

Appendix 1a

Questions from Members (Incorporating Those Included On the Additional Pages for the September Meeting)

Councillor Tony Berry (Kemble and Ewen)

Why does the development not include a vehicular through route?

This is due to the capacity of the highways network to the eastern side of the site and the presence of a Scheduled Ancient Monument. It has been covered within Chapters 7: Site Design and Layout and 11: Access and Movement

How does this development compare in terms of S106 obligations? Has the Applicant gone over and above the standard requirements to deliver the “legacy”?

The Community Infrastructure Levy 2010 sets out planning obligations must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. Therefore the Applicant cannot be required to go “over and above” what is required as such obligations would fail to meet the tests set out in the CIL regulations. However, as will be set out within Chapter 21: Viability and within the report of the DVS, the Applicant has agreed with Council on a number of issues which has increased the proportion of affordable housing that can be delivered as part of the OPA development.

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 Dilys Neil (Stow)

What other options have been considered to deliver this housing?

There is a substantial evidence base underpinning the emerging Local Plan and the allocation of the Chesterton site. This dates back to 2007 when the Council published the first Options paper for the Local Development Framework (the Council switched to a Local Plan in 2013). As part of the process of drafting the emerging Local Plan, Sustainability Appraisals assessed reasonable alternatives in terms of key sustainability issues.

The Sustainability Appraisal that has been submitted with the Local Plan can be found at the following link:

http://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/1500110/Cotswold-LP-Focussed-Changes_SA-Report_v10_120117.pdf

The primary school seems enormous for the size of development. Is the intention that it should also serve surrounding villages and if so how will this impact on other schools which may be threatened with closure?

It is intended that the primary school would serve the need arising from the development. GCC base the projected demand for pupil places from reviews and analysis of the number of pupils at different development / dwelling types across the county.

Could you let me know more details about the plans for a primary health care centre? How many GPs do you think will be needed? Will it be a standalone service or a branch surgery from another local practice?

The development would generate a need for 3 GPs which would require a surgery of around 600m². Officers have been advised by the Gloucestershire Care Commission Group that a GP surgery of that size would not be viable and therefore, would not be supported by them. At this stage, there is no confirmation of whether the GP service would be accommodated within a satellite practice or as part of a larger practice which may wish to relocate to the site. Nevertheless, the Applicant will be required to safeguard and market land for the healthcare provision required for the development and this will be secured within the Section 106 Legal Agreement.

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.

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,

Appendix 1a - Questions from Members (Incorporating those included on the Additional Pages for the September 2017 Meeting)

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

Appendix 1a - Questions from Members (Incorporating those included on the Additional Pages for the September 2017 Meeting)

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.

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.

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.

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).

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.

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.

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,
Appendix 1a - Questions from Members (Incorporating those included on the Additional Pages for the September 2017 Meeting)

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*

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.

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.

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.

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'.

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

As above.

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).

Appendix 1a - Questions from Members (Incorporating those included on the Additional Pages for the September 2017 Meeting)

Response from the ERS Officer: The national objective for nitrogen dioxide is an annual average of 40 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$.

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 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ can be found. (AQMA's are occasionally designated in areas where levels of 37 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ or above are found, even though the measured level has not exceeded the national objective of 40 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$.)

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.

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 ugm-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.

Why are new houses being proposed next to industrial buildings off Somerford Road. What Use Class do these units have and what environmental conditions are 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. It 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.

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”.

Councillor MacKenzie-Charrington (The Rissingtons)

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".

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.

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.

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.

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

Appendix 1a - Questions from Members (Incorporating those included on the Additional Pages for the September 2017 Meeting)

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.

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.

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.

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.

Appendix 1a - Questions from Members (Incorporating those included on the Additional Pages for the September 2017 Meeting)

Councillor Hancock (Northleach)

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:

-Somersford 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.

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 Robin Hughes (Sandywell)

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 (Somersford Road/Wilkinson Road/Spratsgate Lane), they are likely to be delivered in the following order:

Access:

- 1. Somersford 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 is 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);