

(6) PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Council Procedure Rule 10 - Not more than fifteen minutes allowed for written questions to be put by members of the public on any matter in relation to which the Council has any power or duties or which affects the District.

The following questions have been submitted:-

(1) From Mr M Pratley, Cirencester to Councillor Mark MacKenzie-Charrington, Cabinet Member for Planning Services

'I bring to your attention two of the reasons for CDC's refusal of the application for 88 dwellings on Land South of Love Lane, known as Severills Field:

1. "The proposed development would result in an isolated and incongruous residential enclave within open countryside poorly related to existing residential areas of Cirencester."
2. "the scale and massing of built form, along with the proposed access, would have an urbanising effect."

Both of these reasons would be equally applicable to the Land South of Chesterton (Chesterton Farm) application for 2350 dwellings.

I also bring to your attention that in the SHLAA Addendum 2nd December 2015 one of the reasons listed for Severills Field being "not currently developable" is the "loss of Grade 2 agricultural land." The loss of Grade 2 agricultural land is also referred to in the SHLAA appraisal of Chesterton Farm, yet this site is considered to be developable. There are further glaring inconsistencies listed, involving waste water infrastructure, electricity pylons, gas pipelines, Great Crested Newts, Tree Preservation Orders etc.

Does CDC recognise that this clearly demonstrates inconsistencies in dealing with planning issues, and therefore this in itself raises very serious concerns about competence?

(2) From Mr D James, Cirencester to Councillor Mark MacKenzie-Charrington, Cabinet Member for Planning Services

'In the Updated Transport Assessment Vol 1 for the Chesterton development dated 11th November, the traffic modelling showed that Cirencester's roads would have to take a further 1900 vehicles per working day. Whilst the model chosen for this traffic study may be questioned, what cannot be questioned is the fact that our residents will have to cope with a much decreased air quality and consequent increased respiratory illness. What plans does the Council have to enable monitoring of both existing air pollution and the increased pollution from their extra 1900 vehicles?'

(3) From Mr P Dernie, Save Our Cirencester to Councillor Mark MacKenzie-Charrington, Cabinet Member for Planning Services

'In recent correspondence with Cotswold District Council (CDC) Licensing and Planning Committee, Save Our Cirencester (SOC) requested that any updated Chesterton Development Environmental Statement (ES) be audited by ARUP prior to public submission.

The reason, of course, is that ARUP's judgement of the initial January 2016 ES was that it contained numerous significant deficiencies (approximately 58) and they stated '*overall it is considered there is a significant risk in Cotswold District Council using the environmental information provided to determine the current Chesterton application*'. This is a quite astonishing and damning verdict.

SOC currently understands the updated ES, prepared by the same consultants who prepared the initial ES, has not been re-audited by ARUP. Accordingly, there is a real risk that the updated ES remains flawed and unfit for purpose. We believe it should not be used in the decision making process until a second ARUP audit is completed.

Does CDC fully support, and has it technically approved, the contents and conclusions of the recent updates of the ES without any additional ARUP audit?

Will CDC use this un-audited updated ES in the decision making process?

Notes:

(i) The above questions were submitted by the time by responses are guaranteed to be provided to the questioner at least 24 hours before the Council Meeting (by virtue of the Council's Procedure Rules). As such, written responses will be provided to all Members either in advance of, or at, the Council Meeting.

(ii) If the questioners are present at the Meeting, they will be entitled to ask one supplementary question arising directly out of either the answer given or their original question.

(iii) The Member to whom any supplementary question is addressed will try and answer any supplementary question at the Meeting; but if this is not possible, then the Members will answer as much as possible at the Meeting and then provide a full response within five working days. If, for any reason, a full response cannot be provided within those five days, then a holding response will be sent to the questioner, along with the reason for delay and a likely timescale for the full response.

(END)