

MICKLETON PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES

Minutes of the extraordinary meeting of Mickleton Parish Council held on Wednesday 30 July 2025, in King George's Hall, at 7.00pm.

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

PRESENT:

Joanne Piper-Bourn (chairman) (JPB), Andy O'Neill (AON), Chris Cottam (CC), Tim Ellis (TE) and Kevin Fletcher (KF)
The clerk, Elaine Fuoco-Lang (EFL), was also in attendance
Plus 18 members of the public

Business to be transacted:

1. To accept apologies for absence
District councillors Gina Blomefield (GB) and Tom Stowe (TS) gave their apologies
Councillor Emile Dodin (ED) gave his apologies, which were accepted by MPC
2. To make declarations of interest on the items on the agenda
None
3. 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.

Questions/comments regarding item 4a:

Q1: A member of the public commented about the public nature of the roads that go through the Cala Homes development and how the number of intersections were not designed for extra use.

Q2: A member of the public asked how Mickleton might maintain a viable community/identify a village centre. King George's Hall would become too small to cope with the increase in parishioner numbers.

Q3: A member of the public stated that there have been drainage issues in Furrow Way and has concerns regarding this and flooding, including run-off from Meon Hill.

Initialed.....

Q4: A member of the public asked if there was any value in doing a petition, as not everyone has access to the portal.

Q5: A member of the public queried the wording regarding 'all matters reserved'.

CC answered that unless access is granted nothing else will happen.

Q6: A member of the public commented that Mickleton is one of 17 settlements and it is highly likely that it will get more development, noting that we all have to keep up to speed and be aware of this.

4. To consider/ratify the following planning applications:

- a. 25/01621/OUT Outline application for up to 120 dwellings with all matters reserved with the exception of access at Land North East of Mickleton, Gloucestershire, GL55 6UF (consider)

MPC agreed to submit an objection comment to this application, see Appendix A

EFL

- b. 25/01946/FUL Full Application for Extension and alterations to existing dwelling at Darlings Barn, High Street (consider)

MPC agreed to submit a comment of no objection to this application

EFL

- c. 25/02087/TCONR Works to trees in conservation areas for T.1 - Weeping Willow - Crown reduction up to 20%, pollarding; T.2 - Walnut - crown reduction of 20-30% at Walnut House, Gloucester Lane (ratify)

MPC agreed to ratify its submission of a comment of no objection to this application

- d. 25/02156/FUL Full Application for Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of self-build dwellinghouse, alterations to access track, addition of passing bay and associated works at Mickleton Nurseries, Stratford Road (consider)

MPC agreed to submit a comment of no objection to this application

EFL

- e. 25/02169/FUL Full Application for Erection of front porch and two storey rear extension at 18 Granbrook Lane (consider)

MPC agreed to submit a comment of no objection to this application

EFL

- f. To consider any urgent planning applications received since publication of the agenda

Initialed.....

None received

g. To receive an update on planning permissions/refusals
Cotswold District Council approved the following applications:

24/03402/FUL Erection of single storey extension at Ninevah Bridge Cottage,
Campden Road, granted 30/6/25

25/00884/FUL Dropped kerb to allow vehicle access at 18 Granbrook Lane, granted
10/7/25

25/01526/FUL Erection of single storey rear extension, replacement door to garage
and installation of external flue at 29 Glass House Road, granted 10/7/25

In addition to the above, there are four historic applications that remain 'open'.

5. The date for the next parish council meeting: 27 August 2025 at 7pm in King
George's Hall

The chairman closed the meeting at 7.21 pm

Signature of the chairman upon approval of the minutes

Initialed.....

APPENDIX A

APPLICATION 25/01621/OUT – outline application for up to 120 dwellings on land north east of Mickleton.

We refer to the above application for outline planning permission.

Mickleton Parish Council (MPC) wish to object to this application. Further details of our objection are 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.

Impact on traffic through the village

The number of vehicles travelling through the village 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. The type of vehicles include not only cars but also farm vehicles and many large lorries.

In order to access the A46 at Evesham and the A44 towards Moreton-in-Marsh vehicles travelling from north or east of Mickleton have to travel through the village along the High Street (B4632). This part of the village is in a conservation area with many historic Grade 2 listed buildings fronting onto the High Street. In places the road is reduced to single file due to parked cars. This particularly applies at the junction with Chapel Lane. Access to other parts of the village including the village hall, primary school, playing field, multi-use games area and pub are via Chapel Lane, Mill Lane and Back Lane all of which are within the conservation area, congested and reduced to single file by parked cars.

The main High Street through the village has a number of bends which makes crossing for pedestrians very difficult. There is only one zebra crossing which is at

Initialed.....

the far end of the village some distance away from where most pedestrians need to cross in order to access village amenities.

The Apex Transport Planning Report submitted with the planning application estimates that the proposed new development will generate 147 extra vehicle trips in the rush hours between 8-9am and 5-6pm each day. The number of vehicle trips for the entire day will be considerably in excess of this. It also estimates that around 65% of this extra traffic will come through the High Street. That will result in many more vehicles having to come through the village increasing congestion and the detrimental impact on the conservation area and historic buildings.

Despite the planning application including a number of documents which suggest that there should be "no concerns" with respect to differing forms of transport, the experience of current residents is almost the opposite. The bus service is not frequent enough nor reliable enough, hence only used by people who do not have access to a vehicle. Traffic volumes, narrow roads, and a complete lack of cycleways means that residents do not cycle to local amenities for safety reasons. Many residents do not walk either for the same reason. The nearest train station is at Honeybourne which realistically can only be reached by car, cycling not being viable for distance and safety reasons.

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 (albeit that part of the village is technically on the border of the Cotswolds National Landscape (formerly known as the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)) and the historic buildings which line the road.

Access to the public highway

There is only one access to the proposed development which is via Furrow Way at the junction with Stratford Road. Furrow Way is an unadopted estate road which was originally designed to cater for traffic at the existing Shepherds Fold development. The proposed development would more than double the volume of traffic using Furrow Way. It is not capable of supporting this extra traffic without causing a significant risk to users.

Furthermore the junction with Stratford Road is already busy, particularly during rush hours, and it can be difficult turning right from Furrow Way onto the Stratford Road due to the increase in volume of traffic using that road and the junction layout. The extra traffic generated by the proposed new development will compound this problem.

Initialed.....

As Furrow Way is unadopted who would pay for the additional maintenance which would undoubtedly arise as a result of it being used by additional traffic?

Lack of essential village amenities

The village does not have a medical practice, a dentist or a post office. The nearest ones are at Lower Quinton and Chipping Campden. These 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 that 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.

Education

The village primary school is a single form entry and is already operating at capacity. It does not have the space to be enlarged so construction of additional classrooms is not an option. Nearby primary schools at Meon Vale, Lower Quinton and Chipping Campden are also at capacity. The secondary school at Chipping Campden is full and has a waiting list.

The proposed development has been designed to attract families. Where are the children going to be educated because there is little to no vacancies within schools which are within easy reach?

Furthermore the road outside Mickleton Primary School already gets very congested in the morning and afternoon when children arrive and depart as there is limited parking and drop off points. There is no capacity at this school to take extra children.

Employment

Mickleton is a rural village. The nearest towns are Evesham and Stratford-upon-Avon (both about 9 miles away). Neither of these towns are major centres of employment.

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.

Initialed.....

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.

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. We would suggest that the village is seen as a "soft touch" for development because technically the main part of the village is just outside the Cotswolds National Landscape and there are less restrictions on development than areas which are within it.

It is simply not fair or reasonable for Mickleton 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 but with virtually no change to the village infrastructure and amenities.

Future development should be focused on those locations which have not already suffered such large population increases and where the infrastructure and necessary amenities are already in place to support growth. This is what is meant by sustainable development.

Effect on Environment

We have already commented on the increased traffic flow along the High Street and other village roads and the detrimental effect this would have on the character of the village, the conservation area and the historic/Grade 2 listed buildings.

In addition the section of the Heart of England Way (HOEW) between Mickleton and Lower Quinton runs right through the centre of the site of the proposed development and the site is also close to Meon Hill and the Iron Age Fort (a Scheduled Monument) which are within the Cotswolds National Landscapes. This is part of the village's natural and historic environment which should be protected.

Initialed.....

The proposed development includes an estate road which cuts across the HOEW. According to the plans this road will be required to give access to at least 50 houses so the daily traffic using the road and having to cross the HOEW will be considerable. This will have a significant detrimental effect on the tranquil character of the HOEW as there would be large scale development on both sides of it. Also there would be a potential hazard to users where the estate road crosses the HOEW.

It is not clear from the Land Registry documents who actually owns this section of the HOEW so we would question whether the developer has the right to construct an estate road which cuts across the HOEW.

The design of the proposed development shows high density housing with little open space. This would result in a significant reduction in the area of the agricultural buffer land which currently exists between the existing Shepherds Fold development and Meon Hill and would present as a harsh urban looking perimeter to the eastern boundary of the village visible particularly from Granbrook Lane coming from Ilmington with inadequate transition between housing and open fields. This would have a detrimental impact on the rural aspect of this part of the village and the views between this area and the adjacent Cotswolds National Landscape.

The high density nature of the design with lack of open space looks more appropriate for a brownfield inner city site rather than a rural Cotswolds village on the edge of the Cotswolds National Landscape. The most recent large development at Mickleton was the Oak Grange development where housing density is much lower and there are far more open spaces and footpaths. The proposed design shows a total disregard for the environment.

For these reasons we would argue that the proposed development fails to provide adequate open spaces and does not adequately protect this part of the village's natural and historic environment.

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. Furthermore the site of the proposed development falls outside the village's development boundary as shown on the Local Plan.

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.

Initialed.....

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?

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 120 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, the adverse impacts include increased traffic and congestion in the village, additional strain on overstretched essential services such as medical and dental practices and schools and a detrimental effect on the overall character of the village, the conservation area and the village's natural and historic environment.

The proposed development does not support growth nor improve productivity. It also does nothing 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 and as such the application for outline planning permission should be refused.