

**SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING**  
**12<sup>th</sup> December 2017**

**ADDITIONAL PAGES (2) – Update 6th December 2017**

---

**Representations**

Additional representations received between the 1<sup>st</sup> and morning of 6<sup>th</sup> December 2017 are summarised below. The representations can be viewed in full on the Council's Online Planning Register.

**Objections**

Twenty-one representations, including one from Save Our Cirencester and one from the Park Community Group have been received raising matters already listed within the Council report and the previous set of Additional Pages, along with the following:

- Relocation of the bus gate will only assist a few residents;
- The bus gate would still result in two separate developments;
- The road system is effectively two giant cul de sacs;
- Confusion and irritation for delivery drivers and visitors;
- Times for the monitoring of trips should be challenged;
- Open space should be excluded from the development and therefore maintenance charges would not be required;
- Bus gate restrictions are frequently ignored;
- Impact on the SAM of bus gate restrictions failing/being ignored;
- What are the controls for the bus gate? Policy, process and fees;
- What measures are in place to secure S106 obligations:
- Bus gate will be an unnecessary obstacle for future residents-similar measures in the Cranhams were removed 25 years ago;
- Pedestrian and cycle route improvements are limited to the site and not the wider town;
- Temporary facilities are not an incentive to move into a development –permanent facilities should be built from the start;
- The source of drinking water is not sustainable;
- Relocation of GP surgery will be a disadvantage to existing GP patients;
- The Council is using a higher figure for the OAN than the independently assessed figure;
- The overall housing supply in the Local Plan period is 10,504 dwellings-by targeting a number greater than the OAN the Council helps and supports developers build additional homes to make a profit;
- Given the recent report of GCC Social Services it is proper for the Council to draw an adverse inference on that body's ability and capacity to deliver the services that will be needed:

- Bridges are not proposed yet the incline in the main route into the town centre is steeper than the incline of the bridge between the hospital and leisure centre;
- The Case Officer report makes no mention of the Local Plan Examination;
- The recommendation should be amended to take into account issues arising from the Local Plan examination and/or the Inspectors report and application amended accordingly;
- There are still concerns regarding lighting within the SAM;
- The OPA omits to mention the necessity for precautions to minimise inconvenience to local residents whilst building work is undertaken;
- Traffic peak hours in the town differ to the standard peak hours quoted by GCC.

### **Revised Location of the Bus Gate**

To assist Members understanding of the revised location of the bus gate an explanatory diagram has been attached as Appendix 1.

### **Addition to the Heads of Terms**

Paragraph 10.40 of the September Report refers to a contribution towards the Police. This should have been included within the Heads of Terms. Item 15 below is an attached to Appendix 15b to capture this obligation.

<b>15: Social Infrastructure</b>		
<b>Summary: Description</b>	<b>Summary: Implementation</b>	<b>CIL Regulations</b>
Police Contribution	Contribution of £10,000 towards ANPR camera upgrades, an on-site policing point and a contribution of £4350 towards equipment for the on-site policing point.	Paragraph 10.40 of the September Report

### **Consultee Responses to the Amended Parameter Plans**

Appendix 2: Natural England

Appendix 3: Conservation and Design Team