

**(6) PUBLIC QUESTIONS - ADDENDUM**

1. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10, the following further questions have now been submitted.

\*\*\*\*\*

(1) From Mr. D James of Cirencester to Councillor SG Hirst, Chairman of the Planning and Licensing Committee

*'Accumulating scientific and medical evidence has shown that declining air quality in areas near high density traffic flows is a major cause of increased diagnoses of asthma among children the world over. Detailed published UK work has further shown that areas within 500m of a main road with densities in excess of 24,000 vehicles per day threaten children's health the most. With the proposal at Chesterton to build the largest number of new houses per 100 residents of all comparable UK market towns, there will be an extra 4,000 vehicles on our roads. Given the geography of our relief roads, with no northern link, the 500m danger zone covers practically the whole of Cirencester. The Council is now at risk of making our town the most polluted and unhealthiest market town in England for the very young. What precautions will the Council take to prevent this from happening?'*

(2) From Mr. M Pratley of Cirencester to Councillor SG Hirst, Chairman of the Planning and Licensing Committee

*'Does the council accept that the disproportionately high numbers of motor cars resulting from the Chesterton development, and even allowing for some walking and cycling, will still cause pollution to rise significantly, maybe to illegal levels? Therefore, what would the committee say to the idea of a change in policy to reduce the numbers at this huge, single, strategic site thereby avoiding the possibility of illegal pollution?'*

(3) From Mr. P Moylan of Cirencester to Councillor SG Hirst, Chairman of the Planning and Licensing Committee

*'Save Our Cirencester are wondering whether last week's High Court ruling about pollution, against a background of a growing threat to health and alongside the critical ARUP report of BDL's environment report, has given the council cause for concern that its local plan and the Chesterton application may have to be re-considered. Wouldn't it now make sense to reduce the number of dwellings there to say, one thousand? Can the committee let us know why this is not a sensible thing to do.'*

\*\*\*\*\*

2. These questions were only submitted on the afternoon of Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> November, i.e. the day before the Meeting and therefore after the deadline by which responses could be guaranteed either in advance of, or at, the Meeting. As such, written responses will be provided to the questioners in due course.

3. In addition, given the timing issues, there is no provision for supplementary questions to be asked.

(END)