

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET
(SPECIAL MEETING)

21ST APRIL 2016

Present:

Councillor Lynden Stowe - Chairman
Councillor NJW Parsons - Vice-Chairman

Councillors -

Sue Coakley Mrs. SL Jepson
C Hancock

Observers:

SI Andrews	RC Hughes
Julian Beale	RL Hughes (until 6.45 p.m.)
Miss AML Beccle	RG Keeling
AW Berry	Juliet Layton
AR Brassington	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
Alison Coggins	SDE Parsons (from 5.45 p.m.)
RW Dutton	NP Robbins
JA Harris (until 7.05 p.m.)	Tina Stevenson
M Harris	R Theodoulou (until 6.05 p.m.)
SG Hirst	

Note:

All observing Members were invited to speak on Minute CAB.106. Councillor AW Berry was also invited to speak on Minute CAB.108.

CAB.105 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest under the Code of Conduct for Members or Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

There were no declarations of interest under the Code of Conduct for Officers.

CAB.106 COTSWOLD DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN SUBMISSION DRAFT REG. 19
APRIL 2016

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning introduced this item and reminded the Cabinet that it was being requested to comment on the Submission Draft Cotswold District Local Plan, and to make recommendations thereon to the Council.

The Leader of the Council outlined the process for consideration of this item and explained that the relevant Ward Members would be invited to address the Cabinet at the appropriate juncture.

Arising thereon:

(i) Introduction - Paragraph 1.0.18

The Deputy Leader drew attention to the definition of 'soundness' and outlined the requirements for making this point in the Submission Draft. The Deputy Leader explained that guidelines for consultees would be issued in due course.

(ii) Paragraph 2.0.17

In response to a comment from a Member, it was reported that the consultants would be requested to provide an updated figure relating to homeworking prior to the Council Meeting on 17th May 2016.

(iii) Paragraphs 3.0.8-3.0.10

A Member expressed the view that there was a lack of new industry in the District and that, in his view, the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) focussed on the M5 corridor to the detriment of the Cotswold District and Forest of Dean. The Member contended that there was not enough emphasis in the Local Plan on the demand for employment opportunities, resulting in residents having to travel outside the District for work. The Member further contended that the levels of pay in the tourism industry were insufficient, given the high cost of accommodation in the District, and that more local employment opportunities were required to support residents and to avoid further journeys to work in other areas.

Another Member welcomed the cautious approach suggested in Paragraph 3.0.9 and expressed support for the development of 'quality' employment within the District. The Member commented that there was a need for flexible industrial units to be built on employment sites.

A Member, referring to a protected employment site in South Cerney, stated that the majority of employees travelled there from Swindon and elsewhere in Wiltshire. In that context, the Member suggested that reference should be included in the Local Plan to people travelling into the District for employment.

Another Member expressed concern over the lack of public transport and questioned where sponsorship for light industrial sites would come from and where such sites would be located in Fairford and Lechlade. In response, the Deputy Leader reminded the Cabinet that the Local Plan could not demand money from the LEP, but could seek contributions through policies. In response to a question, it was reported that, currently, there was a correlation between the provision of employment sites and housing in the Submission Draft Plan.

The Leader commented that the points raised would be taken on board and that, whilst the delivery of housing had been front-loaded, there could be a requirement for additional housing.

A Member commented that sites earmarked for employment were not always taken up for that purpose. The Member noted that the Council did not have an Economic Development Strategy and suggested that consideration should be given to marketing employment sites through the Local Plan.

Another Member expressed the opinion that high rents could have an adverse impact on returns in a rural economy.

(iv) Paragraph 3.0.14

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that the issue of grey water storage did not apply 'across the board' to all developments.

(v) Section 6.1 - Policy DS1

In response to questions from Members, the Deputy Leader reported that the Local Plan was required to allocate sufficient land to meet the requirement for housing identified in the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN), and that it would be unwise to rely too heavily on estimates of future 'windfall' sites. The need for a strategic housing site had been identified early in the Local Plan process and the site was critical to delivering the District-wide housing requirement of 8,400 dwellings over the Plan period. The Deputy Leader commented that failure to meet the District's housing requirement with identified allocations within the Submission Draft Plan would be at the Council's peril, and he referred to the suggested additional allocations which had been notified to Members on 20th April 2016.

(v) Paragraph 6.1.4

It was AGREED that reference to Willersey should also be included under clause 2 of Policy DS1.

(vi) Section 6.2 - Policy DS2

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that the emerging Local Plan proposed a higher degree of protection for allocated Local Green Spaces than had been afforded to open spaces in previous Local Plans.

(vii) Section 6.3 - Policy DS3

The Deputy Leader explained that this policy was a high risk one for the Council, as it sought to deal with the lack of open market housing in the smaller villages. The Deputy Leader commented that concern had been expressed that few settlements could meet the criteria set out in Policy DS3 1(d) and, in that context, he reminded the Cabinet that thirty-four villages had at least one of the facilities listed while seventeen had at least two facilities. The Deputy Leader added that the existence of public transport services would be a 'bonus' and recommended that the policy remained unchanged.

A number of Members expressed concern over the suggested retention of this policy in its current form. Those Members contended that the policy, as suggested, could result in development decisions being taken out of the hands of the Council; development could fail due to a lack of people living in various settlements; the suggested wording could result in a number of

settlements being classed as 'unsustainable'; rural settlements should be allowed to grow; and small developments over a period of time would not have any detrimental effect such settlements. Other Members considered that deletion of the policy would leave the Council open to speculative developments in unsustainable locations. Some suggestions were made as to how the wording could be amended, including by stipulating a maximum number of units that could be permitted or by seeking support for development from the appropriate Parish/Town Council. One Member commented that not all settlements wished to expand.

In response, it was reported that informal discussions with an Inspector, at the recent advisory visit, had indicated that the general approach set out in Policy DS3 seemed reasonable. Development proposals would be judged on the merits of the location and submission of any supporting evidence. It was added that Neighbourhood Plans could propose additional housing to that included in the Local Plan, if that was what local communities wanted.

It was AGREED that a report detailing the benefits and risks of amending the proposed policy be submitted for consideration by the Council at its Meeting on 17th May 2016.

(viii) Section 7.1 - South Cotswold - Principal Settlements (Policy SA1)

Details of additional sites suggested for inclusion had been circulated at the Meeting. In response to questions from a Member, it was clarified that such sites were being proposed as new sites and would not be separately categorised as 'reserve' sites. If any of them were proposed for development, a Grampian Condition could be suggested in relation to infrastructure improvements.

It was suggested that the second reference to 'one additional youth football pitch in the Fairford/Lechlade area' on page 42 be deleted.

The Ward Member for Kemble commented that there was a question mark over the development potential of Site K_5 - land to the north-west of Kemble Primary School - as the School was discussing a possible purchase of this site with the landowner.

The Ward Member for Tetbury Town referred to the number of planning permissions granted in relation to Tetbury in recent years and suggested that any development on Site T_31B - land adjacent to Blind Lane, Tetbury - should be phased towards the end of the Local Plan period.

The Ward Member for Moreton East expressed support for the inclusion of Site M_12A - land at Evenlode Road, Moreton-in-Marsh - but concern over the inclusion of Sites M_19A (MOR_E8) and M_19B - land south-east of Fossey Avenue, Moreton-in-Marsh. The Ward Member reminded the Cabinet that permission had been granted for approximately 800 new homes in the town since the start of the Local Plan period and that applications for a further 200 new homes were due to be considered. The Ward Member contended that this constituted an excessive number of new homes for the town, especially as there had not been any new infrastructure provided and social cohesion was non-existent. He expressed the view that development

at this rate was not sustainable and concluded by stating that 187 of the 363 additional new dwellings were being proposed for Moreton-in-Marsh.

The Ward Member for Moreton West commented that sites M_19A and M_19B were not in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, but were adjacent to the southern end of the town. The Ward Member contended that this approach should be protected for the benefit of the tourism industry and stated that the sites comprised grade 2 agricultural land and were subject to flooding. The Ward Member considered that recent developments had had a minimal visual impact on the town due to their location on sites on the eastern side, expressed the view that these two sites would have an adverse impact, and concluded by stating that she could not support their inclusion at this moment in time.

The Deputy Leader commented that the additional sites had been assessed through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process as being 'deliverable'. The Deputy Leader explained that a Planning Inspector had advised that the sites should be included as they had gone through the SHLAA process, otherwise they could be developed off-Plan.

It was AGREED that a report detailing the implications of including these additional eight sites in the Local Plan be submitted for consideration by the Council at its Meeting on 17th May 2016.

(ix) Paragraph 7.1.2 - Policy SA1

It was noted that reference to the infrastructure requirements for Cirencester should be included in the Cirencester Section, and details relating to the Chesterton strategic development site would be submitted to the Council as part of the planning application.

(x) Paragraph 7.1.1.2.9 - Policy S2

A Member commented that the majority of housing on the Chesterton strategic development site should be affordable housing in order to help address the current housing crisis. The Member stated that he did not support the proposal for up to 40% of that development to comprise affordable housing.

The Deputy Leader explained that specialist advice had been sought which had suggested that a requirement for 50% of dwellings to be affordable was likely to result in costly negotiations with developers, but that a requirement for up to 40% was more likely to be acceptable.

The Leader reminded the Cabinet that the existing requirement was for 50% of dwellings to be affordable and that the cost of the substantial community and infrastructure benefits that would be required as a result of the Chesterton development had to be met somehow.

(xi) Paragraph 7.1.1.2.24

In response to a question from a Member, it was suggested that a cross-party Working Group could be established to monitor development of the

Chesterton strategic development site, subject to the outcome of the planning application relating to that site.

The Ward Member for Four Acres drew attention to a number of issues that would need to be addressed when the planning application relating to the Chesterton strategic development site was determined by the Council, including traffic impact, parking, employment uses, separation zones, phasing, timescales, provision of a cycle route between the development and Kemble Station, public transport facilities, and the use of private cars. The Ward Member commented that there was a need to liaise with various external organisations over the provision of public open space and the creation of wildlife habitats, and that the views of Thames Water would be needed in relation to upgrades to the sewage network.

The Ward Member for Chesterton expressed concern over the depth of the gas pipe line crossing this site.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that the planning application would deal with the layout of the Chesterton strategic development site, including restricting development under the route of the electricity pylons crossing the site. However, the cost of putting the cables underground would be likely to preclude any other infrastructure improvements. No development to the east of Cirencester was being proposed in the Local Plan.

(xii) Section 7.1.1.3 - Cirencester Town Centre (Policy S3)

A Member commented that consideration should be given to the preparation of a master plan in relation to development in Cirencester town centre.

(xiii) Section 7.1.7 - Tetbury (Policy S9)

The Member for the Tetbury with Upton Ward explained that the three Members representing the Tetbury Wards had expressed reservations over the wording proposed in respect of Tetbury town centre and would forward comments thereon to Officers in due course.

(xiv) Section 7.2.1 - Andoversford (Policy S10)

The Ward Member for Sandywell commented that land between Templefields and Clockhouse Square had been not been included in the Local Plan. In response, it was reported that the site had been omitted following consultation.

(xv) Section 7.3.4 - Moreton-in-Marsh (Policy S18)

The Ward Member for Moreton East explained that he had previously submitted comments to the Deputy Leader and the Head of Service.

(xvi) Section 8.4 - Specialist Accommodation for Older People

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that the Council was not able to require completion of a development within any specified timescale.

(xvii) Section 9.2.1 - Safeguarding Employment Sites (Policy EC2)

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that, over the past twenty years, there had been pressure to redevelop employment sites within the District and that consideration would be given to the options for the proactive marketing of such sites in the future, to support an economic development improvement plan.

(xviii) Paragraph 9.2.3.12 - Special Policy Areas - Policy EC4

The Ward Member for Moreton East stated that he welcomed the suggested policy relating to the Fire Services College, Moreton-in-Marsh. The Ward Member contended that all land owned by the parent company in this location should be included in the special policy area, including a triangle of land to the north, and that Moreton Park should be shown as a built-up area. The Ward Member concluded by commenting that no progress had been made in relation to the creation of additional employment at the Fire Services College site, despite promises made previously by the parent company.

(xix) Section 9.2.5 - Conversion of Rural Buildings

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that national planning policies applied to applications for the conversion of Dutch barns, and that permission should be granted if the scheme was acceptable and the barns were considered to be capable of conversion.

(xx) Paragraph 12.0.1

The Ward Member for Moreton East commented that reference to the flood alleviation project in Moreton-in-Marsh should be included in the Local Plan as, in his opinion, it represented the most important project for the town.

(xxi) Section 13.2 - Kemble Airfield (Policy SP2)

A Member expressed the view that the retention of Kemble Airfield for employment was essential. Another Member stated that an office block at the Airfield, within Wiltshire, remained unoccupied, but commented that any housing development on this site would have to use what he considered to be the two worst roads in Gloucestershire; and he concluded by stating that there was no infrastructure to support such development. A third Member commented that it would be difficult for the Council to condone housing development on this site.

(xxii) Section 13.4 - Cotswold Water Park Post-Mineral Extraction After Uses (Policy SP5)

The Ward Member for South Cerney Village welcomed the inclusion of 'Cotswold Water Park' in the Local Plan, and reminded the Cabinet that the name was now a recognised brand.

(xxiii) Section 13.5 - Former Cheltenham to Stratford Railway Line (Policy SP6)

The Ward Member for Moreton East welcomed the inclusion of this Policy in the Local Plan, and commented that the 'Honeybourne Line' provided a useful link from Moreton-in-Marsh to the north.

(xxiv) Appendix 'C' - Proposed Gypsy and Traveller Sites

The Ward Member for The Rissingtons expressed concern over the inclusion of the site to the rear of Greens Close, Great Rissington as a potential Gypsy and Traveller site, commenting that, currently, there were no services on the site and access from the highway was poor.

In response, it was reported that the site had been considered as part of the SHLAA process, when all issues had been discussed. The County-wide assessment of Gypsy and Traveller needs was currently being reviewed, and the inclusion of this site, along with others, in the Local Plan could be reconsidered, depending on the outcome of such review.

It was AGREED that this site should be visited again in order to check whether access was suitable.

RECOMMENDED that:

- (a) the conclusions arising from the report 'Updated Estimate of the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs of Cotswold District (March 2016)' and other related evidence be accepted;**
- (b) the Submission Draft Cotswold Local Plan (attached at Appendix 1 to the circulated report), as amended, be approved for the purpose of formally consulting, for a statutory period of six weeks in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as the version proposed to be submitted to the Secretary of State for examination (subject to Recommendations (c) and (d) below);**
- (c) the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning be authorised to approve outstanding matters, including minor amendments, prior to the start of the public consultation period;**
- (d) the Cabinet be authorised to approve outstanding matters, including minor amendments, prior to submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for examination;**
- (e) subject to there being no significant new issues raised during the statutory six-week period, the Submission Draft Cotswold District Local Plan be formally submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012, including any minor amendments.**

Record of Voting - for 5, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

Note:

On behalf of the Cabinet, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning thanked the Forward Planning Team for their work in preparing the Submission Draft Local Plan.

CAB.107 COTSWOLD DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT SCHEME - APRIL 2016-MARCH 2019

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning introduced this item, drawing attention to the evidence base to underpin the Local Plan.

RESOLVED that the updated Local Development Scheme be adopted and published on the Council's Website.

Record of Voting - for 5, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

CAB.108 HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT STRATEGY : ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT OF THE COTSWOLDS

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning introduced this item and commended the Action Plan to the Cabinet as the means to ensure the protection of the historic environment of the District.

It was suggested that the reference to 'rainfall patters' in the second line of the paragraph relating to 'Climate Change' on page 21 be amended to refer to 'rainfall patterns'.

In response to a comment from a Member, it was reported that the intention of the Strategy was to ensure that a balance was struck between the use and preservation of the historic environment in the twenty-first century. It was suggested that Town/Parish Councils should be made aware of any assets at risk within their areas.

RESOLVED that the 2016 Historic Environment Strategy 'Enhancing the Historic Environment of the Cotswold District' be approved, as amended, and endorsed as part of the evidence base for the Cotswold District Local Plan 2016-2031.

Record of Voting - for 5, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

Note:

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning thanked the Heritage and Design Team for their work in preparing this Strategy.

The Meeting commenced at 5.06 p.m. and closed at 7.20 p.m.

Chairman

(END)