

Update Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The outline planning application (OPA) was considered at a Special Meeting of the Council on 26th September 2017.
- 1.2 At that meeting, Members voted to defer the determination of the OPA. The confirmed minutes of the meeting state that the reason for the deferral was "...For a maximum period of three months to enable the issue of connectivity across the site to be investigated".
- 1.3 The Applicant has amended the parameter plans in response to this deferral reason. These are attached as Appendices 41, 42 and 43 and will be discussed later on within this report.
- 1.4 The issue of connectivity was the only reason for the deferral of the determination of the OPA, but Members did raise questions and sought clarification on a number of issues. The Applicant has responded to these with a supporting document that was submitted alongside the amended parameter plans. Members have previously been advised of this document and it has not been reproduced in full as an appendix to this report.

2. Amendments and Updates to the September Report

- 2.1 This report is an update report and accompanies a revised version of the Officers report for the Special Council meeting, (hereafter referred to as the "September report"). It has been updated to incorporate all of the amendments that were contained within the Additional Pages circulated to Members in advance of that Council meeting. Revised or additional wording has been included within the September report as bold text. Chapter 23 (Conclusion) is the amended version that was circulated on Additional Pages in advance of the September meeting. There have subsequently been amendments to paragraphs 23.22 and 23.23 shown in bold text.
- 2.2 Appendix 1 (Questions from Councillors) has been superseded by **Appendix 1a** which consolidates all of the questions raised by Members, and the responses of Officers which had previously been set out within the Additional Pages.
- 2.3 Appendix 15 (Heads of Terms) was amended before the September meeting within the Additional Pages dated 22.09.2017. There have been further amendments and an updated version has been included as **Appendix 15b**. Obligations regarding biodiversity (previously 11.2-11.4 in Appendix 15a) have been deleted as the requirements are covered by conditions. Obligation 5.6 (post 16 education) has been amended and other changes are shown in bold text.
- 2.4 Appendix 8 (Summary of Third Party Representations) has been superseded as **Appendix 8a** to include representations that were included within the Additional Pages.

- 2.5 Appendix 38 (Gas Pipelines and Overhead Cables) was revised before the meeting within the Additional Pages and the revised version has been included as **Appendix 38a**.
- 2.6 Appendix 39 (Conditions) has been superseded by **Appendix 39a**. The conditions relating to biodiversity have been amended and conditions relating to the proposed B2/B8 employment uses have been added. A condition regarding the provision of broadband has been included and omitted as an obligation. Due to the amendments to the wording of some of the biodiversity conditions, the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is now referred to as Ecological Construction Method Statement (ECMS) and this has been amended within Chapter 17 of the September report.
- 2.7 The conditions have also been amended to reflect the changes to the parameter plans and any other amendments to conditions have been shown in bold text.

3. Submission of Additional Information by the Applicant

- 3.1 The amended parameter plans were advertised by means of a notice in the local newspaper on 16.11.2017, five pairs of site notices and nearly 500 letters were sent to third parties who had previously made representations to the OPA. At the time of writing this report, the consultation period has not ended, but will do so on 8th December. Any representations received after the publication of this update report will be included within Additional Pages to be circulated in advance of the December meeting.

4. Additional Representations

- 4.1 Twenty-four letters of objection have been received from Third Parties after the September meeting and in response to the amended plans. Many of the issues raised are similar to those already summarised within the September report along with the following:
- *Is the Council satisfied that it has received a full and accurate response to the Kemble junction issue?;*
 - *Will the gardens of neighbouring residents be dug up to allow for new drains required for the development?;*
 - *The increase in the older population will place a significant burden upon already stretched local authority services;*
 - *The bus link would destroy the understanding of the SAM for future generations;*
 - *Meeting should be held in mid-January at the earliest;*
 - *Several units on the present retail park are empty, do we need more?;*
 - *OAN is for 8,400 dwellings. Figure supplied to Local Plan examination states that 10,504 dwellings will be delivered. Therefore only 246 dwellings are needed at Chesterton;*
 - *CDC should learn from overprovision of affordable housing at Kingsmeadow;*

5. Five Year Housing Land Supply and Local Plan Examination

- 5.1 The September report (paragraph 8.13) referred to the Council's position on the Five Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) that was available at that time. The position was

that, in accordance with the May 2016 5YHLS report, the Council could demonstrate a 7.54 year supply of deliverable housing sites for the period (April 2016 – March 2021). At the time of the September meeting, the 2017 5YHLS report had not been completed.

- 5.2 In November 2017, the Council published the 2017 5YHLS report. It states that the Council can demonstrate an 8 year supply of deliverable housing sites for the period (April 2017 – March 2022). The calculation of the 5YHLS now takes into account dwellings that would be delivered by the Chesterton development due to the progression of the OPA.
- 5.3 The 2017 5YHLS report includes information relating to delivery rates of the Chesterton OPA development. This issue of delivery rates was discussed at the examination of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031 (the emerging Local Plan) in October 2017. Following that discussion, the Applicant submitted a revised housing trajectory and this has been included as an appendix to the 2017 5YHLS report. Although the revised housing trajectory has taken a more cautious approach to the delivery of the early years of the development, the Council considers the updated delivery programme to be realistic and achievable and maintains that the OPA development can be delivered during the emerging Local Plan period and that the Council will be able to maintain a 5YHLS throughout the emerging Local Plan period.
- 5.4 Members have been updated on the above for information. There is a clear distinction between delivery rates, which are primarily a consideration for the Local Plan examination, and the determination of the OPA process: the latter is not dependent upon the former. As stated above, the Council considers that the OPA development can be delivered during the emerging Local Plan period. In the event that delivery of the OPA development stalls, the Council could consider reviewing the Local Plan. Any concerns regarding delivery rates would not justify reducing the scale of the OPA nor should they form a reason to refuse it.
- 5.5 Members will have received a copy of the 2017 5YHLS report and it is not reproduced as part of this update report. It is also available on the Council's website.

6. Connectivity Through the Site

Site Connectivity As Proposed Within the September Report

- 6.1 At the September Council meeting, it was explained to Members that there would not be a through-route for vehicles within the development. The parameter plans (Appendices 9,10 & 11 of the September report) identified as a "Bus/Pedestrian/Cycle" route (the "link road") to the north of the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) which could not be used by private/commercial vehicles. It was proposed that the use of the link road would be controlled by APR cameras and fines issued to any vehicles, other than buses and emergency vehicles, that use the link road. The point at which the APR cameras would be located is referred to as the "bus gate". GCC would be responsible for the cameras at adoption and the link road could not be opened/used until the cameras are installed and operated.
- 6.2 A condition proposed by the County Highways Officer restricted the number of vehicles that would be able to enter the site from the east and from the west as follows:

No more than 1,675 dwellings, 24,155 sqm of GFA employment land use and the Neighbourhood Centre uses (i.e. the A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, D1 and D2 uses described on/in the approved drawings and details) hereby permitted shall be accessed from the west of the site and no more than 675 dwellings and 6,503sqm of employment land uses employment land use accessed from the east of the site (the latter excludes employment development on land east of Wilkinson Road and Spratsgate Lane).

- 6.3 There were two reasons for the approach to connectivity. Firstly, the presence of the SAM is a constraint on development in terms of physical works that can be undertaken within it and the need to protect its setting.
- 6.4 Historic England has already granted SAM consent for the single width link road previously proposed. Geophysical surveys and trial trenching undertaken by the Applicant identified that in the vicinity of the link road, there was little significant archaeology relating to the SAM.
- 6.5 Historic England did not object to the inclusion of the link road within the OPA as it was considered that it would be used infrequently by buses, it would not have an urban character and therefore would preserve the setting of the SAM.
- 6.6 The second reason for the inclusion of the link road and bus gate rather than a through route relates to highways considerations. A through route within the site is not necessary as demonstrated by the Transport Assessment. A through route would be attractive to “rat running” traffic between Stroud Road/Tetbury Road and Spratsgate Lane/Love Lane Industrial Estate which the Ring Road is designed to carry. The existing dual carriage way is purpose built for carrying large volumes of traffic in a suitable environment whereas the proposed development is a residential area where it is desirable for traffic volumes and speed to be as low as possible. Additional rat running through the site would result in additional traffic at the site access junctions and in the Spratsgate Lane, Somerford Road and Love Lane area causing unacceptable congestion and delay. Providing a bus gate and not a through route also promotes sustainable travel which will reduce car usage associated with the proposed development.

Amended Parameter Plans

- 6.7 The Applicant has explored various options to improve connectivity through the site, and the option that is presented to Members within this report has been discussed with Historic England, the County Highways Officer and the Council’s Transport Consultant.
- 6.8 The proposed solution is set out in Appendix 44. This is an extract from the Applicant’s supporting document, submitted in response to the referral reason and other issues raised at the September meeting. The amendment retains the link road as a single width road, but the bus gate has been relocated to the west allowing for the link road to be used by vehicles travelling from the eastern side of the site. The parameter plans have been amended to include this change, although they do not fix the exact position of the bus gate. The bus gate would be moved further to the west of the link road, in the area to the north of the farm buildings and to the east of the neighbourhood centre. The amended parameter plans are shown as Appendices 41, 42 and 43.

- 6.9 The proposed amendment would enable residents from the east to drive westwards, past the SAM across the link road and as far as the bus gate before turning into a car park. The car park would be in close proximity to the neighbourhood centre and would have 30-40 spaces. There would be no exit from the car park into the western side of the site and therefore residents from the east would not be able to drive through the site and exit onto the Tetbury Road. Residents from the west would not be able to drive through to the eastern part of the site. The exact position of the car park and its size would be secured at the REM stage. An amended illustrative masterplan has been attached as Appendix 45.
- 6.10 The relocation of the bus gate would result in approximately 30 dwellings to the north-west of the SAM and to the south of the link road accessing the site from the east (Spratsgate Lane) rather than from the west (Tetbury Road) as previously proposed. There would be an additional 20 vehicular movements on the highway network to the east of the site associated with this amendment. This is not considered to be a material increase and would be within the acceptable variation of traffic flow.
- 6.11 The dwellings to the north of the link road would access the site from the Tetbury Road as previously proposed, but they would not have vehicular access from the link road, and would have to be accessed from the rear or a service road. These are design details which will be explored through the design code and REM application for that phase of development.
- 6.12 It has been estimated that the use of the link road by residents from the eastern part of the site would equate to approximately 50 trips in the weekday peak hour and on an annual basis approximately 15 trips on average per hour.
- 6.13 The relocation of the bus gate would result in less signage and associated infrastructure to be installed along the section of the link road that lies within the SAM. This is seen as a benefit by Historic England which would offset the increased vehicular use across the SAM. A new application for SAM consent would be required due to the inclusion of a passing bay but Historic England have advised that they would be supportive of such an application.
- 6.14 The response of Historic England is attached as Appendix 46
- 6.15 The County Highways Officer has advised, informally, that there is no objection to the proposed relocation of the bus gate and the resulting additional dwellings to be accessed from Spratsgate Lane. However, at the time of writing this report, the formal response from the County Highways Officer is awaited and will be circulated on Additional Pages.

Officer Assessment

- 6.16 The OPA seeks to promote sustainable modes of transport and a comprehensive package of improvements to pedestrian and cycle links and public transport would be delivered. A development that would require or result in residents and users relying upon the private car would fail to accord with the NPPF. However, it is recognised that the ability for residents from the eastern part of the site to drive to the neighbourhood centre is beneficial, particularly for those residents who have mobility issues.

- 6.17 Officers consider that the proposed relocation of the bus gate and the ability for the link road to be used by vehicles would improve connectivity across the site for residents living in the eastern part of the site, without undermining the principle of promoting sustainable modes of transport. There would also be benefits to the setting of the SAM due to the removal of the signage and infrastructure associated with the bus gate.
- 6.18 However, Officers recognise that the proposed relocation of the bus gate would have some disadvantages. For example, care will have to be taken when considering the design for the parcel of development to the north of the bus link to ensure that there is still an active frontage despite no direct vehicle access. And the proposed relocation of the bus gate would not improve vehicle access from the western part of the site to the eastern side, although these residents would have access to the neighbourhood centre and would be able to walk, cycle or catch a bus to the eastern side of the site.
- 6.19 On balance, Officers consider that the proposed relocation of the bus gate would improve connectivity across the site without compromising the promotion of sustainable modes of transport within the OPA development or the setting of the OPA.

7. Social Services and Health Care

- 7.1 Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) is the responsible authority for the delivery of social services across the county. When the OPA was validated in January 2016, the Community Infrastructure team at GCC was consulted. A response was received in relation to education and libraries.
- 7.2 Officers did engage with GCC and the Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group (GCCG) regarding health and adult social care during the course of the OPA and representatives of both attended an internal workshop in October 2016 in which infrastructure requirements were discussed. Officers were advised by the GCCG that there would be no requirement to add beds to Cirencester Hospital and the overall response of GCC/GCCG was to support people at home and reduce residential care.
- 7.3 Following the September meeting, Officers have been advised that the Gloucestershire health system receives monies based on population overall which is reconciled on an annual basis, therefore, the growth in population will be covered by this process and as such a financial obligation is not required. There may be opportunities for local community services to work with primary health care provision within the OPA development and this would be for the relevant parties to discuss due course.
- 7.4 GCC has submitted a formal response which is attached as Appendix 47.

8. Thames Water

Waste Water

- 8.1 The September report, within paragraphs 19.12-19.16, sets out the response of Thames Water to the OPA. Thames Water (TW) did not object to the OPA and the Applicant is currently working with them on a design solution for the treatment of sewage from the OPA development. It has been established that a direct link from the site to the Shorncote Sewage Treatment Works (STW) will be required. The absence of the exact design details of the connection to the Shorncote STW at the OPA stage is not a refusal reason.
- 8.2 The Water Cycle Study (WCS), reference in the September report (paragraph 19.15) took into account the impact of OPA development and planned growth upon watercourses within the District. It advised that growth in Cirencester would give rise to a 1.4% increase in dry weather flow over a 30 year return and the report concluded that "The impact of increased effluent flows is unlikely to have a significant impact upon flood risk in the receiving watercourses". There is no national definition of "significant" and for the purposes of the WCS, the Council's consultant defined a 5% increase in the 30 year return flows as "very significant", and a 5% increase in the 100 year return flows as "significant". This approach was reviewed by the EA for the WCS and no objection was raised.
- 8.3 Officers were asked by a Member after the September meeting to establish the volume of waste water arising from the OPA development and then the volume that the Shorncote STW will have to hold and release into the watercourse.

TW has provided the following information:

- TW works on waste flows of 1 l/s when it comes to additional flows in the network and 120 l/p/d for water usage;
 - TW assumes an occupancy of 2.4 per property when considering STW upgrades (the however existing population may move to these house so occupancy in existing homes falls meaning that TW do not just upgrade on number of homes but also take population into account);
 - Shorncote STW currently treats flows of a population equivalent (PE) to circa 24200 (PE is a measure of flow that arrives at the STW made up of flows from residential, retail, trade, industry etc it is not a measure of the number of people in the catchment)
- 8.4 The volume of water that can be discharged from the STW into local watercourses is set by the Environment Agency (EA) through permits issued to TW and it is the EA's responsibility to review these permits.
- 8.5 The EA regularly reviews all the permits granted for a particular sector to check that they reflect the latest regulations and environmental standards. Officers have been in contact with the EA's National Permitting Service and they have advised that the permit for the Shorncote STW will be reviewed to meet improved water quality limits for phosphorus by 31.03.2018. The permit has not yet been updated to reflect this requirement but it is on the EA's work plan to be completed by this date. There is no proposal to increase the current permitted flow limit as part of this permit review.
- 8.6 While Officers understand the concerns regarding the outflows of the Shorncote STW, it has been established that the growth proposed within the emerging Local

Plan for Cirencester, including the OPA development, would not have a significant effect upon the local watercourse network. Furthermore, the discharge of water from the Shorcote STW is a matter for the EA and TW and it is out of the control of the Council.

- 8.7 Members are also reminded of the recent appeal decision received by the Council after the September meeting for Bell Lane Poulton (CDC Ref: 15/01376/OUT Appeal Ref APP/F1610/W/17/3171382). The application was refused for the following reason:

Notwithstanding the consultation response from Thames Water, it is considered that the proposals will exacerbate the existing foul drainage problems experienced in Poulton which will, in turn, lead to an increased risk of flooding elsewhere in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular paragraph 103. The increased risk of flooding elsewhere is considered to be an adverse impact of the proposals that significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits having regard to paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 8.8 The appeal was allowed and costs were awarded against the Council. The Inspector comments that the Council was unable to substantiate the refusal reason which was not supported by technical and statutory consultees. This appeal decision should be considered in conjunction with the appeal decision for a site in South Cerney referenced within the September report (paragraph 19.16).

Water Supply

- 8.9 Thames Water has recommended a condition regarding the provision of water to occupants of the OPA development. The Applicant commissioned TW to produce a capacity study in 2014. This has established that there is capacity to serve the development and that upgrades will be required to maintain pressure in the wider network along with other infrastructure improvements. The upgrades required have already been costed by TW and the costs were accounted for within the viability assessment.

9. Cirencester College

- 9.1 A representation from Cirencester College (CC) was included within the Additional Pages and a representative from CC spoke at the September meeting. There were two areas of concern for CC; highway safety in relation to the students attending the college and S106 obligations. A response from CC has been attached as Appendix 48
- 9.2 The concerns regarding highway safety (traffic lights at the RAU roundabout, right turn from Chesterton Lane and the at-level pedestrian crossing) have previously been covered within the September report and will not be discussed further within this report. However, Officers have an update for Members regarding the proposed obligation for apprenticeships.
- 9.3 Officers met with representatives of CC and GCC after the September Council meeting to discuss the proposed S106 obligation for apprenticeships. It had been proposed that a contribution of £400,000 would be secured through the S106 towards the expansion of local education and training provision for sixth form age

students, with CDC to administer the funds. It was intended that these apprenticeships would be focused upon construction and would include the Town Council's desire for a stone masonry apprenticeship to support the restoration of the Obelisk at the Amphitheatre.

- 9.4 Officers still maintain that the financial contribution (in phased payments) towards the development of apprenticeships would be a necessary and proportionate contribution. However CC has now provided further clarification regarding the types of apprenticeships that they offer and will be able to offer moving forward. CC does not offer specific construction apprenticeships, but would be able to provide a range of apprenticeships not only for new pupils arising from the OPA development but to also support businesses that would be established within the employment land to be delivered through the OPA. Officers consider that the contribution towards apprenticeships is consistent with Policy EC1 (Employment Development) of the emerging Local Plan, which supports economic opportunities that capitalize on the strength of existing academic and training institutions.
- 9.5 There are opportunities for close working between CC and the TC to support conservation projects within the town; e.g. the Amphitheatre, Obelisk, etc. The College has highlighted its Higher Education provision, which includes Foundation Degrees developed in partnership with the RAU. For example, the Environmental Conservation and Heritage Management course offers academic and practical training as a professional gateway into the environmental, conservation and heritage sectors. In addition the proposed Community Development Fund offers opportunities to support heritage focussed projects, for example at the Obelisk, designed to increase integration between the new and existing Chesterton communities.

10. Other Matters

Office and Leisure Impact Assessment

- 10.1 The OPA was accompanied by a retail impact assessment which demonstrated that the proposed retail uses within the neighbourhood centre would not cause harm to the vitality and viability of the town centre. This is covered within the September report at paragraphs 9.19-9.22.
- 10.2 The NPPF advises, within paragraph 24, that a sequential test should be applied for "main town centre" uses (which includes office and leisure uses) which are not within an existing town centre and are not in accordance with an up to date Local Plan. An impact assessment is required if the proposed town centre uses exceed a threshold of 2,500 sq metres as set by the NPPF, in the absence of a locally set threshold. In response to questions raised by the Local Plan Inspector and to ensure that the impact of the non-residential element of the OPA has been fully assessed, a sequential test and impact assessment for office and leisure uses proposed by the OPA has been submitted by the Applicant.
- 10.3 The OPA proposes that 5.86 hectares of the proposed employment land would be for B1 uses and the Transport Assessment has assessed a total figure of 30,658 square metres of gross floor area for this use. This exceeds the threshold set by the NPPF. The proposed leisure uses would not exceed the threshold, but have been included within the assessment for completeness.

- 10.4 The requirement for the delivery of 9.1 ha of employment land at the strategic site (as set out in Policy S2 of the emerging Local Plan) has been based upon a substantial evidence base produced to support the emerging Local Plan. The OPA therefore accords with this policy, although as set out in Chapter 4 of the September report, Officers recognises that at this stage the policy has little weight.
- 10.5 In accordance with the NPPF, a sequential test has been undertaken in relation to the proposed office and leisure uses proposed within the OPA. This has set out that there are no sequentially preferable sites which could accommodate an equivalent floor area that are available or suitable, either within the town centre or in an edge of town centre location. The Council's own evidence base has established that office space available in Cirencester's town centre tends to be smaller units, and generally town centre sites are less desirable due to issues surrounding accessibility and parking and the problems associated with the requirements of modern business in historic buildings.
- 10.6 With regard to impact, the allocation of employment uses, in particular B1 uses, seeks to meet the future employment needs of the District as set out by the Local Plan evidence base.
- 10.7 The proposed delivery of employment land and leisure facilities within the OPA is considered by Officers to be acceptable and in accordance with the NPPF and Policy S2 of the emerging Local Plan. It has been demonstrated that there would be no substantive adverse impacts upon the town centre and Officers consider that their inclusion with the OPA would contribute significantly towards the creation of a sustainable community.

Continued Role of the Council Following the Approval of the OPA

- 10.8 At the September meeting, Officers were asked about the on-going role that the Council would have in respect of the OPA. Attached as Appendix 49, is a diagram which sets out the process following the determination of the OPA. This diagram draws upon the information contained within Chapters 7 and 22 of the September report.

Green/Renewable Technologies

- 10.9 This was covered within the September report at paragraphs 7.58 and 7.59. The inclusion of green/renewable technologies within new buildings cannot be conditioned through the planning process as this is now covered by the Building Regulations process. However, the inclusion of features such as passive solar gain can be included within the Design Codes.

Broadband

- 10.10 A question was raised at the September meeting regarding the proposed cost for broadband provision set out within the viability assessment. It has been confirmed by the Applicant that the cost includes ducting for others to lay cables along primary and secondary routes and an allowance for diversions relating to the works along the Tetbury Road. This has been covered in more detail within the Applicant's response to the September meeting.

- 10.11 A condition has been proposed requiring the submission of a strategy for superfast broadband.

Service Charges

- 10.12 Services charges are not a planning consideration, but this has been covered in more detail within the Applicant's response to the September meeting.

Confirmed Minutes and Copies of Third Party and Town Council Speeches

- 10.13 The confirmed minutes for the September meeting are attached as Appendix 50. The text of the speeches given by Third Parties (Save Our Cirencester) and the Town Council at the September meeting are attached as Appendices 51 and 52. The Council did not receive transcripts from other Third Parties or the Applicant.

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 Officers consider that the proposed amendment to the parameter plans has addressed the reason for deferral without compromising the principles of sustainable development.
- 11.2 At the time of writing this report, no other material considerations have arisen following the September meeting that have altered the reasons for Officers recommending approval of the OPA, as set out within Chapter 23 of the September report.
- 11.3 For consistency, an amendment has been made to the recommendation set out within the September report to take into account any conditions agreed at the December meeting.
- 11.4 Members are therefore requested to vote upon the following recommendation having taken into account the conclusion of the September report along with the updates contained within this report :

The Officer Recommendation is that the Council resolves to PERMIT the application for the reasons set out in the Report subject to:

- (i) the completion of Section 106 Legal Agreements between the Applicant and Cotswold District Council and the Applicant and Gloucestershire County Council, prior to the decision notice being issued;**
- (ii) the suggested draft conditions set out in the application report, together with any draft conditions as may be agreed by the Council at its Meeting on 12th December 2017;**
- (iii) delegated authority being given to the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council, to amend and/or add to the suggested draft conditions set out in the application report prior to the decision notice being issued, where such amendments would be legally sound and would not deviate significantly from the purpose of the draft conditions;**

(iv) referring the application back to the Council if any new or altered material considerations arise before the grant of planning permission which, in the view of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing (having consulted the Group Manager of Land, Legal and Property), may have the effect of altering the resolution ;

(v) referral to, and confirmation from, the Secretary of State that the application will not be called-in for determination by the Secretary of State if the decision notice is to be issued in advance of the adoption of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031.

IN THE EVENT OF PERMISSION BEING GRANTED BY THE COUNCIL –

(b) that if, by 12th April 2018, one or both of the Section 106 legal agreements have not been completed and an extension of time for completion has not been agreed, delegated authority being given to the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing to refuse the application, with the reason for refusal to be based upon the failure to secure the required infrastructure to support the development.