

SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING
26th September 2017

ADDITIONAL PAGES (3) - Update 22nd September 2017

Representations

Additional representations received between the 20th September and the 22nd September are summarised below. The representations can be viewed in full on the Council's Online Planning Register.

Objections

Three representations have been received raising matters already listed within the Council report, along with the following issues:

Amendments/Corrections/Updates to the Report

Page 61, paragraph 10.40. The Gloucestershire Police Service has confirmed that they will accept the counter offer proposed by CDC if Members do not accept their initial request (as set out in paragraph 10.38).

Page 111, paragraph 17.15: the Fourth sentence should read: The bat box proposed within the EMMF for lesser horseshoe bats is not considered to be appropriate for this particular species and a condition is required for the submission of details of a replacement lesser horseshoe bat night roost structure at a suitable location.

Page 112, paragraph 17.19: Second sentence should read: "..... and this would be secured through conditions for monitoring to be delivered as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the Landscape, Ecology and Arboricultural Management Plan (LEAMP)".

Page 112-113, paragraph 17.26: Last sentence should read: "The management of the Scheduled Ancient Monument for breeding skylarks will be delivered as part of the requirements of the S106 agreement".

Page 113, paragraph 17.29: should read "A detailed reptile mitigation strategy for the highway works at the Tetbury Road will be required as part of the Ecological Construction Method Statement (ECMS) and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) condition".

Page 113, paragraph 17.30: second sentence should read "However, Officers consider that there are further opportunities to retain and create new badger setts within the south-eastern part of the site and this can be incorporated within the LEAMP. Each phase/sub-phase or REM application has to demonstrate compliance with the principles of the EMMF and this includes badger mitigation."

Page 123, paragraph 19.17. The second sentence should read "However, this is not unresolvable..."

Appendix 1: Further consideration has been given by Officers to the Chapter 23: Conclusions, having taken further legal advice. The amendments primarily relate to the issues of prematurity and consideration of alternatives. The amendments do not change the conclusions reached in the Report but provide some further clarity in respect of the approach to the consideration of both of those issues. Paragraph (iv) of the Officer recommendation has been amended and widened to include reference to any new material issues that may arise following a resolution of Full Council to approve the OPA, and this amendment reflects the correct approach in law. This amendment is also applicable to **paragraph 1.1 and recommendation a)** set out on page 1 of the Agenda papers.

Appendix 2 For completeness, the DVS's report concerning a development viability, which is referred to at para.8.29 and 21.3, and explained in Chapter 21: Viability, of the report, is been made available as part of these additional pages.

Appendix 3 Heads of Terms revised to include reasons for obligations and an additional obligation within table 15 regarding the on-going notification to the Council of the progress of the development. A correction has been made to box 1.2. No other changes in terms of the obligations sought have been made.

Appendix 4 Amended version of Council Report Appendix 38 with amended key.

Councillor Questions

Councillor Ray Brassington (Four Acres)

1 *What are the housing densities for development near to the site including the Maples, Morestall Drive? (Paragraph 7.4).*

The Maples is 22.5 dwellings per hectare, Morestall Drive is 24.2 dph, Haygarth Close, 54.2 dph.

2 *How has the job creation figure of 1600 jobs been calculated, where will the workforce come from, how many vehicle movements will this create. What is the unemployment rate in percentage and actual figures for Cirencester. The glossy brochure recently sent to councillors by the applicant says 1800 jobs which is correct? (Paragraph 9.14).*

The Officer report has referred to a figure contained within the Environmental Statement (paragraphs 15.6.5 and 6). The average number of jobs to be created by the development has been based upon standard employment densities and shift working patterns using guidance and information contained within the *Employment Densities Guide 3rd Edition* (Homes and Communities Agency 2015) and *Cotswold Economic Study Part 2 Vol 1* October 2012. The information published by the HCA is based on multiple sources with a range of densities and the guide includes a range of jobs per m² by use type – the floorspace needed for B1a office type employment is quite different from say employment in B1a light industry. The figure of 1600 is therefore an indicative figure as it will depend upon the specific type of businesses that will occupy the site.

The figure of 1800 jobs contained within the promotional leaflet sent to the Members by the Applicant, includes jobs created within the neighbourhood centre and the primary school.

ONS Nomis Data for Cirencester (Beeches, Chesterton, Park, Stratton-Whiteway and Watermoor) suggests 72 people claim Job Seekers Allowance at August 2017 – a rate of 0.6%. Estimates from the Annual Population Survey for Cotswold District report a total of 1,200 people unemployed (2.6%).

The employment land is forecast to generate 516 vehicle movements in the AM peak hour and 500 vehicle movements in the PM peak hour on the external highway network.

3 *How many cars will the development produce? (Paragraph 11.27).*

The entire development is forecast to generate 1902 vehicle movements in the AM peak hour and 1876 vehicle movements in the PM peak hour on the external highway network. The vast majority of these trips will be cars.

4 *Please confirm that the figures used are 2013 existing trips plus background growth? (Paragraph 11.31).*

All the scenarios are derived from 2013 observed traffic flows and growth is applied as appropriate (background growth and committed growth).

5 *It is misleading to state that the 88 houses, which will generate about 150 extra cars, have been excluded. This is important when considering additional traffic going to use Somerford Rd to get into town, already a bottle neck at peak times? (Paragraph 11.33).*

The Land South of Love Lane is forecast to generate 70 vehicle movements in the AM peak hour and 61 vehicle movements in the PM peak hour. Not all of the vehicles will use Somerford Road. General background traffic growth provides an allowance for recently consented development.

6 *Please state why the scenarios for 2031 are not considered? (Paragraph 11.36).*

The 2031 level of road traffic must be considered? (Paragraph 11.49).

The applicant is only required to mitigate their impact for the year of opening. 2031 is included in the Transport Assessment for information only and is therefore excluded from this summary for simplicity.

7 *I consider a subway safer than a toucan crossing on such a busy road. Also a crossing will further delay traffic on what will be a road of many hold ups with 3 roundabouts in a short distance. Please explain the rationale behind the thinking? (Paragraph 11.63).*

Current best practice is to cross at grade rather than use subways as there are personal safety issues and difficulties for disabled users. Whilst there are risks with toucan crossings, this has to be balanced with the risks associated with subways. The timings of the toucan crossings will be co-ordinated with the traffic lights to minimise delay to traffic. The roundabouts are all existing and already delay traffic. Providing additional lanes and traffic lights is the most effective way to mitigate the development impact at the roundabouts.

8 *Where has such "Travel Planning" been demonstrated to produce modal shifts? (Paragraph 11.84).*

The DfT has undertaken research to demonstrate the effectiveness of Travel planning.

Mode shift has been demonstrated in the research reports below.

11% reduction in car trips across six residential sites:

http://www.steerdaviesgleave.com/sites/default/files/elfinder/Newsinsights/LSFT%20Projects%2005092014_FINALsml.pdf

12% reduction in single occupancy car use:

http://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/media/2232/13_-_pd6_-_thinktravel-66801.pdf

9 *In paragraph 11.89 The summary dismisses queues on arms of junctions but its conclusions in 11.92 does, is this logical?*

11.89 and 11.92 provide a summary of queue lengths for simplicity. The summary considers the average queue per arm at junctions to provide context. Full queue length details are provided in the Transport Assessment.

10 *Table 5-1 shows various scenarios, looking at A419/429 Ring Rd/Chesterton Lane shows an increase of, according to my calculations, 25400% so how can they say impact is not severe; looking at averages hides the peaks and is misleading*

The percentage impact is high due to the existing queue length being very small. The impact has been mitigated and the absolute queue lengths are not severe.

11 *Table 5-2 shows an increase of 113% for the ring road westbound AM peak*

Whilst there is an increase in the AM westbound journey time, overall there is a journey time reduction.

12 *11.100 How can the figures in Table 5-3 show mitigation when the data is analysed giving significant increases in 2021 let alone 2031, for example a 85% increase for Love Lane Wilkinson Rd to ring road southbound PM peak? (Paragraph 11.100).*

The increased journey times in 2021 Do Minimum are a result of committed development. The applicant is only required to mitigate severe impact as a result of the development impact in 2021 ('2021 With Development and Mitigation' compared with '2021 Do Minimum'). Overall there is a reduction in journey time between '2021 Do Minimum' and '2021 With Development and Mitigation'.

13 *Given the percentage increase in those tables how can they conclude "that theimpacts..... are not severe"? (Paragraph 11.111)*

As above.

14 *The air quality assessment says air pollution will not exceed national objectives, what levels of all pollutants will there be for both 2021 and 2031. Will it be as high as 93% for nitrogen dioxide as stated by some? (Paragraph 12.13).*

Response from the ERS Officer: The national objective for nitrogen dioxide is an annual average of 40 ug^m-3.

Local authorities are required to designate AQMAs where this level is found or where it is at risk of being exceeded.

At busy roadsides all around the country, annual average nitrogen dioxide levels between 30 – 39 ug^m-3 can be found. (AQMA's are occasionally designated in areas where levels of 37ug^m-3 or above are found, even though the measured level has not exceeded the national objective of 40 ug m⁻³.)

The national objective level has been set to protect the health of residents and local authorities are not expected to designate an AQMA where no residents live or where residential properties are set back from the road as nitrogen dioxide levels are known to decrease as you move away from the road.

There are hundreds of these “hotspots” of nitrogen dioxide, designated as AQMA's, all around the country.

Highways Departments consider whether there are any appropriate measures that can be implemented to reduce nitrogen dioxide levels at these points. The excessive pollution can be due to sheer quantity of traffic, presence of high buildings close to the road and/or the road layout causing poor flow and thus build-up of exhaust emissions from idling vehicles, for example. Often there are factors such as health and safety of pedestrians that have to be accounted for when the Highways department consider available options.

Using a national model and results from the national roadside air pollution monitoring network, government has identified the top 12 worst areas in the country for air pollution from traffic. They are requiring local authorities in these identified areas to develop “Clean Air Zones”, which are anticipated to take at least a couple of years to implement. The local authorities will then potentially impose charges upon specific categories of vehicles entering the “Clean Air Zones”, unless they are using clean technology. This is in an effort to promote the use of clean technology in polluted areas.

Neither of our AQMA hotspots have fallen into the category identified by government as requiring implementation of a Clean Air Zone. For areas with AQMA hotspots such as ours, government is anticipating that fleet replacement with newer vehicles that meet stricter emission standards will improve nitrogen dioxide levels so that they meet the national objective.

According to Table 3 in the report, the places where levels of nitrogen dioxide in the high 30s have been predicted for 2021 are at busy roadsides, where levels are already in the high 30s. Indeed the predicted levels are up to 94% of the objective at Tetbury Road and 93% on the A429. No residents are affected at these roadside locations so there is no requirement for the local authority to measure the levels or to designate an AQMA. Assuming the government “national fleet replacement” predictions (referred to in the paragraph above) are correct, we would anticipate these levels would be reduced by 2031.

We will continue to monitor levels at busy roadsides where we do have residents living.

15 *What is the "substantial impact" on human health at the Air Balloon at Birdlip? (paragraph 12.16).*

ERS Response: The term "substantial impact" in this report is technical jargon taken from the screening tool, where it is used specifically to categorise **the impact of the increased traffic upon nitrogen dioxide levels.**(It is not used to describe the effect of the change in traffic emissions on human health.)

The predicted increase in the nitrogen dioxide level at the Air Balloon lies within the screening tool category described as "substantial impact". If the same increase had been noted in an area that was not an AQMA, the impact would have been described as negligible. Within an AQMA, the screening tool takes into account the excess above the national objective level and an increase of 2% above the 40 ug_m-3 is described as "substantial impact".

The Air Balloon roundabout is a pollution hotspot within the district, due to emissions from the traffic using the trunk roads that meet at the roundabout which are exacerbated by the steep incline up to the roundabout from the Gloucester direction. We have designated it as an AQMA, recognising that it is an area of concern and could potentially have an adverse effect on the health of residents living there.

As this "substantial impact" on nitrogen dioxide levels is within an area that is designated as an AQMA it has already been acknowledged that this is an area of concern to the health of residents here. The residents here are aware of the situation in the vicinity of their home.

16 *Why are new houses being proposed next to industrial buildings off Somerford Road. What Use Class do these units have and what environmental conditions on imposed on them. Has ERS commented on this aspect if so what did they say if not why not? (paragraph 12.19).*

The Applicant's noise assessment contained within the ES has assessed and duly considered noise emissions from the Industrial estate and concluded that subject to final layout mitigation *would* be required. Is stated in paragraph 14.6.26 that: *"Therefore, subject to the final layout of dwellings on land to the west of the industrial estate, additional noise mitigation measures would be required such as additional noise screening along the site boundary, a buffer zone, and appropriate facade insulation with acoustic ventilation"*.

As layout of the buildings is not known at this stage, it is appropriate to apply conditions at the Reserved Matters stage.

17 *If the situation of insufficient capacity to meet demand for a water supply is " not resolvable" how can the development proceed? (paragraph 19.17). (Also asked by Councillor Berry).*

The paragraph should state "...this is not unresolvable".

Thames Water response: "We would need to work with the developer to identify all the needs for the development of this scale. Essentially, we would need a study to help understand

- The local water supply infrastructure
- The more strategic requirements of the wider network
- The overall demand that would be required by the development

- The phasing of how the development would be delivered

Like with the waste drainage strategy it would have to cover the what, where, when, who. We would expect the information on what likely upgrades are required to be contained within the report.

Obviously some of this is outside of the developers remit and sits with Thames Water, but it all needs to be pulled together into one overarching strategy”.

18 *Appendix 38 not easy to distinguish colours and hence difficult to interpret.*

Noted. Amended plan with revised key attached.

Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington (The Rissingtons)

1 *Education: I see that the proposals are for a new primary school with a capacity of 630 pupils and 142 nursery school places which are to be spread across the site. With my experience at Upper Rissington on the Victory Fields site it is clear that the GCC Education Department has demonstrably underestimated the number of pupils wishing to take places in both categories. The development comprises circa 350 new homes of 2, 3 & 4 beds and the school which was first built with 6 out of the 9 consented classrooms was full within 2 years of opening. One of the three additional classrooms is being built as we speak to accommodate a role of 217 students. Staff have had to give up their rest room so as to accommodate the numbers. Based upon these figures I'd say that Chesterton needs a school with an eventual capacity that is nearly double what is being proposed. Turning to the nursery provision of 142 pupils if the same rationale is used I calculate that up to 235 places will need ultimately to be provided. The nursery provision at Upper Rissington has had to be closed down owing to the pressure from the primary school needing all the available space. While funding is now in place for a new nursery building it won't be ready till the autumn of next year meaning that families with both partners working are struggling to know what to do with their young children if they are meant to be at work.*

My question based on this background is to ask whether we can be confident that the estimates are quantifiable and that we can be assured that there won't be a crisis in say 10 years' time by which the project will be in its final stages with much of the new housing being occupied?

GCC Response:

“Primary School Size: The child yield and pupil yield are based on evidence from recent GCC studies, and benchmarking/comparison with other authorities. Of course the yields are kept under review but GCC is confident that the primary school requirement arising from the occupation of the development is in the order of 3 forms of entry (630 places). It is not possible to require over-provision of a school site or size because this would be unlawful and potentially open to challenge. The requirement needs to address the impact of the development which itself is estimated at 510-570 primary aged school children.

The school will be opened in phases to ensure that it caters for the children moving into the development. There is a small level of surplus nearby which will relieve pressure in the very early phases of development. Phasing and take-up of places will be monitored, and in the event that there is forecast shortfall of pupil numbers against the level of provision, GCC will need to plan for further provision elsewhere, or expansion of existing schools which would become apparent in the early phases of development.

Where new schools (primary or secondary) are opened too soon within a development, or are simply too large, experience elsewhere shows that it leads to problems which can take years to correct. For example, the viability of a primary school can depend on admitting pupils from further afield, which can result in local children missing out on places in later years, as the earlier admitted children may have siblings. Additionally, a new school may spark interest from further afield, diverting children from their nearest school, placing a strain on those existing schools. All of this needs to be monitored carefully over time to get the best outcome for the development; I would expect an education monitoring/review group which comprises GCC, CDC and the applicant to keep all of this under scrutiny.

For reference: As an approximate rule of thumb, and taking account of a mix of tenures and types GCC expects a 1FE school to be provided in developments of ~700 dwellings. Some comparisons for a primary school being double what is proposed here: NE Leicester Sustainable Urban extension (4500 homes) is providing 2 primary schools and between 5 and 6 forms of entry. NW Cheltenham (~4200 dwellings) also will provide between 5 and 6 FE of primary provision.

Nursery/Pre-school: It is now a requirement that where a primary school is required to be provided 'in-kind' it will have a nursery/pre-school attached, as part of that school. This is the case for the 3FE on-site primary school, but there will still be a requirement for additional places to be provided elsewhere, for which a financial contribution is sought. A 78 place nursery/pre-school should be provided as part of the 3FE primary school; a 78 place nursery/pre-school will of course be able to offer service to a greater number of children depending on their attendance requirements. The total requirement is for 142 places, so the financial contribution will cover the remaining 64 places. These will be provided elsewhere through expansion or new provision.

As with the primary yields, GCC uses evidence-based and regularly reviewed yields and is confident that the requirement is both justifiable and does not extend into over-provision bearing in mind the legal requirements for securing planning obligations. At nursery/pre-school age a greater number of children will arise, but the distribution of their care is different. Some parents may choose to use child-minders or home-care arrangements, whilst others may seek nursery provision close to work rather than their home. I am familiar now with the issues at Upper-Rissington and the experience there will help with reviewing at pre-school yields to become more sophisticated in the future (e.g. the context of the location should be factored in). The requirement at Chesterton Farm development is based on the most up-to-date evidence and represents the requirement expected to need places from this development. As with primary school provision, take-up rates can be monitored and reviewed, with appropriate action taken in time to ensure that provision continues to meet the need in the future".

2 Recommendation(s) (a)(iii) I am not happy that the proposal to give delegated powers to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman along with the Head of Planning & Strategic Housing is correct. Owing to the sensitivity and scale of this project I strongly feel that a broader based committee is established bringing in the expertise of Members who collectively make these decisions. Has any consideration been made of this or is this merely a procedural statement with flexibility behind the scene?

The proposed conditions are set out within Appendix 39. Officers are not seeking delegated authority to significantly change these conditions or to change the overarching purpose/requirements of them. However, Officers are seeking delegated authority to refine the wording of some conditions to reflect the phasing of the development.

3 *New Homes Bonus: How will the significant NHB be spent – on facilities in Cirencester or spread to the wider Cotswolds?*

The New Homes Bonus will not be ringfenced to Cirencester.

4 *Balanced Community: Are there proposals to attempt to create a truly balanced community with genuinely low cost housing ranging through to market housing so as not to create a ghetto of high value homes that are out of reach of the average person but all of a similar quality in design and materials? A real attempt at this will help remove much of the prejudice.*

Officers always seek to ensure that development is “tenure blind” and this would be the case with any future reserved matters applications. In addition, development at this site would be guided by a design code, which would be applicable to both open market and affordable housing.

5 *Highways: Has there been any attempt to look at providing a new link road from the A419 (up-grading the existing J11 route to the south of Siddington and skirting the site, joining the A429 Stroud Road at say the junction with A433 which is an accident black spot? The point here is that the Chesterton development will bring significant additional traffic onto the already busy ring road, particularly so if the internal spine road is not a through road. A link road will divert a considerable amount of traffic away from the town, much possibly being heavy goods, wishing to go in the direction of Tetbury and Stroud. Additionally residents of the two halves of the site can then drive between the two without going onto the current ring road causing further congestion.*

A new link road between the A419 and A429 has not been proposed by the applicant and it has been demonstrated that it is not necessary to mitigate the impact of the proposed development. The junction of the A433 with the A429 is not considered to be an accident black spot as in the three year study period there were only 4 personal injury accidents, 3 of which resulted in slight injuries and 1 which resulted in a serious injury.

6 *Pollution: Do the estimates of hazardous nitrogen dioxide caused by vehicles take into account the government's recent announcement that within 20 years the UK will no longer be manufacturing fossil fuel vehicles, thus significantly reducing the output?*

Response from ERS: The developer's air pollution modelling work used the emission figures provided by Defra prior to this announcement. It was already anticipated that as the nation's fleet of vehicles is replaced (old for new) emissions will improve, as new vehicles will meet the stricter Euro VI standards; so this is accounted for in Defra's figures that the developer used.

In due course I would expect Defra to update their guidance and associated screening tools, to reflect the anticipated impact of any new plans.

Prior to publishing guidance related to any decision, Defra usually follow procedures such as carrying out and consulting upon:

- a cost benefit analysis
- social and economic impact assessments
- evidence regarding the environmental impact

This ensures its incorporation into policy is robustly supported. Once the policy decision has been made, then technical guidance is drafted to implement the policy.

7 Health & Wellbeing: Will there be outdoor areas for adults provided with static exercise equipment, in addition to the children's play areas? Why are there no full size football pitches, basketball courts etc?

The Parameter Plans do not show indicative locations for static exercise equipment but there certainly is the potential to include this and a "trim trail" within the development which would be covered at the Reserved Matters stages.

The provision of sports pitches at the site was informed by the Council's evidence base produced to support the emerging Local Plan (i.e the Play and Pitch Strategy). The development does generate a need for full sized football pitch but it is recognised by Officers, and advised by Sport England, that it such requirements should be located at existing facilities where the necessary infrastructure is already in place. The FA has recently approved funding for a 3G football pitch at Cirencester Town FC which will meet the need generated by the OPA development. The proposed obligation includes provision towards the maintenance of this facility.

8 Travellers: Will land be set aside specifically for travellers either within or adjacent to the development site?

There is no provision for traveller pitches within the OPA.

Councillor Hancock (Northleach)

1 The development does not provide a through way for private vehicles, said to be for reasons attaching to the ancient monument. As presently proposed, the development seems to split a new community in two. If somebody on one side of the community wishes to drive to visit somebody on the other side, what route options do they have, and what additional journey time and distance is involved?

If a resident did not want to walk, cycle or catch a bus to travel to the other side of the site, the route options would be:

- Somerford Road/Chesterton Lane/Tetbury Road which is 2.6km (1.6miles) and take approximately 5 minutes.
- Wilkinson Road/Love lane/Midland Road/Ring Road/Tetbury Road which is 3.7km (2.3miles) and take approximately 5 minutes.

2 *The additional road width required would be 2.75m over a fairly short distance. How is it the case that this small additional width cannot be accommodated either with appropriate engineering or a minor route variation? What are the technical issues beyond the conclusion that this would result in harm"? What is the physical nature of the "harm" that would result from such widening? Alternatively, could the site not accommodate movements between the two sections by use of a weight limit and or one-way traffic calming arrangement given that it is clearly suitable for bus movements?*

The bus link is proposed to the north of the of the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) and to the south of The Cranhams, a Grade 2 listed building. A through road may require different engineering options which would require a new application for SAM Consent.

Any additional engineering/infrastructure requirements that may be required would have to be assessed in terms of their impact upon the setting of the SAM and the listed building, as would the impact on additional vehicular movements.

There are also implications associated with a through road for the highways network to the east of the site.

The proposed bus link would be 4.0m with 1.0m verge and 1 x 3m shared cycle footway.

A through road would require a carriageway with a minimum of 6.5m with 3.0m shared footway/cycleways either side.

Councillor Berry (Kemble)

1 *The report mentions 'other strategic sites considered' but doesn't anywhere mention specifics?*

The Sustainability Appraisal in the early days of the Local Plan looked at four sites:

- Harebushes (NE of Cirencester)
- Land East of Kingshill (E of Cirencester)
- Land at Chesterton (S of Cirencester)
- Land at Worm's Farm, beyond Dobbies Garden Centre (SE of Cirencester)

Councillor Robin Hughes (Sandywell)

1 *I wonder if it might be possible to give me a very brief overview, please, of how you see the phased development coupling with the highway improvements with timescale of housing numbers and road improvements completed at each stage, please?*

In respect of your question, the highways conditions for the delivery of the new accesses and mitigation works have various trigger points. Based upon the indicative phasing plan which shows development starting in the east (Somerset Road/Wilkinson Road/Spratsgate Lane), they are likely to be delivered in the following order:

Access:

1. Somerford Road/Wilkinson Road access (to separate parcel) (estimated year 2019);
2. Spratsgate Lane Roundabout –prior to the occupation/use of dwellings and/or employment land accessed from Spratsgate Lane (2019/20);
3. Tetbury Road Roundabout (main access) dual carriageway - prior to the occupation/use of dwellings and/or employment land accessed from Tetbury Road (2022-2024);
4. Tetbury Road Roundabout (smaller roundabout to SW)- prior to the occupation/use of dwellings to be accessed from that roundabout (2028/29).

Off Site Highways works:

1. Cherry Tree Junction-Before the site in bought into use (2019);
2. Somerford Road/Chesterton Lane Junction – Prior to the occupation of dwellings accessed from Spratsgate Lane and/or Somerford Road/Wilkinson Road (i.e the separate parcel to the south of the allotments) (2019);
3. A419/A429 Kingsmeadow 200 dwellings (2021/22);
4. A419/A429 Midland Road/Watermoor (Fire Station Roundabout)/Love Lane-99 trip rate generation envelope equivalent to dwellings E and 200 dwellings W (2021/22);
5. A429/A419 Tetbury /Stroud Roads (RAU) 400E &499 W (2022/23);
6. A419/A429 Hammond Way (Hospital) -650 W or 1000 E&W (2025/26);