 1906 ss9-10

Total payments: £4,525.00

Approved by council.

To note that CC is the authorised signatory.

CC/EFL

- c. To note receipts (signed by two councillors)

Interest	39.26
Cemetery fees	1280.00

Total receipts £1319.26, see Appendix A.

Noted by council.

EFL

d. To note bank reconciliation: 01.01.2026 to 31.01.2026 (signed by two councillors)

Noted by council.

EFL

e. To note quarterly internal checks

Noted by council that CC carried out these checks on 25.02.2026.

EFL

f. To authorise clerk's overtime

Council RESOLVED to authorise 12.5 hours' overtime, to be paid in March's payroll.

EFL

06. To provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on items in respect of the business on the agenda (maximum time 15 minutes and 5 minutes per person as per Standing Order 3 e–g). At the close of this item, members of the public will no longer be permitted to address the council.

Q1: A member of the public asked TB a question regarding potholes and hedge trimming, and the fact that the contractors do not seem to clear away after themselves. TB stated that the standard in Mickleton has been appalling and has raised this with the cabinet member responsible for highways.

CC stated that plastic pipes have been left at the roadside when litter picking. TB asked CC to flag this, as the equipment will be trackable.

07. To receive a report from Gloucestershire County Council

TB made the following points in his report:

He noted that Neighbourhood Planning funding has been withdrawn by the new government.

Regarding the painted signs on the road, GCC do not do these anymore; however, there is nothing to indicate that children might step into the road. TB agreed and asked JPB to send this to him.

JPB

Hidcote Road resurfacing is being carried out from Bakers Hill to Ebrington.

JPB and TB met at Stratford Road corner, looking at options for signage and road marking. It was agreed that visibility is poor and should be improved. This is with GCC Highways.

TB has received numerous emails regarding pothole repairs and the roundabout at the bottom of Bakers Hill. A works inspection has been scheduled.

TB is looking into what is causing the delay regarding the lack of highway adoption on the Cala and Oak Grange estates.

TB is meeting with the residents' association at Greyrick Court, although noted this is mostly private highway.

20mph speed limit review: only one of the 'tranche 1' reviews are in TB's area, and that will be Willersey, in spring 2027.

Family farm tax to be discussed at next GCC full council meeting.

Initialed.....

GCC's new budget has been voted on, resulting in an increase in council tax. Parking charges are increasing, the flooding budget has been cut, the local highways budget for small projects has been abolished. Borrowing and debt are increasing. MB queried the highways management budget and TB stated that less money is being spent locally, localities do not follow up and the current set up is reactive not proactive.

08. To receive a report from Cotswold District Council
No report given

09. Mickleton Parish Council Representatives/Working Groups
a. To confirm new representatives/working group members

AS: Planning and Nanny Millard.

MB: Burial Board and Neighbourhood Plan [a formal NP working group will be set up depending on MPC's decision on item 11].

10. To consider/ratify the following planning applications:

- a. 25/04010/OUT Outline planning application for the demolition of buildings and erection of up to 170 new dwellings, public open space, landscaping, sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and creation of associated vehicular access point to Broadway Road and other associated infrastructure. (Some matters reserved). (To consider)

MPC RESOLVED to submit an objection comment (two abstentions), as at Appendix B.

EFL

- b. To consider any urgent planning applications received since publication of the agenda 26/00554/TCONR Works to trees in conservation areas for Chandos House - Yew tree in rear garden – reduce all round by 1.5m at Chandos House High Street

MPC RESOLVED to submit a comment of no objection

EFL

c. To receive an update on planning permissions/refusals

- 24/01873/FUL Full Application for Conversion of existing barn (revision to previous permission ref.) Abbots Ground Farm Broad Marston Lane, approved 06.02.2026.
- 25/03263/FUL Proposed porch, garage conversion and replacement rear extension at 23 Nursery Close, approved 12.02.2026.
- 25/03490/FUL Full Application for Proposed dormer loft conversion with associated alterations at 1 Glass House Road Mickleton, approved 12.02.2026.

11. Neighbourhood Plan

a. To receive an update on the gathering of information regarding a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) JPB thanked CC for the update. CC updated MPC as at Appendix C.

The clerk highlighted that various information has been sent (including information from county and national associations). It is important to understand that a NP does not stop development and that the precept percentage increase will be at least double this year's increase. General reserves and MPC's policy on this have also been circulated.

b. To decide whether to formally apply to start the Neighbourhood Plan process
MPC RESOLVED to formally apply and to set up a working group.

Initialed.....

It was confirmed that there would be no spend at this stage and reports would be brought back to full council.

CC/MB/EFL

12. To respond to the government's consultation document regarding Local Government Reorganisation in Gloucestershire

KF put himself forward to lead on this with AON. Answers will be circulated and final answers to be returned to EFL by 12.03.26 for submission to the county association.

KF/AON/EFL

13. To discuss how to proceed with regard to the solar panel lighting on the Stratford Road bus shelters

Total cost for both units would be £1,954 (ex VAT) plus fitting.

TB the Grassroots Neighbourhood Fund is a £20,000 pot and TB has 24 parishes. TB is happy to support this, but there may be other areas MPC wishes to consider.

MPC RESOLVED to replace both units, which were no longer working, and to apply for a grant from GCC's Grassroots Neighbourhood Fund.

EFL

14. Policies to implement/amend:

a. Co-option policy

IT was RESOLVED by council to adopt this policy.

EFL

15. To ratify that the majority of votes for motion 20 (to purchase a storage container (using s106 funds) to store equipment at the community games area) at the 28 January 2026 meeting, were to accept quote A £1,370 (no VAT)

RESOLVED by council to ratify this decision.

JPB to liaise with contractor re exact location of the storage container.

16. Family sports day:

a. To consider a date for a family sports day

RESOLVED by council to hold the event on Sunday 5 July.

b. To confirm the location of the event

It is noted that as a trustee of the proposed event location (senior playing field), JPB did not take part in this vote.

RESOLVED by council to hold the event at the senior playing field.

c. To confirm the spending limit for the event

RESOLVED by council to have a £400 spending limit.

d. To note the councillors who are organising the event

JPB, CC, AS

The clerk noted that insurance requirements regarding risk assessments, rules regarding events, and tug of war and bouncy castles in particular, have been passed to councillors.

Initialed.....

To note MPC has been advised that joint events will not be covered by the council's insurance policy, but two events on the same day will. Also, to note that MPC's event is a community event and not a fundraising event.

Council noted that MPC was suspending standing orders [item 3x] to allow the meeting to continue to allow business to be completed.

17. To confirm membership of Gloucestershire Association of Parish and Town Councils (GAPTC) (includes 10% discount for CiLCA-qualified clerk)

RESOLVED by council to confirm GAPTC membership.

EFL

18. Cemetery:

a. To agree to work with the clerk to contact families regarding the removal of items on graves, as per Mickleton Parish Council's cemetery rules and regulations

MPC has a duty of care to all in the cemetery, and certain graves are not adhering to MPC's cemetery rules and regulations.

MPC RESOLVED to contact families regarding the removal of items and to give families a 6-month period to do so.

JA/MB/JPB/EFL

b. To consider purchasing an unwanted cemetery plot from a grave owner

MPC RESOLVED to give a refund of £18.18 for the unused full years left on the grant of exclusive right of burial. This will be legally transferred by use of a form of assignment.

EFL

19. To receive a report from the Climate Working Group

Nothing to report.

20. To receive a report regarding the Community Speed Watch (CSW) camera

One full year's worth of information has been gathered from the CSW camera.

Data for the months of December and January are at Appendix D.

21. To receive a report from the 20's plenty working group

Results of the 20's plenty survey can be seen at Appendix E.

JPB confirmed that these results have been sent to TB at GCC.

22. To note checks of the following:

a. Junior Playing Field playground (weekly): 02.02.26, 08.02.26, 1 x missing, 22.02.26.

b. Games Area (weekly): 01.02.26, 09.02.26, 1 x missing, 22.2.026.

c. Churchyard and cemetery (fortnightly): 11.02.2026 and 21.02.2026.

d. Defibrillators (monthly): all checked.

23. To receive correspondence

A request regarding branded hi-vis jackets for the litter pickers is being looked into.

MPC was informed that a bus shelter was leaking. MPC's contractor could not find anything

obvious causing the issue, and could only offer to apply sealant. This could have been linked to

Initialed.....

the amount of rain, so should be checked again, but action is on hold until council decide what to do regarding the lighting.
Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) and two clerks at nearby councils have informed MPC that they will be submitting objection comments in relation to item 10a.
Letters were received this evening detailing a member of the public's letter to the police and crime commissioner and his reply. These were passed to the chairman.

24. To confirm the date for the next parish council meeting: 22 April 2026
Confirmed by council.

The chairman closed the meeting at 8.40pm

Signature of the chairman upon approval of the minutes

Appendix A

MICKLETON PARISH COUNCIL			
Feb-26			
NAME	AMOUNT	METHOD	
PAYMENTS			
February			
Clerk sim card – Feb	4.90	Direct debit	LG(FP)A 1963 s5
Games area sim card – Feb	4.40	Direct debit	LG(FP)A 1963 s5
BT broadband/phone – Feb	53.92	Direct debit	LG(FP)A 1963 s5
Microsoft 365 software – Feb	12.10	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s111
Lloyds bank charges	6.97	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s111
Nest pension – Feb payroll	174.57	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s112
*National insurance/PAYE – Feb payroll	477.92	BACS	LGA 1972 s112
*Clerk salary – Feb payroll	1638.51	Standing order	LGA 1972 s112
Smart Cut Grounds maintenance – Feb	800.58	Standing order	Open Spaces Act 1906 ss9-10
Grundon Waste – Cemetery bin	56.20	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s214(2)
Scribe accounts	42.00	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s111
HP instant inks	28.99	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s111
*Hall hire – Jan	102.00	BACS	LGA 1972 s134(4)
Contractor T Small	161.94	BACS	Open Spaces Act 1906 ss9-10
*Smart Cut power washing community games area	810.00	BACS	Open Spaces Act 1906 ss9-10
*Contractor T Small	150.00	BACS	Open Spaces Act 1906 ss9-10
TOTAL	4525.00		
RECEIPTS			
Interest	39.26		
Cemetery fees	1280.00		
TOTAL	1319.26		

* TO BE AUTHORISED AT THE MEETING

Appendix B

APPLICATION 25/04010/OUT – outline application for the erection of up to 170 dwellings on land north of Broadway Road, Mickleton.

We refer to the above application for outline planning permission submitted by Catesby Estates.

Mickleton Parish Council (MPC) wish to object to this application as set out below.

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF (December 2024) states that the planning system should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development including the provision of homes and supporting infrastructure in a sustainable manner.

Sustainable development requires ensuring land of the right type is available to support growth, innovation and improved productivity and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure. New homes must have accessible services and open spaces to support health, social and cultural wellbeing. It also requires the protection and enhancement of our natural, built and historic environment.

It is MPC's contention that the proposed development at Mickleton is not sustainable development for the following reasons.

Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) 2021

A number of sites in Mickleton were designated by CDC in the SHELAA as possible candidates for further consideration for allocation in the Local Plan.

That part of the site to the west of Tops Nursery and fronting onto Broadway Road which has now been proposed by Catesby Estates for development was not put forward for consideration in the SHELAA as it fell outside the development boundary of the village. The north-east section of the site (designated MK20 in the SHELAA) was put forward but was designated as unsuitable for housing development.

The development of this site would result in an unreasonable and unnecessary extension of the south-western boundary of the village along the Broadway Road towards Weston Subedge beyond the village development boundary envisaged in the SHELAA

Impact on Landscape

The land immediately to the south of the site adjoining Broadway Road is within the Cotswolds National Landscape and the land to the west of the site has been designated as the Norton Hall special landscape area. The site is therefore located in an area which is highly sensitive to development – evidenced by the fact that the existing properties on the southern boundary of the site fronting onto Broadway Road have restrictive covenants which prevent certain types of development.

Initialed.....

The proposed development is for 170 dwellings on a site which is on the edge of the village, surrounded by open countryside on all sides except the east. It would be clearly visible as you approach the village from Broadway Road and Honeybourne Lane as well as from the higher ground within the Cotswolds National Landscape along Bakers Hill and Campden Road.

In our opinion the size of the proposed development in this particular location would dominate the landscape when viewed from various positions and is not appropriate for an edge of village development on the border of the Cotswolds National Landscape. Edge of village developments should be low density, incorporate large open spaces and trees and blend in unobtrusively with the surrounding countryside.

Enabling effect on development

If this development is allowed to proceed then it is highly likely that permission would also be granted for the development of the adjoining Tops Nursery site (application 25/03351/OUT) as that is nearer to the village and would become an infill site. It could also enable the development of the Broad Marston Lane site (application 25/02213/OUT) which adjoins the north-eastern boundary of the Catesby Estates site.

This could therefore open the floodgates for the development of potentially 325 dwellings forming in effect one huge development block with very little separation between the different sites. This would increase the number of houses in the village from the current 954 to 1279 (a 34% increase) which is quite clearly unsustainable in terms of access to services and facilities, lack of adequate infrastructure and increased traffic through the village.

It would also result in one very large development on the south-western edge of the village which would have a detrimental impact on the overall landscape of the area when viewed from the surrounding open countryside and the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Impact on traffic along the High Street (B4632)

The number of vehicles travelling along the High Street has increased enormously over the last few years as a result of the recent developments at Oak Grange and Shepherds Fold as well as the large developments at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield. This can be evidenced from data recorded by the MPC camera on Stratford Road which records the number of vehicles coming into the village and from surveys carried out by local residents on traffic volumes through the village. This data indicates that the High Street is already classed as a very busy road for a rural village location with an average of over 500 vehicles an hour using the road during a typical weekday. The type of vehicles include not only cars but also farm vehicles and many large lorries.

The High Street is in a conservation area with many historic Grade 2 listed buildings fronting onto it. In places the road is reduced to single file due to parked cars. This particularly applies at the junction with Chapel Lane.

The road has a number of bends which makes crossing for pedestrians very difficult. There is only one zebra crossing which is at the far end of the village some distance away from where most pedestrians need to cross in order to access village amenities.

Furthermore, Stratford-upon-Avon and Warwick District Councils are currently consulting on creating new settlements in Warwickshire and the Long Marston Airfield site between Meon Vale

Initialed.....

and Willicote has been identified as a preferred site for the development of up to 10000 houses. If this goes ahead then these residents will need to use the B4632 through Mickleton in order to access the A46 and A44 going south/south-west which will increase the traffic through Mickleton considerably. Current estimates are that approximately 13% of traffic generated from the proposed Long Marston site will travel through Mickleton.

The High Street and other roads through the village were never designed to cater for the large increase in traffic which has occurred over the last few years. The basic infrastructure is the same as it was 50 years ago when the volume and type of traffic using the road was considerably lower and different. The roads are already heavily congested due to recent development and this is having a detrimental effect on the character of what is a typical Cotswold village and the historic buildings which line the road.

Although we accept that due to the location of the proposed development along the Broadway Road not all traffic will need to come through the centre of the village, there will still be a significant proportion which will in order to reach services at Lower Quinton and Stratford-upon-Avon. This will therefore add to the congestion along the High Street and the detrimental effect on the character of the village.

Modes of transport.

Any suggestion or proposal in Transport Assessments that vehicle congestion can be alleviated by walking, cycling or use of buses or trains is not realistic in practice and will simply not happen. Some of the data used in these Assessments (for example estimated traffic flows and daily trips) is inaccurate and misleading and does not bear any resemblance to what actually happens in practice and how people live their lives. They are based to a large degree on theoretical desktop data which is not directly relevant to Mickleton, prepared by those who do not live in the village and do not understand the practicalities of accessing services and facilities which are not actually available within the village.

As we will demonstrate later in this submission, there is no practical alternative to vehicle use in order to access the following essential services all of which are located at least 3 miles away from the village and cannot in most circumstances be conveniently reached by other forms of transport:

- Places of employment.
- Medical practice.
- Pharmacy.
- Dentist.
- Primary and secondary schools.
- Post office.
- Supermarket or large grocery store.
- Gym or other leisure facility.

The nearest train station is at Honeybourne and there is no bus service to there. There is a bus service via Chipping Campden to Moreton-in-Marsh (where there is a train station) which runs every two hours but it is totally impractical to co-ordinate the bus and train departure and arrival times so residents use their cars instead.

Initialed.....

There is also a bus service via Lower Quinton to Stratford-upon-Avon which runs every two hours but in practice the vast majority of residents who use the service are those who are unable to drive. Residents who have a car will opt to use it rather than relying on a bus.

There is no bus service to Evesham other than the Hedgehog Community Bus which runs a service to and from Evesham on two days each week.

There are no dedicated cycle ways in the village and cycling on the road is too dangerous other than for very experienced cyclists. Cycling to access essential services outside of the village is not a practical option because they are too far away and can only be reached using busy roads.

If this proposed development is permitted then the reality is that every household will need to use their vehicles regularly in order to access places of employment, schools and essential services. There will also be a consequential increase in delivery and service vehicles all of which will add significantly to the congestion in the centre of the village.

Lack of essential village amenities

The village does not have a medical practice, a pharmacy, a dentist, a library or a post office. The nearest ones are 3 miles away at Lower Quinton and Chipping Campden. The medical practices are already operating at capacity which makes it very difficult to get appointments. The new developments at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield are also putting extra strain on the medical and dental practices at Lower Quinton.

If the proposed development was to proceed then it is highly likely that new residents would not be able to obtain adequate local medical and dental care, and certainly nothing would be available to them within the village.

The village does have a local convenience store, a butcher and a delicatessen but none of these are adequate for the weekly grocery shop. The nearest large supermarkets are 9 miles away at Stratford-upon-Avon and Evesham.

As part of its Local Plan Review – Preferred Options Consultation, Cotswold District Council commissioned a Settlement Role and Function Study (November 2025) ("SRFS"). This assessed the sustainability of each settlement in its region after taking into account access by car and public transport to essential services and facilities and employment density. Set out below is a table which shows the sustainability of each principal settlement in the CDC region for both employment and services/facilities with the total sustainability score shown in the right hand column. This has been taken from Table 14 of the SRFS. The figures for current dwellings has been taken from the data contained in the Local Plan Review Consultation.

Settlement	Current dwellings	Employment Score (max 5)	Services & Facilities Score (max 10)	Sustainability score (max 20)
Cirencester	9900	5	9.6	19.6
Moreton-in-Marsh	2663	4	8.1	16.1

Initialed.....

Bourton-on-the-Water	1936	4	7.9	15.9
Tetbury	3257	4	7.9	15.9
Chipping Campden	1154	4	7.3	14.3
Fairford	1800	3	7.0	14.0
Stow-on-the-Wold	1240	4	6.8	13.8
South Cerney	1318	3	5.7	12.7
Lechlade-on-Thames	1241	2	6.3	12.3
Siddington	339	4	4.9	11.9
Northleach	815	1	6.1	10.1
Blockley	616	2	4.3	9.3
Kemble	388	1	4.4	8.4
Mickleton	954	1	4.3	8.3
Upper Rissington	757	0	4.4	7.4
Andoversford	307	1	4.2	7.2

This data clearly shows that Mickleton is one of the least sustainable villages out of all the principal settlements within the CDC region – coming 14th out of the 16 principal settlements. Indeed the Services & Facilities score of 4.3 has been based on some inaccurate data – the true score should have been less than 4 which means that Mickleton would not have even reached the threshold for a principal settlement (only settlements with a score of over 4 were classed as principal settlements). This all goes to show what poor access the village has to essential services and facilities.

It currently has 954 dwellings. If the proposed Catesby Estates development is allowed to proceed then this would take the total to 1124, and because of the enabling effect on other developments as previously highlighted then the total housing is likely to reach 1279. This would result in Mickleton having housing levels greater than Chipping Campden and at a similar level to Stow, South Cerney and Lechlade. Quite obviously each of these settlements have far more extensive services and facilities than Mickleton and score higher for employment density.

This clearly shows that the level of development which would result from the approval of the Catesby Estates application is not sustainable.

Education

The village primary school is a single form entry and is already operating close to capacity. It does not have the space to be enlarged so construction of additional classrooms is not an option.

A recent report from Gloucestershire County Council s106 Infrastructure Team (prepared for the Tops Nursery application) indicates that there would be 9.8 surplus places available at Mickleton Primary School for 2027/28. The proposed Catesby Estates development would generate a primary education requirement well in excess of this surplus which means that many children moving into the village would not be able to attend their local village school and would have to

Mickleton Parish Council

Initialed.....

travel by car to attend other primary schools in the area. According to the GCC report the other available primary schools in the area range from 3.3 to 11.1 miles from the village.

The secondary school at Chipping Campden which has a large catchment area is already operating over its capacity. The nearest alternative secondary school within the GCC secondary planning area in Gloucestershire is the Cotswold Academy in Cirencester which is 17 miles away. The secondary schools in Stratford-upon-Avon and Evesham are both around 9 miles away but these are both in different counties so there is no guarantee that children from Mickleton would be granted places there.

The proposed development has been designed to attract families. Where are the children going to be educated? We would argue that development is not sustainable if primary school children moving into that development cannot attend their local primary school because there is insufficient capacity to accommodate them and that secondary school children may have to travel some distance for their secondary education because the local secondary school is full.

Employment

Mickleton is a rural village. The nearest centres of employment are at Evesham and Stratford-upon-Avon (both about 9 miles away) and even these towns do not have significant employment opportunities.

More major centres of employment are much further afield at Worcester, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Oxford, Coventry and Birmingham but none of these locations are easily accessible for people living in Mickleton.

As such we would argue that the proposed development at Mickleton is not likely to support growth, innovation and improve productivity and question whether there would be adequate local employment opportunities available for people moving into the development.

The working from home culture which arose due to necessity during COVID is now reversing as employers realise that productivity has been detrimentally impacted so any argument that employment opportunities can be satisfied by home working is not sustainable in the long term.

The SRFS also assessed the employment role of each settlement based on workplace population and employment density (see Table 12 of the SRFS). The employment score from Table 12 has been set out in column 3 of the table shown above. As a net exporter of working people and with an employment density of 139.5% Mickleton recorded a score of 1 (on the cusp of a score of 0) which placed it as one of the least sustainable settlements for employment. This is yet further evidence that more development in the village is not sustainable.

Utilities

A report from Thames Water cast some doubt on whether the current water and sewerage infrastructure in the village can support further development. Clearly no further development should be permitted in the village unless the relevant water authorities can categorically confirm that the current infrastructure will be upgraded to a level which can support the increased demands for water and sewerage services.

Initialed.....

Similarly the village suffers from frequent power cuts, particularly in windy or stormy weather. Can the current electricity infrastructure support more development?

Population Increase

Between 2011 and 2021 the population of Mickleton increased by 38%. Taking account of all towns and larger villages within the Cotswold District Council's region, this was the second largest increase with only Moreton-in-Marsh recording a larger increase.

The population increase in other towns and villages within the region was much lower – for example the increase in Cirencester was only 6%. The total population increase across the whole of the CDC region was 9.6%.

It is quite clear that Mickleton has already incurred a disproportionate increase in population. It is simply not fair or reasonable for the village to continue to take the brunt of new development when it has already suffered large scale development over the last 10 years. If the proposed development is allowed to proceed then it is likely that this would result in the population of the village increasing by well over 50% since 2011 (and probably by as much as 75%) but with virtually no change to the village infrastructure and amenities.

Compared with other large villages in the CDC region, Mickleton has far fewer essential services and amenities yet it continues to be targeted for development. This is not sustainable development.

Local Plan

The CDC Local Plan 2011-2031 concluded that due to environmental constraints and the size of the village, recent growth and lack of developable and deliverable land, no further housing allocations would be made in Mickleton.

Although certain parts of the Local Plan now carry less weight due to the publication of the NPPF, this does not in any way alter the conclusions which CDC reached in the Local Plan about future development in Mickleton and the development boundary which should apply to the village. Those constraints still apply notwithstanding that central Government has increased CDC's housing target.

So if CDC concluded that development in the village was not sustainable when the Local Plan was published, why should it suddenly become sustainable now just because housing targets have altered?

Design and Placemaking Planning Practice Guidance

This Practice Guidance has recently been issued by the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government for consultation.

Although the document is only at consultation stage, it does provide a useful guide as to factors which need to be taken into account when considering whether or not to approve new developments.

Initialed.....

Two aspects which the draft Guidance refers to are "Liveability" and "Movement", and in particular the need to ensure that new developments have good access to essential services which are conveniently located and can be easily reached by means other than car.

As we have already demonstrated the Catesby Estates development fails in this respect.

Conclusion

The key question is whether the benefits of this proposed development outweigh the adverse impacts.

In practice what are the benefits? We would suggest that the only conceivable benefit is that it would increase the region's housing stock by 170 and create some affordable homes for those people who want to live in the village but cannot afford to buy an existing property. It is difficult to see what other benefits would arise given the location of the site.

On the other hand and as already demonstrated, there would be numerous adverse impacts on the village.

The location of the site is outside the proposed village boundary and, if developed, would inevitably enable the development of adjoining sites creating one large development block on the edge of the village. This would have a detrimental effect on the landscape particularly when viewed from adjoining land within the Cotswolds National Landscape and Norton Hall special landscape.

The village does not have good access to essential services and facilities or centres of employment, its primary school is already close to capacity and the roads through the village are busy and congested. Development of this site would put additional strain on what are already overstretched services and infrastructure and generate considerable additional traffic through the centre of the village. In addition to causing even more congestion this would have a detrimental effect on the overall character of the village and its landscape, the conservation area and the village's natural and historic environment.

The proposed development does not support growth nor improve productivity. It also does little to improve village infrastructure – on the contrary it puts additional strain on it. It harms rather than protects or enhances the village's natural and historic environment.

Mickleton is a rural village some distance away from local towns. It is not a town or a suburb and should not become one. Although parts of the village are not technically in the Cotswolds National Landscape it does border it and most visitors and objective people would see it as a typical Cotswolds village which needs to be protected. You only have to walk around the village to see that. It has already suffered extensive development, disproportionate compared with other nearby towns and villages. It cannot and should not be expected to accommodate further development.

In our view the adverse impacts of this proposed development would significantly outweigh the very limited benefit. The site is not appropriate for development and the application should be refused.

Initialed.....

Appendix C

Neighbourhood Plan

1. Why have one?

- a. Consistent view that a Neighbourhood Plan provides best protection from unsustainable and opportunistic development.
- b. Anecdotal evidence that building a Neighbourhood Plan reinforces spirit of community. People feel they are shaping their own future.
- c. Improved financial flow to MPC from increased level of CIL contribution.

2. Why hasn't Mickleton developed one in the past?

- a. Not needed. Good protection from CDC Local Plan.
- b. Impractical. Lack of resources on MPC to take ownership (people and budget).
- c. Lack of enthusiasm. Uncertain if the village community has the desire to engage.

3. Why now?

- a. Experience of the demise of CDC Local Plan and 4 * outline applications.
- b. Rising levels of general unrest in the village about lack of facilities, traffic, transport etc.
- c. MPC has more Councillors.
- d. We have access to a suitably qualified resident who is willing to project manage the process.
- e. Move to Unitary Authority might increase scope of MPC responsibilities.

4. Risks

- a. No explicit budget for 26/27 and likely increase in precept for 27/28.
- b. We don't really know the village view.
 - i. Is this a good use of public resources?
 - ii. Is the willingness there to engage?
- c. Unknowns.
- d. MPC credibility. We start something we don't finish.

5. Mitigations

- a. Alternate sources of funding.
- b. We will never know what we don't know until we try.
- c. Applying and getting started is not committing anything other than time.
 - i. We can choose most important sections only.
 - ii. We can scale back, delay, or even stop completely if we see the need.High confidence that we can do it, but do we need to, and do we think the village needs to?

Appendix D

Dec-25

LOCATION	MPC	
SPEEDERS VERIFIED	290	
MAX SPEED (MPH)	51	
VEHICLE COUNT	18772	
85 PERCENTILE(MPH)	44	
GREEN <=30MPH	8563	46%
YELLOW>30<36	5783	31%
RED >=36	4426	24%
ILLEGAL*	7	
	QED	100%

Jan-26

LOCATION	MPC	
SPEEDERS VERIFIED	158	
MAX SPEED (MPH)	56	
VEHICLE COUNT	15004	
85 PERCENTILE(MPH)	45	
GREEN <=30MPH	6844	46%
YELLOW>30<36	4483	30%
RED >=36	3677	25%
ILLEGAL*	3	
	QED	100%

