

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

CABINET

20TH OCTOBER 2016

Present:

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

Councillors -

Sue Coakley Mrs. SL Jepson
Alison Coggins MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
C Hancock

Observers:

SI Andrews Juliet Layton
Maggie Heaven Jim Parsons

CAB.27 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.28 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Cabinet held on 15th September 2016 be approved as a correct record.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

CAB.29 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10, the following two questions had been submitted. However, such questions had been submitted after the deadline by which answers could be guaranteed either in advance of, or at, the Cabinet Meeting. Notwithstanding this, responses had been provided in advance of the Meeting.

- (1) From Mr. P Moylan of Cirencester, on behalf of Save Our Cirencester, to Councillor NJW Parsons, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning

'The on-going development of the local plan and the corresponding Chesterton application has slowly revealed to the community the truly massive scale of this development. It is the fervent wish of nearly everyone in Cirencester that this number should be reduced. It has

been reported that in response to a question from a district councillor about reducing the numbers that the Council's reply was that changing policy would have to undo years of work. Policy would not be changed because it would undo years of work.

Does Councillor Parsons not accept that such a reply exposes how weak the Council feels about its own policy? Such an answer simply will not do when we are talking about something as important as this. Save Our Cirencester has found many reasons why this is bad policy and bad policy should not be implemented because no matter how many years of work it has taken, it is as nothing compared with the everlasting damage that such a policy will inflict on Cirencester. Do you agree that the explanation given to the District Councillor about reducing numbers was totally inadequate?'

Response from Councillor Parsons

'During the Local Plan process, the Council has considered the consequences of delay, or even abandonment, of the process, having regard to the Government's policy that Local Plans would be imposed by the Planning Inspectorate if not adopted by 2017. The Council has consistently been of the view that it would be better to continue to progress the Local Plan, rather than risk a delay that might result in a Local Plan being imposed by Government to the significant disadvantage of those living in the District.

That said, the Local Plan has been built on a strategy that the Council has agreed as being the right strategy for the District. It is the culmination of many years of work, many consultations, and the consideration of various options along the way - and I remain convinced that a change in strategy is not required. My response to Councillor Harris reflected the work undertaken on the Local Plan, the Council's agreed strategy, and my own personal views on how other potential changes might affect the situation as time moves on - and was a pragmatic one given to a District Councillor who understood the implications of delay. Had the question been asked by a member of the public, I would have provided a full explanation of the implications of delay.

The Council received approximately 1,300 representations in response to the Regulation 18 consultation, of which around 150 related to the strategic site south of Chesterton, Cirencester. While it is accepted that a good proportion of those representations expressed an objection to the site and put forward a number of modifications, including the suggestion that the level of housing should be lowered, I struggle to see how such level of response could equate to the comment made that "It is the fervent wish of nearly everyone in Cirencester that this number should be reduced" - this simply does not follow. I can also confirm that a number of the representations expressed their support for the strategic site.'

Mr. Moylan thanked the Deputy Leader for his response, and stated his view that the level of opposition to the strategic development site was not a moot point. Mr. Moylan pointed out that Save Our Cirencester was accessible to the whole community, and he considered opinion against the strategic

development site to be widespread, with two opinion polls - one having been conducted by The Wiltshire and Gloucestershire Standard - proving that overwhelmingly. Councillor Parsons had referred to '150 objections'; Mr. Moylan contended that the way in which the Local Plan had been prepared and presented, and the impenetrable on-line system for comments, had put people from submitting comments. Mr. Moylan stated that over 700 objections had already been submitted in respect of the planning application itself for the strategic development. By way of a supplementary question, Mr. Moylan asked Councillor Parsons if the Council had properly considered the case for reducing the number of houses at the strategic development site, and would such consideration be given at some point before the Local Plan was approved and/or the planning application was determined?

In reply, Councillor Parsons stated that the Council had considered and debated the strategy and potential alternative strategies, as well as a Notice of Motion put forward relating to the dispersal of development throughout the District. However, the Council had decided to continue with the strategy, which had been subject to two public consultations.

(2) Mr. D James of Cirencester, on behalf of Save Our Cirencester, to Councillor NJW Parsons, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning

'The residents of Cirencester are very worried by the harm from pollution that the huge development at Chesterton would bring. Traffic-borne air pollution is now a national and international health hazard and there are reports of 40,000 premature deaths in the UK. Traffic volumes and pollution implications have been understated in the Environmental Statement produced by Bathurst Development Limited to support their application.

We believe that the Environmental Statement has dealt inadequately with the threat of pollution hazard based on research we have undertaken and a detailed report that we have produced. This has been submitted to both the local plan consultation and the outline application public access system. Our report draws particular attention to pollution levels at the hospital and schools. The underlying criticism we have of the BDL-commissioned Environmental Statement is that it is based on outdated guidelines which ignore recent evidence and which we believe do not represent up-to-date best practice.

It would be appreciated if the Council could convene discussions about these concerns with the relevant parties, including representatives of the community. Will the Council do this?'

Response from Councillor Parsons

'The Council commissioned an external review of the Environmental Statement (ES), which flagged up that some areas in the ES, relating to air quality, required further clarification. The Council is expecting the submission of additional information next month in response to this review, and it is understood that the matters raised by Save Our Cirencester will also be addressed by the Applicant.'

Mr. James thanked the Deputy Leader for the response and, by way of a supplementary question, asked whether, as the issue had been deferred to a future date, he would be able to re-submit his original question to the Cabinet once the additional information had been received.

In response, Councillors Parsons stated that Mr. James would be able to re-submit his original question once the information had been gathered, but that it should be more properly directed to the Chairman of the Planning and Licensing Committee.

CAB.30 MEMBER QUESTIONS

No questions had been submitted by Members.

CAB.31 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements from the Leader.

CAB.32 INSURANCE SERVICES

The Leader of the Council introduced this item.

The Cabinet was requested to consider the award of insurance contracts.

The Leader explained that the outcome of the joint tendering process had generated a sum of £41,000 in savings on the previous year's contract. In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that Cheltenham Borough Council, Forest of Dean District Council and West Oxfordshire District Council had already approved the award of the insurance contract Lots. Another Member commented that it was encouraging to see further savings accruing from joint working.

On behalf of the Council, the Leader thanked Officers for their work on this project.

RESOLVED that the award of insurance contract Lots, as detailed at paragraph 3 of Exempt Appendix 'A' to the circulated report, be approved.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

CAB.33 SUBMISSION DRAFT COTSWOLD DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN - FOCUSED CHANGES

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning introduced this item, and a copy of a plan illustrating the proposed Development Boundary for Chipping Campden was circulated at the Meeting.

The Cabinet considered a report suggesting that the focussed changes to the Submission Draft Cotswold District Local Plan be subject to a six-week public consultation. In updating the circulated report, it was noted that the first paragraph under the 'Legal and Human Rights Implications' section should be amended to omit reference to the 'Focussed Change Addendum' in the first line thereof.

The Deputy Leader explained that the Focussed Change consultation was in response to issues of material change raised in respect of the Regulation 19 consultation. In response to a question posed on behalf of a Councillor who did not serve on the Cabinet, it was reported that the issue of a policy relating to the capture of waste 'grey' water could be considered as part of the Focussed Change consultation. In response to a question from a Member relating to the proposed Development Boundary for Chipping Campden, it was reported that the circulated plan was for illustrative purposes.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) a 'Focussed Changes' addendum to the Local Plan be approved for the purpose of formal public consultation, for a statutory period of six weeks in accordance with regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and thereafter for submission to the Secretary of State for examination (subject to Resolution (b) below);**
- (b) the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning be authorised to approve the 'Focussed Changes' addendum prior to the start of the public consultation;**
- (c) subject to the there being no material issues raised during the six week consultation period, the Council approves the Submission Draft Cotswold District Local Plan 'Focussed Change' addendum for formal submission to the Secretary of State in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012.**

Record of Voting - for 7, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

CAB.34

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

The Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning introduced this item.

The Cabinet considered a report detailing the Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule, and the Deputy Leader explained that, following public consultation, the Draft Charging Schedule would be subject to public examination by the Inspector as part of the Local Plan process.

It was reported that the document at Appendix 'D', which had been circulated at the Meeting, would not be subject to examination by the Inspector, as it constituted a draft document listing 'critical' projects which had been drawn up to ensure that there was no duplication of collection of contributions. In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that the document at Appendix 'D' would form part of the documents which would be subject of the proposed consultation.

In response to a question from a Member, it was reported that proposals for hotel development, which were considered to have a significant potential effect on the local infrastructure, would be addressed through the prior completion of Section 106 Legal Agreements as part of the determination of the relevant planning applications.

RESOLVED that:

(a) consultation be undertaken in respect of the “Draft Charging Schedule” (DCS) attached at Appendix ‘A’ to the circulated report and its supporting documents in accordance with the statutory requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended);

(b) the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, in consultation with the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning, be authorised to make any minor amendments needed to prepare the DCS and its supporting information for public consultation;

(c) following the DCS consultation, the Cabinet and the Council authorise the Cotswold District Council Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule to be formally submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with the statutory requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended);

(d) the draft list of projects that might not be secured through Section 106 and Section 278 Agreements (Community Infrastructure Levy: Regulation 123) be noted for inclusion in the consultation at resolution (a) above.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

CAB.35 SCHEDULE OF DECISION(S) TAKEN BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND/OR INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBERS

The Cabinet noted a Schedule detailing decisions taken by (i) the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Forward Planning, and (ii) the Cabinet Member for Environment.

CAB.36 ISSUE(S) ARISING FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY AND/OR AUDIT

There were no issues arising from Overview and Scrutiny and/or Audit.

CAB.37 OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business that was urgent.

CAB.38 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public and Press be excluded from the Meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph (3) of Part I of Schedule 12A to the said Act (Information relating to financial or business affairs), and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information concerned.

Record of Voting - for 7, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

CAB.39 INCREASED PARKING PROVISION IN CIRENCESTER

The Cabinet Members for (i) Enterprise and Partnerships and (ii) Planning Services and Cirencester Car Parking Project introduced this item.

The Cabinet considered a report detailing three potential options for achieving increased parking provision in Cirencester, and a proposal to improve the condition of The Beeches Car Park, Cirencester. Officers amplified aspects of each of the three potential options, and responded to various questions thereon.

A Member contended that the costs associated with the first potential option outweighed the number of additional parking spaces that could be achieved. In response, it was reported that Officers would explore all available options in order to provide a 'package' of parking solutions, and that Option 1 would be subject to a successful trial being concluded.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the Council enters into an agreement for the provision of a commuters' 'Park and Ride' scheme, as detailed at paragraph 6 of the circulated exempt report and, subject to a successful trial, funding from the Car Park Reserve be approved to fund 'Park and Ride' bus services;**
- (b) a partnership to invest in the provision of commuter parking, as detailed in paragraph 7 of the circulated exempt report, be further explored;**
- (c) a partnership to invest in the provision of additional car parking, as detailed in paragraph 8 of the circulated exempt report, be further explored;**
- (d) the sum detailed in paragraph 6.4 of the circulated exempt report be allocated for a traffic assessment for the 'Park and Ride' scheme to support a planning application and, subject to approval, to provide appropriate signage and short-term staffing resource during the launch of the scheme;**
- (e) the sum detailed at paragraph 7.4 of the circulated exempt report be allocated for a traffic assessment and other relevant specialist technical assessments which will be required to enable a planning application to be made in respect of the provision of commuter parking;**
- (f) the proposed improvements to the Beeches Car Park be carried out with capital funding from the existing provision for car park improvements included in the Council's approved capital programme, as detailed in the circulated exempt report.**

Record of Voting - for 7, against 0, abstentions 0, absent 0.

The Meeting commenced at 4.05 p.m. and closed at 4.50 p.m.

Chairman

(END)