2026098

Initialled……

MICKLETON PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of Mickleton Parish Council held on Wednesday 23 September 2026, in King George's Hall, at 7.00pm.

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

PRESENT:
Councillors Chris Cottam (CC), Andy O'Neill (AON), Kevin Fletcher (KF) and Phil Britt (PB).
The clerk, Elaine Fuoco-Lang (EFL), was also in attendance.
Plus 0 members of the public.

BUSINESS TO BE TRANSACTED:

01. To receive apologies for absence: apologies to be accepted/not accepted by council
District councillors Gina Blomefield (GB) and Tom Stowe (TS) gave their apologies.
County Councillor Tom Bradley (TB) did not attend.
Councillors Anna Scott (AS) and Jerry Arnull (JA) gave their apologies, which were accepted by council.

02. Declarations of interest:
a. To make declarations of interest on the items on the agenda
None.
b. To consider any dispensation requests
None.

03. To confirm the minutes:
a. of the meeting of the parish council held on 26 August 2026
It was RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the parish council meeting held on 26 August 2026 as a true and accurate record of that meeting, accepted and signed by the chairman.
EFL

04. 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.
No questions.

REPORTS

05. To receive the clerk's report
Further to the report at APPENDIX A, important and new items are:
There are still a number of outstanding items, all councillors to check past minutes.
ALL COUNCILLORS

Initialled……

Plot 150 at Mickleton Cemetery was approved for a funeral by MPC.
The village shop defibrillator is now rescue ready and councillors on the defibrillator working

group have been sent guardian emails from The Circuit: JA has accepted and AON to accept.
AON

Following CDC's original email (10 September 2026) regarding budget information for the May 2027 elections, which I queried due to the high increase, CDC has emailed again (18 September 2026) to say that the estimated cost of a contested election is inaccurate and it will provide an updated estimate by the end of the month.

Circulated to councillors: District Councillor GB has submitted a question for CDC Full Council asking what pressure it is putting on GCC Highways re road signs (directional and warning signs) that are completely illegible/hidden by overgrowth, and has requested any photographs councillors have to be emailed to her.

An article regarding speeding has been put on website, highlighting the need for people to reduce their speed.

Stonework that was damaged on the Plantation has been repaired.

GCC Highways has informed MPC that there are further delays to the Broadway Road closure, which has pushed this into the next financial year.

One unitary authority for Gloucestershire is currently paused while the Government carries out a review.

06. To receive a report from Gloucestershire County Council
No report given.

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

FINANCE
08. Documents circulated prior to the meeting
a. To receive the financial statement (signed by chairman)
RECEIVED BY COUNCIL
EFL

b. To approve payments (signed by two councillors and to note authorised signatory)
APPROVED BY COUNCIL. Noted authorised signatory: Chris Cottam (see below and full list of payments at APPENDIX B).
*KGH hall hire £34.00
Total payments £4521.16
CC/EFL

c. To note receipts (signed by two councillors)
NOTED BY COUNCIL total receipts: £18,657.93 (see full list of receipts at APPENDIX B).

EFL

d. To note bank reconciliation: 1–31 August 2026 (signed by two councillors)
NOTED BY COUNCIL
EFL

e. To note the adoption of the 2026/2027 pay award, backdated to 1 April 2026
NOTED BY COUNCIL

OTHER COUNCIL BUSINESS
Audit
09. External audit
a. To note the external auditor's report
NOTED BY COUNCIL the external auditors stated: On the basis of our review of Sections 1 and 2 of the Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR), in our opinion the information in Sections 1 and 2 of the AGAR is in accordance with Proper Practices and no other matters have come to our attention giving cause for concern that relevant legislation and regulatory requirements have not been met.
This has been published on the website as per Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.

b. To confirm the duration of the publication of the 'notice of conclusion of audit'
Confirmed by council to publish this as of Thursday 27 August 2026 for a period of two weeks.
EFL

Policies
10. To implement the following policies:
a. Bereavement policy: note this was amended to Parental Bereavement policy
b. Paternity leave and pay policy
c. Whistleblowing policy
AGREED BY COUNCIL to adopt all of the above policies.
EFL

Risk assessments
11. To confirm that all relevant risk assessments will be updated in regard to anti-social behaviour
CONFIRMED BY COUNCIL
EFL

Christmas
12. Annual carol service event:
a. To decide the recipient of the charity collection
CONFIRMED BY COUNCIL that the recipient will be The Air Ambulance Service.
EFL

b. To confirm than an official road closure has been applied for
AON CONFIRMED that he had contacted Highways and is awaiting a reply.

AON

c. To confirm letters will be sent to affected residents regarding the road closures
CONFIRMED BY COUNCIL.
CC

PLANNING
13. To consider/ratify the following planning applications:
a. 26/02433/FUL Full Application for Erection of 85 residential units, including provision of vehicular and pedestrian access, green infrastructure and associated works at Land North East Of Mickleton Mattock Mews NOTE: The parish council has received an extension from Cotswold District Council regarding this application
This will be on a future agenda and MPC will be objecting to this application
EFL

b. To consider any urgent planning applications received since the publication of the agenda
None.

c. To receive an update on planning permissions/refusals/ongoing applications
See report provided by CC at APPENDIX C.

d. To agree the parish council's submission to the Cotswold District Council Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation
AGREED BY COUNCIL, see submission at APPENDIX D
It was noted that if any amendments following the extension period and additional documentation published by CDC are required, these will be circulated and an updated version ratified or agreed at a future meeting.
KF

e. To ratify the parish council's submission to the South Warwickshire Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation
RATIFIED BY COUNCIL see APPENDIX E.

WORKING GROUPS
14. Transport
a. To receive a report from the Transport working group
KF gave the following information:
48,600 vehicles are noted coming into Mickleton (one way) in the past month, in the summer this figure was around 60,000.
1,750 vehicles have been verified going over 40 mph.
Maximum speed of 67 mph was recorded by a repeat offender.

b. To consider purchasing a new speed sign on Stratford Road
Council proposed option one: £2,850 + £160/year after year two for a 4G subscription (ex VAT).
KF/EFL

c. To note the parish council's reply to Gloucestershire County Council's informal consultation on speed limit changes in Mickleton

KF queried extending a 30 mph limit on Broadway Road stating to the edge of the development, and a reply was given stating that this would be considered if possible.

d. To consider writing to companies who are persistently speeding/activating the Community Speedwatch camera on Stratford Road
AGREED BY COUNCIL that the transport group would contact companies.
EFL had sent information informing council that this was possible, but autospeedwatch terms had to be abided by, and advised contacting autospeedwatch.
JA/KF

15. Neighbourhood Plan
a. To receive a report from the Neighbourhood Plan working group
See CC report at APPENDIX F.

OTHER ITEMS
16. To note checks of the following:
a. Junior Playing Field playground (weekly): all checks carried out.
b. Games Area (weekly): all checks carried out.
c. Churchyard and cemetery (fortnightly): all checks carried out.
d. Defibrillators (monthly): all checks carried out.

17. To receive correspondence
A member of public informed MPC about the speed signs that were in place on Stratford Road.
A member of the public reported anti-social behaviour at the games area. EFL advised them to contact the police and this event was also reported to MPC councillors.
A member of public contacted MPC regarding a response to item 13e on the agenda.
A damaged street sign at Bearcroft Gardens was reported to MPC, who have reported it to CDC, and TS has logged this.
Cotswold District Council's Local Plan 2026-2043 has been extended by four weeks. It will now close at 11.59pm on 3 November 2026.

18. To confirm the date for the next parish council meeting: 28 October 2026

The chairman closed the meeting at 19.34.

Signature of Chairman upon approval of the minutes ……

Mickleton Parish Council

2026103

Initialled……

APPENDIX A

Matters arising

There are still a number of long-term outstanding items that have been flagged previously, as noted at previous meetings.

Clerk's report

The Institute of Cemetery and Regulation Management (ICCM) has informed MPC that the government has issued a statement setting out its intention to bring forward comprehensive proposals for the formal regulation of the funeral sector, following the sentencing of Robert Bush of Legacy Independent Funeral Directors in Hu l. MPC will be kept informed as further information becomes available.

A damaged 'no dogs' sign at the games area has been removed, noted there are other 'no dogs' signs at the facility.

Damage to the plantation stonework has been reported to the contractor.

Defibrillator update:

Morrison's Daily: the cabinet has been replaced and the defibrillator is to be replaced and registered on The Circuit by the end of 16.09.26.

The Leasows: the cabinet and defibrillator are to be installed and registered at a later date.

Items circulated to councillors include:

Gloucestershire Association of Local Councils (GALC) training.

An announcement by GALC that following a period of formal consultation, the Board has made the decision to remove the CEO role from its organisational structure.

Local Government Reform seminar.

Cotswold District Council estimate the cost to MPC of a contested district and parish council will be £7,104.95 (no charge for an uncontested election).

Information was resent to the Transport group regarding why Community Speedwatch letters may not have been sent by the police.

Website updates included:

Cotswold District Council's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation, which runs until 5 October 2026.

Replacement bus shelter lighting article.

APPENDIX B

MICKLETON PARISH COUNCIL			
Sep-26			
NAME	**AMOUNT**	**METHOD**	
PAYMENTS			
Clerk sim card	4.90	Direct debit	LG(FP)A 1963 s5
Games area sim card	4.40	Direct debit	LG(FP)A 1963 s5
Microsoft 365 software	13.61	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s111
Lloyds bank charges	4.67	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s111

Nest pension – Sept payroll	214.24	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s112
National insurance/PAYE – Sept payroll	667.52	BACS	LGA 1972 s112
Clerk salary – Sept payroll with backpay	1938.38	Standing order	LGA 1972 s112
Smart Cut Grounds maintenance	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
Scribe cemetery	27.60	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s111
HP instant inks	28.99	Direct debit	LGA 1972 s111
*KGH hall hire	34.00	BACS	LGA 1972 s134(4)
External audit PKF Littlejohn	378.00	BACS	LGA 1972 s111
Cemetery refund	250.00	BACS	Payment refunded customer error
Cemetery plot labels	11.60	Card	LGA 1972 s111
Signs for bollards	29.47	Card	LGA 1972 s111
Pata payroll calculation	15.00	BACS	LGA 1972 s112
TOTAL	**4521.16**		

RECEIPTS	
Interest	57.03
Cemetery fees	4195.00
VAT refund	1668.90
Precept 2/2	12737.00
TOTAL	**18657.93**

APPENDIX C
New Applications Requiring Response

Reference	Details	Comment
13a 26/02433/FUL (Consider)	Erection of 85 residential units, including provision of vehicular and pedestrian access, green infrastructure and associated works at land North East Of Mickleton Mattock Mews.	Resubmittal of Brookworth Homes, originally: 25/01621/OUT. Number of houses reduced from 120 to 85. Draft Local Plan recommends 40 on this land. Nothing much has changed from original application. Recommend: Object.

26/02056/FUL was withdrawn. This was for the erection of ground floor front and side extension and first floor roof lift with associated works and demolition of shed, at The Cottage, High Street.

In addition to the above, there are 9 historic applications that remain 'open' as follows:

Reference	Details	Comment
26/02012/FUL	Variation of conditions 2 (Drawings) of permission 25/02156/FUL (Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and erection of self-build dwellinghouse, alterations to access track, addition of passing bay and associated works) to amend fenestration and add chimney, at Mickleton Nurseries Stratford Road.	Mostly cosmetic changes. More bifold doors rather than windows. Extra chimney. 2 additional access doors. Recommend: No objection.
26/02050/FUL	Erection of a two-storey rear extension, three dormers, and a single-storey rear/side extension, with associated works. Demolition of the existing single-storey rear wing at Lamorna Stratford Road.	This is a very large extension replacement plus addition of a new single story extension and internal redesign. Despite the scale the property is isolated and the front elevation will remain unchanged, plus materials will be used to match existing. Recommend: No objection.
26/02034/FUL	Replace existing wooden windows with UPVC windows at The End House High Street.	Replacement of single glazed and double-glazed wooden windows with uPVC. This is in the conservation area. Selected windows are of hiqh quality and designed for use in conservation areas. The reasons to replace are ok; rot, thermal performance, etc. My question would be why not replace with wooden units? Surely available at similar quality and price? Elaine has confirmed CDC are ok for using these uPVC windows so makes no sense to object, even though this positioning is inconsistent across the village. Recommend: No objection.
25/02213/OUT	Outline planning application for the erection of 60 dwellings with means of access at Foxwold House, Broad Marston Lane.	Major development. Requires full analysis and village engagement. Close date for comments: 21st October 2025. MPC recommended Objection Status: Awaiting Decision.
25/03351/OUT	Outline planning application for up to 95 dwellings with associated access and infrastructure, all other matters reserved, at Land North Of Tops Nursery.	Outline application made by Newland Homes. MPC ran a Public Consultation session on 7th January 2026. MPC has made a submission. MPC recommended: Objection. Status: Awaiting Decision. **CDC have approved this but with technical conditions. Once the technical**

Reference	Details	Comment
		conditions have been met the portal will be updated to 'Approved'.
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) on land north of Broadway Road.	Catesby Estates. MPC held a Public Consultation 23/1/26. MPC has submitted a formal response. MPC recommended: Objection. Status: Awaiting Decision.
26/00163/FUL	Erection of link extension between former barn and dwelling, conversion of former barn to additional living space and conversion of garage into home office/guest bedroom with associated works. Demolition of existing link extension. The Cedars. Ivy House Lane.	Major works. Partly undoing previous owner's modifications, and partly renovating derelict buildings. Good presentation of concern for using matching materials where possible. Very little visibility from road as majority of work at far end. MPC Recommend: No objection. Status: Awaiting Decision.
26/00164/LBC	Erection of link extension between former barn and dwelling, conversion of former barn to additional living space and conversion of garage into home office/guest bedroom with associated works. Demolition of existing link extension. The Cedars. Ivy House Lane.	**This is linked to 26/00163/FUL**. Its is the same application but has to be treated separately because it is a Listed Building Consent. Recommend: No objection. Status: Awaiting Decision.
EN0110033	The Scheme comprises the construction, operation, maintenance, and decommissioning of a solar PV electricity generating station, and associated development including BESS, and grid connection Infrastructure. Applicant is Arrow Valley Solar.	**Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP)** 1,762 hectares over 4 sites plus interconnecting cable ways. Site covers interest from Redditch, Stratford and Wychavon. MPC is a statutory consultee as adjacent to Stratford. Long process with opportunities to comment once initial reports and feasibility studies are complete. Recommend: No comment.

Mickleton Parish Council

2026107

Initialled……

Additional Planning Notes

- MPC submitted a comment to South Warwickshire Local Plan Regulation 19, opposing the plan on a number of grounds including employment issues, infrastructure costs, and transport considerations for Mickleton.

- Kevin has developed MPC's draft response to CDC Regulation 19. This needs to be approved and sent in to CDC.

- Angela Rayner's department responded to our joint letter with 15 other Councils highlighting the disastrous consequences of applying the Government's new 'standard method' for calculating housing numbers when applied to places like the Cotswolds. The letter was initiated by Fairford Town Council.

- Councillor Lisa Spivey, leader of GCC, responded to Chair's message about Gloucester's plans for a 'Housing Commission':

  Dear Chris,

  Thank you for your email and for setting out the concerns that residents in Mickleton have regarding the emerging Cotswold District Local Plan. I appreciate why the announcement of the Gloucestershire Housing Commission has prompted questions about how its work relates to the Local Plan process.

  The two are connected, but they have different purposes. The Cotswold Local Plan is focused on planning for growth and development within the district, while the Housing Commission has been established to consider Gloucestershire's housing challenges from a countywide perspective.

  The Commission's role is to look beyond individual district boundaries and examine wider issues such as housing affordability, housing quality, homelessness, demographic change, the needs of key workers and older people, and the relationship between housing, health, infrastructure and economic growth. It will provide an independent evidence base and recommendations to help inform future decision-making across the county.

  Importantly, the Commission is not intended to replace or undermine the Local Plan process. Rather, it recognises that housing markets, employment patterns, transport networks and public services operate across Gloucestershire, and that some of the county's housing challenges are best understood through that wider lens.

  I recognise that proposals of the scale being considered in Mickleton naturally raise questions about infrastructure, services and community sustainability. Ensuring that housing growth is considered alongside the infrastructure needed to support it is a key issue that the Commission will be exploring.

  The Commission is at an early stage, with the University of Gloucestershire and Arc4 currently undertaking the scoping and evidence-gathering work. Further information about the Commission's programme and any opportunities for wider engagement will be shared in due course.

  Thank you again for getting in touch.

  Best wishes

  Lisa

Mickleton Parish Council

2026108

Initialled.....

Cllr Lisa Spivey
Member for the South Cerney Division
Leader of Gloucestershire County Council

APPENDIX D
Weblink for full text:

1) Introduction

By way of background, in the Local Plan Review Preferred Options Consultation November 2025 (the Regulation 18 stage), Mickleton was put forward as a proposed principal settlement with a total housing allocation of 589 of which 439 were additional non strategic site allocations and 143 were windfalls (see page 21 of that Local Plan Review).

Following the conclusion of the Regulation 18 consultation, Mickleton was redesignated as a strategic site and its housing allocation was increased to 1387 (excluding windfalls) comprising a strategic site allocation of 1238 houses and a non strategic site allocation of 149 houses. This represents an incredible 216% increase in the housing allocation from that which was put forward to the residents of the village during the Regulation 18 consultation.

Mickleton currently has approximately 954 houses so an additional 1387 houses represents an increase of 145% over the period of the Local Plan.

This significant change in strategy following the conclusion of the Regulation 18 consultation was driven solely by the fact that a large block of land to the north of the village became available following a call for sites and that land is less constrained as it falls outside the Cotswold National Landscape.

It is our contention however that the redesignation of Mickleton from a principal settlement to a strategic site is not an appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives and therefore is not "justified". Furthermore, we would argue that the Plan is not deliverable over its period and is therefore not "effective". Accordingly the Local Plan is not sound.

2) Inappropriate Strategy

The redesignation of Mickleton as a strategic site is not an appropriate strategy for the reasons set out below. These are inherent problems due to the location of Mickleton – they cannot be solved merely by a promise to construct infrastructure.:

(A) Traffic

Mickleton is poorly located in the relation to the major road network with the main access points to the A46 in the north and west, the A429 to the east and the A44 to the south all being between 6 and 11 miles away. Furthermore most of them can only be reached by travelling along minor country roads and through rural villages, and in the case of the A46 to the north, only via single lane bridges over the River Avon at Welford-on-Avon or Bidford-on-Avon or through Stratford-upon-Avon

The B4632 through the centre of the village is already heavily congested with over 4000 vehicles a day (over 500 vehicles an hour at peak times) using that road. The High Street is in a designated conservation area lined by many Grade 2 listed properties, and a recently discovered subterranean water network which runs just below the surface of the High Street is the subject of a Non-Designated Heritage Asset application. In many places the road is reduced to single file by parked cars.

The South Warwickshire Local Plan produced by Stratford-upon-Avon and Warwick District Councils (currently subject to a Regulation 19 consultation) proposes the development of at least 4500 houses at Long Marston Airfield over the next 24 years increasing to a minimum of 10300 thereafter. There is also ongoing development at Meon Vale. Both of these developments are located off the B4632 within Warwickshire yet are only a few miles outside Mickleton and traffic emanating from them will need to come through the centre of Mickleton village in order to reach Evesham and the A46/A44 going south. This will have a significant impact on traffic volumes through the village and on the surrounding roads.

The traffic assessments which have been considered when redesignating Mickleton as a strategic site only take into account the impact arising from the proposed development in the village. They do not properly consider the significant cumulative impact on the roads arising from the adjacent cross border developments at Long Marston Airfield and Meon Vale. This indicates a failure to take a proper cross border strategic approach when considering the effect of development on traffic volumes.

Furthermore, although the Local Plan provides for a primary road through the proposed development to the west of the village off Broadway Road connecting to Broad Marston Road, there is no continuation of that primary road through the proposed development to the north of the village connecting with Stratford Road and the proposed new school and local centre. This means that traffic travelling between the west and north of the village (and vice versa) will need to come through the High Street. Surely it would make more strategic sense to incorporate one primary relief road connecting the two proposed developments and linking Broadway Road and Stratford Road which may help to divert some traffic off the High Street and avoid the creation of a short cut through the estate roads.

All of this is strong evidence that insufficient consideration has been given to the effect which the proposed developments will have on traffic volumes through the centre of the village and on the local road network.

(B) Public Transport

The nearest train station is at Honeybourne and the route operating from there only serves Malvern, Worcester, Oxford, Reading and London plus minor stations in between. There is no public transport from Mickleton to Honeybourne train station and Appendix B of the Local Plan (pages 41-43) which sets out proposed improvements to public transport does not indicate that any such service will be provided. In reality, the only practical way of getting to that train station is by car through minor country roads and even then the car parking facilities at the station are very limited. For residents who rely heavily on train transport, Honeybourne offers a very limited service with extremely poor access.

The nearest train stations for other destinations, particularly the major employment centres at Birmingham and Coventry, are located at Stratford-upon-Avon , Warwick Parkway and Leamington Spa all of which are between 9 and 19 miles away. There is a bus service to Stratford (although not to the train station) but no service to Warwick Parkway or Leamington Spa. In reality virtually all residents will use their car to get to these stations.

The reality is that Mickleton is not well located for residents who wish to reach their destinations by train and very few of them therefore choose to use rail travel on a regular basis.

(C) Employment

The nearest centres of employment to Mickleton are at Stratford-upon-Avon and Evesham, both of which are over 8 miles away with limited employment opportunities. More major centres of employment are much further away at Worcester, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Oxford. Coventry and Birmingham.

There is a reference in the Local Plan to employment opportunities arising from the proposed developments at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield. In reality the number and type of jobs which will be available at these locations will be very limited and unlikely to offer viable employment opportunities for the vast majority of new Mickleton residents. Furthermore, there will be huge numbers of new residents coming into the new houses at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield who will also be looking for employment so the competition for the few jobs which might be available on these developments will be significant.

Mickleton is therefore extremely poorly situated for access to employment. A recent village survey found that 80% of employed residents commuted to their places of work, with almost half of those travelling over 10 miles and over 30% travelling over 20 miles.

This was in fact recognised in the Cotswold District Settlement Role and Function Study – November 2025 (pages 33-35) which was commissioned by Cotswold District Council as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. Here Mickleton scored poorly for employment and economic activity compared with many other settlements in the region with a high employment density, meaning that Mickleton was designated as an exporter of workers with consequential increase in commuting.

No proposals have been included in the Local Plan for new employment in Mickleton (other than that associated with the proposed new infrastructure) so even though Mickleton has been redesignated as a strategic site no attempt has been made to improve the local employment situation.

The Government's policy is to adopt a workplace based approach to development focusing development on locations where residents can be close to their places of work. The decision to include Mickleton as a strategic site with a large housing allocation is therefore completely at odds with this policy.

(D) Character

Mickleton is a rural village with around 950 houses and 2350 residents. The Local Plan proposes an additional 1387 houses which would increase the population to over 5000. Mickleton would cease to be a village and instead become a small dormitory town.

This would fundamentally change the nature and character of the area both from an aesthetic and cultural standpoint with huge areas of farmland being taken over for development and well over 50% of the residents being new to the area. It would no longer be a Cotswold village and instead become a dormitory town for residents, many of whom will have to commute considerable distance to work.

We consider this to be an excessive and disproportionate increase in housing driven purely by land availability and not appropriate given the nature and location of the village. The Local Plan fails to provide evidence of an objective assessment that the village can absorb growth on this scale without destroying its character and landscape.

(E) Conclusion

Mickleton is poorly located in relation to the major road network and is facing severe congestion through its historic High Street as a result of extensive development at Meon Vale and Long Marston Airfield. It does not have a train station and there is no public transport to the nearest one. The village is poorly located for employment with most employed residents having to commute considerable distances to reach major employment centres.

Yet despite all of these inherent drawbacks it has been identified as a strategic site with a proposal to more than double the housing in the village over the next 17 years – a disproportionate increase bearing in mind all other factors which would irreversibly damage its character and landscape.

There is only one reason for this which is that land is available and it falls outside the Cotswold National Landscape. But you cannot base a sensible planning strategy solely on availability of land. Strategic sites should have good access to the major road network in order to avoid overloading the local road network. They should be convenient for centres of employment with good public transport links to reduce commuting and should be planned in a way which does not fundamentally alter the character of the settlement. It is quite clear that none of these key criteria have been taken into account in redesignating Mickleton as a strategic site. This is not in line with Government policy regarding selection of sites for major development.

Therefore, for the reasons given, it is our contention that Mickleton is not a suitable location for a strategic site. The redesignation of the village from a principal settlement to a strategic site with the consequential large increase in housing allocation is not an appropriate strategy when judged against other alternatives, is not justified and therefore not sound.

3) **Not Deliverable**

The infrastructure proposed in the Local Plan for Mickleton is not deliverable over the period due to the following reasons:

(A) Primary School and Local Centre

The Local Plan proposes the development of a new two form entry Primary School and a Local Centre although it is not specific about what services and amenities the Local Centre will provide.

The increase in housing proposed in the Local Plan would result in the population of Mickleton increasing to over 5000. To accommodate this number of residents there would need to be a significant increase in social infrastructure including, at the very least, a medical practice, a pharmacy, a new village hall (the current one has limited capacity), a post office plus relevant convenience retail outlets. Except for a small village hall, one convenience store and a small delicatessen the village currently has none of these services and amenities and so the Local Centre would need to incorporate all of them as a minimum.

So who is going to fund the construction of a two form entry Primary School plus all of the buildings required in the Local Centre? Will the developers be willing to fund this or will the proposals be watered down once negotiations commence with the developers on planning applications? We strongly suspect that the developers will not be able or willing to fund all of the infrastructure which is required to support such a large growth in population and that therefore it will not be fully delivered.

Indeed this possibility is already highlighted in Core Policy 6; Infrastructure Delivery of the Local Plan (page 55) which indicates that if the developer can show that the infrastructure requirements would render the development unviable, then the Council will prioritise developer contributions for critical, essential and important infrastructure and/or defer developer contributions. So a marker has already been put down that infrastructure plans may not be guaranteed.

The justification for a large housing allocation in Mickleton is the promise to provide adequate infrastructure to support the resulting large increase in population. If the necessary infrastructure cannot be delivered then that justification no longer exists. You cannot have one without the other.

Furthermore, Cotswold District Council has indicated that new developments on strategic sites will be zero rated for CIL and that proposed infrastructure will be funded purely from s106 contributions from developers. This makes it even more unlikely that the necessary funding will be made available for all the infrastructure required as it leaves more control over infrastructure spending between the local authority and the developers (increasing the likelihood of commitments being negotiated away) and takes away the ability for the local community to fund certain projects itself.

Also no timetable has been proposed in the Local Plan for the completion of the infrastructure. When will the new primary school and local centre be built relative to the new housing? Will the infrastructure be built in tandem with the new housing or will it follow many years later?

For example, there are currently three live planning applications on the land to the west of the village off Broadway Road and one on land to the east of the village at the back of Furrow Way. If all of these were developed then potentially around 400 new houses could be built. Currently there are no planning applications on the land to the north of the village where it is proposed that the new school and local centre will be sited. So if these new houses were built first would the new school and local centre be built at the same time to support the increase in population or would their development be postponed until such time as housing is constructed on the land to the north of the village which could be many years in the future given the staged approach to development proposed in the Local Plan? If so, then this would mean that the population of Mickleton could increase significantly but with no improvement to local education provision or other necessary services and amenities.

(B) Cycleways

The Local Plan (Appendix B – pages 41-43) indicates that a cycleway and/or shared pathway will be provided along Long Marston Road to facilitate segregated access to National Cycleway 5 allowing car free travel to Stratford-upon-Avon.

Although this would be a welcome addition to the village infrastructure, the reality is that in order to provide a safe segregated car-free travel route this would require the construction of a cycleway/pathway of around 3 miles in length from the centre of the village to Station Road in Long Marston which is the nearest access to the National Cycleway. This stretch of Long Marston Road is a narrow country lane and crosses the county boundaries of both Worcestershire and Warwickshire. The cost of constructing a dedicated cycleway or pathway of this length would be enormous and well beyond the affordability of most developers. It would also require cross border co-operation with two adjacent Highway authorities. We would doubt whether in practice it would be possible to construct it anyway on such a narrow country lane – there isn't the space available.

If the proposal is only to construct the cycleway/pathway for a short distance along Long Marston Road before reaching the Worcestershire border then it would not provide a safe segregated car-free route to Stratford-upon-Avon because the cycleway/pathway would not connect directly to the National Cycleway and it would be necessary to walk or cycle on the road for several miles to reach it.

So it is highly unlikely that this aspect of the Local Plan could ever be delivered.

(C) Conclusion

It is our contention that the infrastructure proposed in the Local Plan, and in particular the new Primary School, Local Centre and cycleway/shared pathway along the Long Marston Road are not deliverable over the period due to the anticipated costs involved, lack of funding and, in the case of the cycleway/pathway, the practicalities of construction. Although it is conceivable that some form of Local Centre may be provided, we do not believe that the funding will be available to provide for the range of facilities and amenities which we have highlighted and which would be essential requirements to support a population of over 5000.

As such the Local Plan is not effective and therefore not sound.

APPENDIX E

Weblink for full text

The following relates to Site E1 (Long Marston / Meon Vale Strategic Growth Area) and the associated Transport / Infrastructure Strategy.

Historic Context

In February 2025 Mickleton Parish Council submitted a comprehensive set of objections to further development at Site E1 as part of the Regulation 18 process. Essentially our comments reiterated SWLP's own findings that this site would be wholly inappropriate for major expansion for reasons of unsustainability, primarily in relation to employment, transport, and the massive costs associated with providing necessary infrastructure. Nothing much appears to have changed in Regulation 19, with infrastructure commitments remaining vague, unfunded, and likely undeliverable, the bypass and the railway being the two most obvious examples. In particular our concerns over the traffic impact along the B4632 and through Mickleton have been completely ignored. We are therefore restating our specific concerns as follows.

Specific Regulation 19 Comment

We object to the allocation of Site E1 (Long Marston Airfield / Meon Vale) because the plan is unsound due to a critical failure in its transport modelling and cross-boundary infrastructure planning.

The plan is not **Positively Prepared** because its traffic mitigation strategies suffer from a distinct northbound bias, focusing almost exclusively on links to Stratford-upon-Avon and the proposed Southwest Relief Road. The plan completely fails to account for or assess the severe impact of thousands of additional daily vehicle movements travelling south along the B4632 through the historic village of Mickleton to access employment, services, and strategic routes in Gloucestershire.

The potential damage to Grade I and II listed buildings on Mickleton High Street from increased traffic volumes has increased significantly since our Regulation 18 submission through the discovery and mapping of a historic subterranean water system, currently being registered as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset.

Furthermore, the plan is not **Effective** as it demonstrates a failure in cross-boundary cooperation. No formal, funded infrastructure or traffic mitigation strategies have been agreed upon with Gloucestershire County Council to protect Mickleton from the inevitable increase in commuter traffic and heavy goods vehicles generated by this 10,000+ home allocation. Without comprehensive southern traffic modelling and formal cross-border mitigation, the transport strategy is undeliverable and fundamentally flawed.

APPENDIX F

- Further delays due to complexity of CDC Local Plan Regulation 19 (>8,000 pages), the need to respond to South Warwickshire Local Plan Regulation 19 (similar size), and resubmission of Brookworth Homes application.
  Despite these delays the Steering Group continues to target May 2027 for delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- A new resident with hydrology engineering and major project expertise has been invited to join the Steering Group.
- The Village survey has undergone a major rewrite following feedback from Mark Harrison. As such it is now expected to be delivered to the Village around mid-October with a 6-week period for completion.
- Shortlist of possible consultants identified.
- A draft of the Hydrology NDHA has been reviewed by Mark Harrison. Next steps will involve Historic England, CDC's conservation officer, and Gloucester's County Archaeologist.
- Gardening Club and Women's Institute have received an in-person update on activity and asked for their support.