

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
26th September 2017

ADDITIONAL PAGES (2) – Update 20th September 2017

Representations

Additional representations received between the 15th September and the 20th September are summarised below. The representations can be viewed in full on the Council's Online Planning Register.

Objections

Eight representations including two from Save Our Cirencester have been received raising matters already listed within the Council report, along with the following issues:

- No assurances that the construction traffic would be prohibited from using Somerford Road and Cranhams Lane;
- Reducing the speed limit would probably improve traffic flow but not necessarily reduce journey time;
- Predicted journey times do not take into account proposed traffic lights;
- No planned mitigation at the A419/A429 roundabout where the current access to Deer Park causes tailbacks and the addition of a toucan crossing will add to the problem;
- The only modification required for the Chesterton Lane/A419 junction is to allow traffic heading for Tetbury to exit in a left turn-the pedestrian crossing will cause additional delays;
- Pedestrian crossing at the hospital roundabout not required as there is a footbridge;
- Pedestrian crossing at the Fire Station roundabout not required as there is a subway;
- Footbridge already serves pedestrians at the Kingsmeadow roundabout;
- All traffic lights should be at peak times-during the rest of the time traffic should be allowed to find its own flow;
- There is scope to remove toucan crossings because safe crossing points (subways and footbridge) already existing;
- The resulting stop/start environment will create higher pollution;
- There are no significant mitigation measures for Midland Road/Bridge Road/Love Lane-traffic will still be congested about the industrial estate;

- Most other “mitigation measures” consist of dropping kerbs, tactile paving and other little uses paths will be widened or a cycle element added.

A representation from SOC to the Councillors and also submitted as a representation to the OPA is attached as Appendix 1

Promotional Material Circulated to Councillors by the Applicant, attached as Appendix 2.

Corrections/Amendments to the Report

Page 11, Para 4.8 should read “This is what is known as the tilted balance test”.

Page 18, Para 46.3-the policy require is up to 40% affordable housing subject to viability.

Page 44, Para 8.13. For clarity, the Council’s 5YHLS figure for 2017 has not yet been resolved and the Council is proceeding on the basis of the 2016 position, i.e a 7.54 year supply of deliverable housing.

Page 87, Para. 13.17, end of paragraph changed to “...would have an impact upon the setting of these designated heritage assets, which could never be fully mitigated, and this is considered to result in harm *to the significance of those assets*, although this harm would be less than substantial.”

Page 88, Para. 13.23, end of paragraph changed to “Officers consider that the remaining agricultural land surrounding *The Cranhams, on the application site*, particularly to the principal south elevation, forms an important part *of the significance of the listed building*.”

Page 88, Para. 13.24, end of paragraph changed to “The general experience of the rural setting would be considerably changed and Officers consider that *there would be harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, albeit less than substantial harm*.”

Page 89, Para. 13.30, reference at end of paragraph to ‘less than substantial’ omitted and paragraph amended to “*Officers consider that the loss of these buildings would result in harm to the heritage assets. However, these assets are considered to be of lower significance*”.

Page 95, Para.13.74, reference at end of paragraph to ‘*less than substantial*’...omitted.

Page 95, para. 13.75 third line should read “A balanced judgment has been made regarding this less than substantial harm *to the significance* of the heritage assets and their setting...”

Page 94, new para between 13.73 and 13.74 “The proposed development would cause some harm to the setting of the listed buildings identified above albeit the harm is considered to be less than substantial. In accordance with Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the High Court and Court of Appeal have recently made it clear (in the 2013 High Court and 2014 Court of Appeal judgments in the Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd vs. East Northamptonshire District Council case) that decision-makers are obliged to give “considerable importance and weight” to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings and conservation areas when undertaking the balancing exercise inherent in planning decision-making. However, and for the reasons set out in paragraphs 13.66, 13.68, 13.69 above, it is considered that the public benefits of the

scheme outweighs the harm to the setting of these listed buildings even when “considerable importance and weight” is attached to that harm”.

Questions from Councillors

Cllr Dilys Neill (Stow)

The size of the school and the pre-school provision suggests that you are expecting 90 children in each year group. However, the provision of secondary school places is only estimated at 264 (para10.33) which even allowing for the fact that some young people will leave school at 16 suggests that there will be less than 50 residents per year in the 11 - 18 age group. Is this difference likely?

GCC: The primary school size will be a 3FE (630 place) school which means that the school has capacity for 90 per year group. The development itself is expected to create the need for around 510-570 additional primary school places, based on GCC evidence from schemes within GCC and within neighbouring authorities. It will, in fact, result in a higher number of primary school-aged children, but the formulae allow for a proportion of these to be schooled elsewhere, at home etc. The average number of primary aged children per 100 dwellings is 30 in total (see publication attached table 5.1).

The legal agreement will require the provision of an on-site primary school built to an agreed GCC specification. This will be slightly over-size relative to the impact of the development, but there needs to be some headroom to allow for changes over time, and it is not practical to build part of a school. The school will be opened in phases aligned to the growth of the development which allows it to accommodate the growth at the development rather than to attract pupils from further afield.

At secondary level, again the total number of secondary school-aged children will be greater than the 264 **places** which will be required for 11-15. The average number of 11-15 year olds per 100 dwellings is 16.5 in total (see table 5.1).

At secondary age, however, there is a greater tendency to keep a pupil in a school, even if this means travelling further to their school. The evidence suggests that there is some surplus capacity within secondary sector. Not all of this capacity should be allocated to the scheme – we know of some developments happening which will complete in coming years for which there will be a need for secondary school places.

From an education perspective, the impact over time will be different to the impact of the development on initial occupation. Evidence suggests that on initial occupation there tends to be a higher number of pre-school or primary school-aged children. As families' children reach secondary school-age, there is a decreased tendency to move or relocate. Hence the relatively high primary impact does not translate into such a high impact on the secondary sector.

What is the expected demographic of the residents of the proposed Chesterton development? Do you know how many people there will be in total & how many in each age group? The size of the primary school suggests that you are anticipating that there will be about 90 children in each year group, which would mean 16 - 1700 in the 0 -18 age group. In addition, I understand there will be provision for students. Does this mean that you are expecting that the age profile of the Chesterton residents is likely to be younger than the national average?

According to statistics produced by the Office of National Statistics, in mid-2016, the median age for the population for the UK was 40, for England 39.8, Gloucestershire 44 and for Cotswold it was 48.5. The median age for the District is expected to increase further over the period of the emerging Local Plan.

Officers do not have information on the expected demographic of the population of the proposed development at Chesterton and it cannot be confirmed that the age profile would be younger than the national average. However, Cirencester currently has a slightly younger age profile than the District (Role and Function of Settlements Study 2012) which is to be expected given that it is the largest settlement in the District and has a range of service and facilities and employment opportunities.

The intention is to create a mixed community within a mixed use development and the provision of open and affordable housing to meet a range of needs will contribute significantly towards this. The indicative mix of dwelling types, which has been used to inform the parameter plans, includes a large proportion of smaller and family sized homes which will be attractive for younger people and those with families (this is covered in the report).

You kindly told me that you thought that the age distribution of residents will probably be near the national average. Looking at the office for national statistics database it seems that 19% of the population are in the 0-15 age group. If we are expecting 90 x 15 children in this age group that will be 1,350 children in this age group, which would suggest that there would be 7,000 residents in total.

GCC: I am not expecting 90 children in each of the age groups from ages 0-15. As above, there may be around 80 per year group in the primary (0-10) range, and an average of around 60 per year group in the secondary sector (11-15). This is an estimate and will vary by age.

I would say that the distribution of residents' age will probably be near the national or district average, especially over time. However, partly because of the way that new homes are marketed and sold, you will find that there is a disproportionately high number of families with younger children buying the properties initially (things like new kitchens, bathrooms etc can be rolled into the mortgage). There is no way of forecasting this exactly, but for school planning purposes we use GCC child yields and pupil yields which are based on studies of housing developments, and on averages. These yields are reviewed regularly.

I was surprised that the Gloucestershire Care Commissioning group has said that only three GPs would be needed to service the whole of the development so that a stand-alone health centre would not be viable.

The requirement for 3 GPs came from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which is part of the evidence base supporting the Local Plan. The CCG advised that there is no national figure for the number of GPs per head of population and that typically; across the UK there is a range of around 1,500 to 2,000 patients per GP. But it also needs to be remembered that GP practices can also use advance nurse practitioners and pharmacists to treat patients.

Based on the information about affordable housing given in chapter 8 I calculated that there would be up to 3,000 residents occupying affordable housing. Even allowing for the fact that there will be smaller households, including single person households in the rest of the development it seems unlikely that the 30% of the development which is affordable housing would accommodate well over half the total population. Do you know roughly how many people you expect will live in the development?

The Design and Access Statement refer to an estimated population of 5,376 which has been calculated on the basis of 2.4 residents per dwelling and 2.0 per dwelling for older people (5,256+120).

A more detailed calculation based provides a range of 4,816 to 6,509. This has been calculated using the minimum and maximum eligible occupancy of the rented and low cost home ownership; 1,195 and 2,888 respectively. Open market (omitting student, older and using District average of 2.29) $1485 \times 2.29 = 3,401$. Older People: $60 \times 2 = 120$. Student: $100 \times 1 = 100$.

Councillor Ray Brassington (Four Acres)

Will any bungalows be built? (para 1.2)

Bungalows could be included within the future Reserved Matters application and house types will be discussed within the Design Codes.

Will the residential units be built to current building regulation standards or better in terms of environmental performance e.g. solar panels, ground source heat pumps, higher thermal insulation? (4.13).

In recent years, there has been a shift away from planning requirements for sustainable buildings and instead there are national technical standards for new dwellings are contained within Building Regulations (Part L). It will become the sole tool to control energy efficiency in new homes and therefore it is not appropriate to apply conditions or seek controls through legal agreements.

How will the development enhance the natural environment? (para 4.15)

There are a range of enhancements proposed. For example page 110, para 17.12 enhanced planting at the southern boundary for bats, page 111, para 17.18 enhancement to hedgerows for dormice and structural planting.

Why is there no provision for local shops and services? (para 7.50)

There is provision within the Neighbourhood Centre, see page 51 para 9.3 and page 53 para 9.19 and the Heads of Terms.

Can there be a section 106 to achieve higher environmental standards? (para 7.58).

See the answer above re para 4.13

Should say that National Grid does not prescribe minimum distances and that each instance must be dealt with on its merits. The guidelines in a Sense of Place do not replace guidelines in their existing document "Development Near lines". What is EMMF should this read EMF? (para 20.18).

National Grid publications, including the Sense of Place and Development Near Overhead Lines can be found at the following link:

<http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Services/Land-and-Development/Publications/>

Extract from Development Near Lines: "It has sometimes been suggested that minimum distances between properties and overhead lines should be prescribed. National Grid does

not consider this appropriate since each instance must be dealt with on its merits. However, it has always sought to route new lines away from residential property on grounds of general amenity. Since the only limitation on new development has been the statutory safety clearances ... a large amount of residential and other development has been carried out subsequently beneath and adjacent to overhead lines”.

The EMMF is the Ecological Management and Mitigation Framework-please see page 109, para 17.4 and appendix 34 for the proposed wildlife zone beneath the power lines.

The presence of overhead power lines has controlled residential development in Cirencester recently so why not now? (para 20.21)

The Land Use Parameter Plan has been informed by the location of the overhead power lines. Dwellings are not proposed underneath them.