

COTSWOLD DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNCIL  
(SPECIAL MEETING)

(HELD AT CIRENCESTER BAPTIST CHURCH,  
CHESTERTON LANE, CIRENCESTER)

16<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2018

Present:

Councillor Julian Beale - Chairman  
Councillor David Fowles - Vice-Chairman

Councillors -

SI Andrews	Jenny Hincks
Mark F Annett	SG Hirst
AW Berry	RC Hughes
AR Brassington	RL Hughes
T Cheung	Mrs SL Jepson (until 3.40 p.m.)
Sue Coakley	Juliet Layton
Alison Coggins	MGE MacKenzie-Charrington
PCB Coleman	Dilys Neill
Andrew Doherty	SDE Parsons
RW Dutton	NP Robbins
Jenny Forde	Tina Stevenson
C Hancock	R Theodoulou
JA Harris	LR Wilkins
Maggie Heaven	

Apologies:

M Harris	NJW Parsons
RG Keeling	Lynden Stowe

CL.62 CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

The Chairman thanked Pastor Frost and his team for hosting this Special Council Meeting and for their help in making the arrangements.

The Chairman reminded the Council and members of the public and Press of the purpose of this Meeting, including the previous decision to defer consideration of this application for further information, which was taken by the Council at its Special Meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2017. The Chairman explained that the Meeting could revisit any aspect of the application, but he suggested that the debate should concentrate on those matters relating to the previous deferral of this application, and that repetition should be avoided if at all possible.

Following the introduction of Members, Officers and the Council's external Legal Advisor (seated on the dais), and other Officers and Advisors who were present, it

was suggested and agreed that the Meeting be adjourned for a period in order to allow time for comments just received from the Planning Inspector in relation to the examination of the Emerging Local Plan to be considered.

#### CL.63 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Head of Democratic Services confirmed that, in accordance with the Council's previous decision (Minute CL.52 (d) of 21<sup>st</sup> February 2017, interviews had been held with all Councillors and relevant Officers to assess whether there were any aspects that would prevent participation in this Special Meeting.

As a result, Councillors M Harris, NJW Parsons and Lynden Stowe had elected not to take part in the Special Council Meeting. However, this was not due to any specific interest, but related to issues of pre-determination, and perception of apparent bias.

A Member referred to recent claims that several Conservative Members were also members of the Cirencester Bull Club, and he called upon Councillors AW Berry and SDE Parsons, who were present at this Meeting, to withdraw for reasons relating to transparency and an apparent conflict of interest. In response, the Head of Democratic Services explained that the information referred to had been provided as part of the agreed questionnaire/interview process carried out in advance of the Special Council Meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2017. The external Legal Adviser apprised the Council of recent case law relating to a Member's ability to participate in the determination of a planning application in light of a declared interest.

The Head of Democratic Services then advised the Council that no conflict of interests had been identified through undertaking the questionnaire/interview process with Councillor RA Morgan, who had recently been elected to represent the Grumbolds Ash with Avening Ward.

The Head of Democratic Services also reported that Councillor JA Harris had recently declared his membership of the Cirencester Society in London, which was linked to his previous role as Mayor of Cirencester; and the fact that the Earl Bathurst was also a Society member. Notwithstanding this, it was not considered that Councillor Harris had a conflict of interest that should prejudice his participation in the Special Meeting. In addition, and for completeness, the Head of Democratic Services further reported that Councillor NP Robbins, who was the current Mayor of Cirencester, was not a member of that Society.

#### (1) Declarations by Members

No Disclosable Pecuniary Interests had been identified by any Member.

Councillor AW Berry declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because he was a member of Cirencester Bull Club together with the Earl Bathurst.

Councillor PCB Coleman had previously declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because he was also a Member of Cirencester Town Council.

Councillor JA Harris declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because he was a member of the Cirencester Society in London together with the Earl Bathurst.

Councillor M Harris had previously declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because he was also a Member of Cirencester Town Council. Councillor Harris was not present at the Meeting.

Councillor Jenny Hincks had previously declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because she was also a Member of Cirencester Town Council.

Councillor RC Hughes had previously declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because he was also a Member of Cirencester Town Council.

Councillor NJW Parsons had previously declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because he had a pre-determined view having promoted the site in the Local Plan allocation, and have defended its allocation in the Local Plan. Councillor Parsons was not present at the Meeting.

Councillor SDE Parsons declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because he was a member of Cirencester Bull Club together with the Earl Bathurst.

Councillor NP Robbins had previously declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT, because he was also a Member of Cirencester Town Council.

Councillor Lynden Stowe had previously declared an interest in respect of application 16/00054/OUT because, in his previous role as Leader of the Council, he had been the chief supporter of the Deputy Leader in promoting the site in the Local Plan. Councillor Stowe was not present at the Meeting.

(2) Declarations by Officers

There were no declarations from Officers.

CL.64 OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION - LAND TO THE SOUTH OF CHESTERTON, CIRENCESTER (16/00054/OUT)

The Forward Planning Manager outlined the purpose and contents of the Local Plan Inspector's Main Modifications Note which had been received earlier in the day. In summary, following the hearing sessions in relation to the submitted Local Plan, the Council had prepared a Schedule of Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan. The Schedule had been reviewed by the Inspector, and his Note proposed several modifications which he believed were needed to make the Local Plan 'sound'. In relation to the Chesterton Strategic Site, the Inspector considered it likely that 1,800 dwellings could be delivered during the Local Plan period with the remaining 550 being built on the site after the Local Plan period. He also considered it likely that 120 dwellings would be built by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 and he had not suggested that the Council should seek to modify the housing allocation. The Forward Planning Manager then outlined the next steps of the Local Plan process, which were for a public consultation on the Council's proposed modifications to the Local Plan, noting that only representations relating to matters of soundness could be submitted to the Inspector for consideration, together with a summary by, and comments from, the Council

The Chairman then drew attention to a suggested procedure for the Meeting. The Head of Planning and Strategic Housing reminded the Council of the issues raised at the Special Council Meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2017 in respect of this application and updates on the emerging Local Plan and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). She apprised the Council of issues relating to the formation of a Community

Management Trust and a list of planning obligations, and explained that national policy required the Council to maintain a five-year housing land supply throughout the Local Plan period. It was explained that this was necessary to avoid a return to a 'planning by appeal' situation.

The Case Officer reminded the Council of the location of the site and outlined the proposals, drawing attention to an overview of the site; its proximity to the A429 to the west, the boundary of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty beyond and Spratsgate Lane to the east, the town centre and various facilities; its context within Cirencester; its landscape and heritage context; the buildings, known as The Steadings, which were proposed for demolition to facilitate the construction of a dual carriageway; proposals for highway mitigation works; protected trees and man-made constraints; public rights of way; the proportion of the site that was Grade 3A agricultural land; what would be approved as part of this outline planning application and the requirement for subsequent reserved matters applications; land use parameters; green infrastructure; the phasing of development; an indicative layout; and maximum building heights.

The Case Officer reported that it was now proposed to situate the bus gate 340 metres to the west of the Scheduled Ancient Monument. In addition, a car park would be provided adjacent to the bus gate so that residents living in the eastern section of the development could park their cars in the car park while they accessed the facilities within the neighbourhood centre but they would not be able to travel through to the western side of the site. However, buses would be able to travel through to the western side of the site. The Case Officer reminded the Council that the Scheduled Ancient Monument, which comprised 21 hectares 4.7 of which were within the boundaries of the strategic site, constituted a constraint on the site. The revisions in relation to the link road also included an additional passing bay, underpasses for newts and the omission of signage and street lighting. In conclusion, the Case Officer drew attention to the relative distances from the centre of the site to the boundaries relating to pedestrians and cyclists.

A Member of Cirencester Town Council, nine Objectors, three Supporters, and two representatives of the Applicant were invited to address the Council in accordance with the previously-agreed arrangements.

In response to various questions from Members, it was reported that:-

- (i) The delivery of the infrastructure associated with the proposed development would be dependent on the delivery of the housing units.
- (ii) The Applicant maintained that, as 2,350 units would be delivered through this development, there would not be any adverse impact on the planning obligations detailed in the Section 106 Agreement.
- (iii) The Council's Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing was 8,400 units throughout the Local Plan period. Affordable housing needs were assessed over and above that figure and, as there were acute affordability issues in Cotswold District, a more balanced approach had been sought. In the opinion of Officers, the Council should aspire to achieving the target suggested by the Inspector, but it was not a national policy requirement to fully deliver the affordable housing need.

- (iv) A total of 157 dwellings per year were needed to improve affordable housing provision in the District up to 3031 and, therefore, in excess of 2,350 units would be necessary to achieve that target.
- (v) If up to 2,350 units were approved, the infrastructure would be provided in accordance with the phasing strategy which suggested an orderly development; and the Inspector's comments did not impact on the OAN.
- (vi) The delivery of the housing units and infrastructure would be managed through the phasing plan, and infrastructure delivered in proportion to the number of dwellings delivered. For example, if the delivery of dwellings stopped at 1,000 units, the Applicant would not have to deliver a primary school to meet the needs of 2,350 dwellings.
- (vii) Any delay in delivery would not have any adverse impact on the viability of the scheme.
- (viii) If the Council was minded to approve this application, as recommended, any development would move forward pursuant to that permission. In his Main Modifications Note, the Inspector had not suggested any modifications to the strategy or to Policy S2 of the emerging Local Plan - which was considered to suggest that there had not been any concerns at that stage in relation to either that strategy or Policy, although that could still be subject to change throughout the remainder of the Local Plan Examination process.
- (ix) The evidence suggested that delivery of the 500<sup>th</sup> unit could be achieved by 2022/23, based on the previously-assumed delivery rates.
- (x) If the Council was minded to approve this application as recommended, it was likely that work could commence in 2019/20 and proposals were in place to ensure the provision of temporary facilities from the commencement of works.
- (xi) The figure of 1,800 units suggested by the Inspector in his Main Modification Note was not a cap, but was intended to provide realism to ensure that the emerging Local Plan was sound. It was considered that 1,800 units could be achieved given current market conditions. The Council was reminded that the proposal was for a development comprising up to 2,350 units on this site and there was nothing in the Inspector's letter to suggest a move away from that figure. While the policy stated a figure of 'up to' 2,350 units, the focus of the emerging Local Plan was that 2,350 units would be delivered in order to maintain the five-year supply of housing land throughout the Local Plan period up to 2031.
- (xii) Gloucestershire County Council was satisfied that the proposed primary school would meet the need arising from this development.
- (xiii) In the opinion of the Council's external Legal Advisor, it would be inconsistent to refuse this application on a point of principle so, if the Council was minded to refuse permission on that basis, it was likely that the Inspector would require withdrawal of the emerging Local Plan or for it to be put back to an earlier stage of examination. It was also likely that the Council would lose certainty and control over the successfully negotiated planning obligations in the event that permission was granted by an Inspector on appeal.
- (xiv) The strategic site was included in the emerging Local Plan, which had been subject to public consultation prior to its submission to the Inspector for examination,

and the proposed development was fundamental to the maintenance of a five-year supply of housing land throughout the Local Plan period to fully deliver the District's OAN of 8,400 units. It was reported that the Inspector's Note had not proposed a modification to the Council's methodology of calculating the five-year housing requirement (the residual requirement methodology) which took account of past over-delivery of housing. If account was not taken of over-supply, it was estimated that approximately 12,500 units would need to be built in the District over the Local Plan period.

(xv) Details of the benefits that would accrue to the town were set out in the Heads of Terms for the proposed Section 106 Agreement. In summary, the following contributions had been negotiated - £100,000 towards the cost of town centre projects put forward by the Town Council, £500,000 in respect of car parking, £100,000 in respect of on-site community development, £100,000 in respect of art and culture projects within the community, and £200,000 development cost for the setting up and pump-priming of the Community Management Trust and floor space. It was further reported that this Council would administer the contribution towards town centre projects following identification of such projects by the Town Council.

(xvii) In the event that the Council was minded to refuse this application and the Applicant submitted an appeal against that decision, the Council would be required to produce evidence to support every benefit/contribution sought. In addition, the Council could face an award of costs in the event of a successful appeal.

(xviii) In response to a comment that the Section 106 Agreement contributions were intended to mitigate for the development and were not for the wider benefit of the town, the Council's Legal Adviser reminded the Meeting that, as a matter of law, such contributions needed to be necessary to make a development acceptable.

(xix) In the event that the Council was minded to approve this application as recommended, the developer would be obliged to provide ducting to each property to enable Broadband connection, the cost of such connection being met by the subsequent occupiers of the properties.

(xx) It had been calculated that the proposed relocation of the bus gate would result in 30 additional dwellings accessing facilities from the east, resulting in an additional 20 peak hour trips from the east of the site. Officers considered that, given this low level of additional traffic movements, no further traffic modelling would be required in relation to the relocation of the bus gate.

(xxi) In the event that the Council was minded to approve this application as recommended, various triggers for highways mitigation would be contained within planning conditions. The triggers would be dependent on when material harm would arise from the development, and the practicalities of undertaking too many highways works at any one time.

(xxii) In the event that the Council was minded to approve this application as recommended, there would be a requirement to provide a car park, accessed only from the eastern side of the site, in close proximity to the bus gate. As there was a need to control the volume of traffic passing the SAM and to promote sustainable transport, the size of the car park would meet the needs of those who needed to drive. The issue of meeting the needs of disabled drivers would be addressed through a future Reserved Matters application.

(xxiii) The proposal was for the existing subway in the vicinity of Cirencester Fire Station to be closed and to be replaced by a 'Toucan' crossing. It was reported that such closure was necessary to accommodate the requirement for additional traffic lanes in this area, the existing subway was impassable at certain times, and that there were no other available options to cross this road.

(xxiv) In response to a question relating to the monitoring of highways impacts in the future, it was reported that the Transport Assessment had taken into account committed developments within the town.

(xxv) The highways mitigation proposals had been subjected to a robust assessment by Highways England and Gloucestershire County Council and an extensive package of mitigation measures had been identified.

(xxvi) The highways mitigation measures would need to be subject to technical approvals, which would provide a mechanism to enable minor amendments to the mitigation measures.

(xxvii) A significant housing allocation would be required in order to justify provision of a bypass to the south of the site from the A429 (Tetbury Road) to the A419 (Swindon Road).

(xxviii) The Council would be required to produce substantial technical evidence to support a refusal of this application for highway-related reasons.

(xxix) It was considered that this development would not have any significant impact on the A429/A433 junction as it would result in a minimal number of journeys to and from Kemble.

(xxx) The developer would be required to implement the mitigation measures proposed in respect of the Cherry Tree Lane junction prior to occupation of the first property, and it was considered that such measures would result in an improvement of capacity at the Burford Road roundabout.

(xxxi) The air quality assessment had been based on the use of current fuels but it was expected that air quality would improve as existing vehicles were replaced over time.

(xxxii) While the requirement was for the on-site primary school to be provided by the occupation of the 500<sup>th</sup> unit, it was likely that the school would open on a host site with effect from 2021/22. Gloucestershire County Council was currently looking at the options for a temporary host site, in line with a model which had been previously used extensively across the country. It was considered that the occupancy of 500 units would generate approximately 110 pupils, which would allow a viable one-form entry school to open. It would be possible to ensure that places at the new primary school were taken up by those pupils living in the new development. A financial contribution had been sought in respect of secondary education to meet the cost of expanding capacity in the existing schools.

(xxxiii) Effluent flowing into the Cirencester (Shorncote) sewage treatment works was treated to Environment Agency water quality standards and then discharged into local water courses. To help mitigate the risk of flooding, there was a storm treatment area within the sewage works.

(xxxiv) It was proposed that a 4 kilometre sewer would be constructed in 2019 between this site and the treatment works to cater for the foul outflows from the

development. There was also the potential to connect approximately 800 existing properties to the new pipeline to help mitigate existing flood risk.

(xxxv) The assessment was based on foul and surface water flows and there was sufficient space at the Cirencester Sewage Works for a future upgrade, if that proved to be necessary.

(xxxvi) If the Council was minded to approve this application as recommended, the effective date for completion of the Section 106 Agreements or an extension of time therefor, would be 12<sup>th</sup> July 2018 and such contributions could only be used to meet the cost of needs relating to the application.

(xxxvii) It was not considered necessary to require an Insurance Bond in respect of this application as the Council had enforcement powers.

(xxxviii) The intention was for the Council to employ dedicated Compliance Officers to monitor this project, due to the scale of the proposed development.

(xxxix) There was a requirement for arrangements to be put in place for the management of community buildings and facilities, including open spaces. The formation of a Community Management Trust was considered to be appropriate as such a Trust would be a charitable company and Town Councillors could be appointed to serve on the Board. The Town Council would be able to tender to carry out various pieces of work on behalf of the Trust, which would be an accountable body acting on behalf of the community.

(xl) The development would provide 705 affordable housing units (based on 30% of 2,350) of which 458 would be available to rent, with 388 of those units being let at affordable rents and 70 units (10% overall) being let at social rents.

(xli) The Council sought social rents on larger units due to affordability implications and an increase in the number of units available at social rents would have an adverse impact on the viability of the development and therefore the overall number of affordable homes delivered.

(xlii) The contribution sought in relation to car parking had been based on an assessment of need. The Council was reminded that car parking generated income.

(xliii) The Council had sought additional, on-going external advice in respect of master planning and community development planning, and had support in place as it had never previously dealt with an application of this scale.

The Council then considered the application.

Councillor RL Hughes PROPOSED that this application be approved as recommended, and that Proposition was duly SECONDED by Councillor SG Hirst.

A number of Members expressed their support for that Proposition, commenting that this application was a rare opportunity to develop a community, and that it was key to the future of Cirencester and the wider Cotswold District; there was a need for sustainable housing and employment in the District, which this proposal would go a long way towards meeting, including helping to meet affordable housing targets and providing homes for young people; and consideration of this application had been deferred on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2017 in order to resolve access arrangements across the site and an appropriate solution had been secured. Those Members further



considered that, if this application was refused, there was a high risk that the emerging Local Plan would either be withdrawn or put back to an earlier stage of examination and that the Council would lose certainty and control over the successfully negotiated planning obligations in the event that permission was granted by an Inspector on appeal, which could be to the detriment of the District. Dismay was expressed over some recent housing developments on 'green field' sites across the District which had been allowed on appeal and one Member, expressing concern over the establishment of a Community Management Trust, suggested that its remit should not be defined at the outline planning stage.

Other Members stated that they did not support the Proposition. Those Members considered the process to have been complex and confusing, but stated that they had been convinced by the arguments put forward by the Objectors and expressed concern over the suggested highway and infrastructure mitigation measures. The Members expressed the view that this development would not tackle the housing issue in the District. They contended that 30% affordable housing would not meet the needs of the 1,500 applicants on the housing waiting list and that the viability argument had been used to justify the non-delivery of affordable housing. They further contended that the Council had been trapped by the emerging Local Plan, which had not received unanimous support amongst Members. In conclusion, they stated that the Council should not ignore the strength of feeling in the community in its determination of this application, the community had been short-changed and its concerns had not been mitigated.

At this point, the Ward Members representing the three Wards which would be directly impacted by the development were invited to address the Council.

Councillor AR Brassington, the Member for the Four Acres Ward, stated that he had considered the advantages and disadvantages arising from this application and expressed his view that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages. He agreed that most people accepted there was a need for some development on this site, but suggested that this application should be refused for reasons of prematurity, scale and adverse traffic implications. Councillor Brassington expressed concern over the impact of the development on parking within the town and reminded the Council that there was no guarantee that the proposed highway mitigation works would not cause further delays. He suggested that, if the Council was minded to approve this application, as Proposed, the effectiveness of the mitigation measures should be closely monitored during the period of development. Councillor Brassington contended that this development would result in a 25% increase in the population of Cirencester and that it was overbearing given its magnitude. He also contended that pollution from nitrogen dioxide would exacerbate existing health problems, and that air pollution would impact on both the development and the wider town, due to emissions from start/stop traffic being impeded by the additional roundabouts and traffic lights. Councillor Brassington also referred to the 600 formal objections and a petition submitted in respect of this application and he urged the Council to do what he considered to be correct for Cirencester and refuse this application, concluding by reiterating his view that it was overbearing, unnecessary and harmful.

Councillor Jenny Hincks, the Member for the Watermoor Ward, contended that the proposed bus gate would not be of benefit to those residents living on the eastern side of this site who would only be able to access the facilities on the western side on foot, by bicycle or by driving around the town to get there. Councillor Hincks stated that the number of affordable housing units should be increased, and that making the development self-sufficient in terms of its facilities would not result in integration with the rest of the town. Councillor Hincks suggested that the proposed facilities would

only be of benefit to those living in the development and, in conclusion, reiterated her view that those living on the eastern side of this site would feel disconnected.

Councillor RC Hughes, the Member for the Chesterton Ward, referred to the development at Cranhams Lane in the 1980s and 1990s, where the facilities originally promised had not been developed. Councillor Hughes expressed concern over the lack of infrastructure to support the development, and stated that existing bus services between Chesterton, Stratton and the town centre would soon be reduced from hourly to two-hourly. In conclusion, Councillor Hughes contended that this application should be refused for reasons relating to the pressure it would put on the town.

At this juncture, the Proposition was put to the vote.

**RESOLVED that:**

- (a) application 16/00054/OUT relating to land to the south of Chesterton, Cirencester be approved for the reasons detailed in the circulated report, and subject to:-**
- (i) the completion of Section 106 Agreements between the Applicant and this Council, and between the Applicant and Gloucestershire County Council, prior to the Decision Notice being issued;**
  - (ii) the suggested draft conditions detailed in the circulated report, together with any draft conditions agreed by the Council at this Meeting;**
  - (iii) the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, together with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council, be authorised to amend and/or add to the suggested draft conditions as detailed in the circulated 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) the application be referred back to the Council in the event that any new or altered material considerations arise before the granting of planning permission which, in the opinion of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing (having consulted the Group Manager Land, Legal and Property Services), 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;**
- (b) if, by 12<sup>th</sup> July 2018, one or both of the Section 106 Legal Agreements have not been completed and an extension of time for completion has not been granted, the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing be authorised to refuse this application, with the reason for refusal being based on the failure to secure the required infrastructure to support the development.**

**Record of Voting - for 17, against 9, abstentions 3, absent 5.**

Notes:(i) Recorded Vote

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.6, a request was made for a Recorded Vote to be taken in respect of the Proposition, and this was supported by the requisite number of Members. On being put to the vote, the Proposition was CARRIED, with the record of voting being as follows:-

For: Councillors SI Andrews, Mark F Annett, Julian Beale, AW Berry, Sue Coakley, Alison Coggins, RW Dutton, David Fowles, C Hancock, Maggie Heaven, SG Hirst, RL Hughes, MGE MacKenzie-Charrington, RA Morgan, SDE Parsons, R Theodoulou and LR Wilkins - Total:17;

Against: Councillors AR Brassington, T Cheung, PCB Coleman, Jenny Forde, JA Harris, Jenny Hincks, RC Hughes, Juliet Layton and NP Robbins - Total: 9;

Abstentions: Councillors Andrew Doherty, Dilys Neill and Tina Stevenson - Total: - 3;

Absent: Councillors M Harris, Mrs. SL Jepson, RG Keeling, NJW Parsons and Lynden Stowe - Total: - 5.

(ii) Additional Representations

Lists setting out details of additional representations received since the Officer report had been prepared were considered in conjunction with the related planning application.

A further representation was reported at the Meeting.

(iii) Public Speaking

Public speaking took place as follows:-

Councillor S Tarr	)	Cirencester Town Council
Mr. M Pratley	)	Objector
Mr. T Buxton	)	Objector
Mr. J Nicholas	)	Objector
Mr. N Dummett	)	Objector
Mr. D Broad	)	Objector
Mr. T Golics	)	Objector
Mr. D James	)	Objector
Mr. S Goldblatt	)	Objector
Mr. P Moylan	)	Objector
Ms A Morris	)	Supporter
Mr. R Kerton	)	Supporter*
Mr. S Large	)	Supporter
Mr. D Jackson	)	On behalf of the Applicant
Mr. G Phillips	)	On behalf of the Applicant

\* Mr. Kerton was not present at the Meeting.

Copies of the representations by the public speakers would be made available on the Council's Website in those instances where copies had been made available to the Council.

The Meeting commenced at 10.00 a.m.; adjourned between 10.15 a.m. and 10.45 a.m., between 1.00 p.m. and 1.45 p.m., and between 3.40 p.m. and 4.00 p.m.; and closed at 5.07 p.m.

Chairman

(END)