

**SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING**  
**26<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

**ADDITIONAL PAGES (1) – Update 15<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

---

**Representations**

Additional representations received between the 26<sup>th</sup> August 2017 to 15<sup>th</sup> September 2017 are summarised below.

**Objections**

Thirteen representations including one from Save Our Cirencester have been received raising matters already listed within the Council report. along with the following issues:

- An emergency plan for the high pressure gas pipeline would be imperative due to the change in status from rural to sub-urban;
- There are no employers proposed to move to the site;
- One multi-storey car park is not going to cover the shortfall in car parking spaces created by this development;
- Traffic modelling fails to take into account town centre works;
- Families who have moved to Cirencester have found the primary schools to be full and so their children have had to travel elsewhere including Wiltshire;
- A bond should be paid by the applicant to ensure that the planning obligations are delivered;
- There is no evidence to support the employment figure claim;
- Source data for traffic volumes has used a resident profile (over 50% retired) which does not represent the use and frequency of the car use of a younger and more active resident profile (SOC).

**Siddington Parish Council** objects to the application for the following reasons:

"1. Introduction. The Parish Council has read the Inspectors' reasoning behind their decisions to grant planning permission in both instances in the recent planning appeals by Great Gable in Siddington and Gladman in South Cerney. A consistent point that the applicants/appellants make (and one that is accepted by the Inspectors) is that because such a significant proportion of Cotswold District is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the District's housing need has to be substantially accommodated in the relatively small areas outside the AONB, particularly the area to the south of Cirencester. Against this background, it is clear that the parishes of Siddington, South Cerney and Preston will remain especially vulnerable to opportunistic planning applications until such time as the District's objectively assessed need is demonstrably satisfied by the planned allocation of sufficient land.

2. The Parish Council's objections are to the ill-thought through implications of the scheme for the surrounding area and the lack of proposed mitigating measures.

3. Traffic generation is the major concern. The developers have procured a Transport Study which has been subjected to detailed examination by Gloucestershire Highways' engineers apparently with the input of external consultants on certain aspects. We do not believe that this reactive method of assessing transport impact is appropriate for a scheme of this magnitude.

4. The Highways' Authority in its section headed Impact South of Site - South Cerney, Siddington & Ewen is dismissive of the fears previously expressed by those parishes as to the impact of traffic on them: "the vehicle trip generation from the proposed development is relatively low" based on the detailed estimates contained in the Technical Note Land to the South of Chesterton, Cirencester. The note records 675 dwellings and about 19,500 sqm of employment space being located on the east side of the Chesterton Farm scheme. At say 30 sqm average per employee, the employment space is likely to attract some 700 staff as well as deliveries and service vehicles. To suggest that those staff plus the residents will only generate between them, for instance, an additional 15 peak hour trips at the Ashton Road/Park Way junction, defies credulity.

5. Even if the proposed traffic light mitigation measures were to be generally effective, the scheme depends on the continuing efficacy of narrow roads. When there are, for instance, road works or unloading car transporters blocking the carriageway, drivers will be faced with the binary choice of long queues or an alternative route south through those parishes. Each parish has had experience of this and junctions such as the Ashton Road/Park Way one will become intolerable for residents.

6. The conclusions of the developer's consultants and Gloucestershire Highways may be correct and the very modest mitigation measures proposed - introducing traffic lights - may be sufficient. However, the implications for the town and the surrounding communities if the conclusions of the study prove to be unduly optimistic will be a social, environmental and economic disaster. The developers should be required to fund and support (but not influence) an independent study before planning permission is granted for the 675 houses and the employment space on the east side of the proposed scheme."

### **Corrections**

Page 47, paragraph 8.31: The % mix of 3 bed dwellings should read **20%** not 25%.

### **Members Questions**

Councillor Dilys Neill (Stow): Have the local churches expressed an opinion? Is there facility for a place of worship, Christian or otherwise in the development?

*None of the local church groups submitted a representation to the application. There is no statutory requirement to provide a place of worship although the application will include the provision of a multi-purpose community meeting space. Equally, there is nothing to prevent any subsequent reserved matters applications including the provision of a place of worship.*