

South Cerney Parish Council

Neighbourhood Plan  
Consultation Statement

Submission Version

March 2021

## **Introduction**

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfill the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2). Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies that were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- (b) explains how they were consulted;
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

## **Aims of Consultation**

- To draw out, from the household and business community; local issues, concerns and priorities which could enable the drafting and agreement of a Vision and Objectives for the Plan.
- To broaden understanding by explaining the purpose of Neighbourhood Planning; how the Plan conformed with and gave a local flavour to the District Council Local Plan, and positioning the Plan within the National Planning Framework.
- To explain that the Plan was not about preventing development rather detailing how future development could take account of local character and needs.
- To ensure that consultation events took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken.

## **Background to Consultation**

In October 2015 the Parish Council discussed the possibility of producing a Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish. Other local Parishes were beginning the process and it was agreed that a Steering Committee involving Parish Councillors and others from the community with relevant skills should be established.

The Parish had produced a Parish Plan in 2013 but that Plan did not address the effect of development on the character of the Parish.

The Parish Council agreed the terms and reference of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, these appear as **Appendix 1**.

At the first meeting of the Steering Committee in January 2016 it was agreed that a Plan would take advantage of the provisions of the Localism Act in relation to future planning applications in South Cerney.

The assistance of Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC) was considered and agreed. They had expertise in the development of Plans and could help both in questionnaire development and analysis. They would also be prepared to attend public sessions to give a broader input to the attendees.

In order to meet the aims the consultation was to take place in stages:

- A household survey covering all homes within the Parish.
- A business survey for all employers in the Parish.
- A survey specifically for the owners of second homes situated around the lakes in the Parish. These owners are visitors to the Parish for holiday purposes and their views were considered to be important in respect of tourism and local facilities.
- Drop in presentations to enable the sharing of the results of the surveys and to share and confirm the draft and final Vision and objectives.

There is a well established Parish Magazine, South Cerney News, which provided the ideal vehicle for the distribution of the household survey, it is hand delivered on a monthly basis.

Business surveys were also separately hand delivered and the Lakeside homes survey distributed to owners by email through the lakeside management companies.

As part of the process of producing the Plan it was identified that a comprehensive neighbourhood character assessment report should be produced. This task was performed by members of the steering group and representatives of the South Cerney Trust. This was a very valuable example of community engagement and ensured that all aspects of the settlement and its position in the area were well documented.

### **Those Consulted**

In addition to those identified in the previous paragraph guidance was sought from Cotswold District Council in respect of Statutory Bodies to be consulted at the Reg 14 stage and to this list was added the names of local landowners and of those whose property was specifically mentioned in the Draft Plan.

The Ministry of Defence was included due to the presence of the Duke of Gloucester Military Base and Barracks in the Parish.

The list appears in **Appendix 2**.

## **Stages of Consultation**

The Parish Council concluded that the area for the Plan should be the boundaries of the Parish. This was proposed and agreed with the District Council.

The programme of consultation events held during 2017 and 2018 was as follows:

### **Household Questionnaire**

The questionnaire was distributed for completion by 16th January 2017. It is included as **Appendix 3**.

Analysis of the responses was completed by GRCC.

In summary the response priorities were:

Top 4 likes:

- Green space/Countryside,
- Community/Community spirit,
- Peaceful/quiet/secure,
- Amenities, Shops inc Post Office

Top 4 dislikes:

- Parking Issues,
- Congestion,
- Development,
- Speeding

### **Public Open Day**

The analysis of the results of the questionnaire was presented to the public through an open day held on 25th March 2017.

In excess of 150 people attended the consultation to view the summary output of the questionnaire. Members of the Committee listened to comments and GRCC staff

explained the wider context of Neighbourhood Planning. The stages to be followed were explained.

A display of photographs of South Cerney “then and now” encouraged visitors to follow a thought process of how we can plan for the next 20 years. A “post it “ note exercise collected feedback.

The feedback can be summarised as follows:

- Road maintenance, white lining and drainage and lighting
- Integration of Watermark developments into South Cerney
- Expanded and clearer access to open spaces and lakes
- More village shops
- Pavement and cycle/footpath maintenance and establishment in Broadway Lane, Spine Road and village
- Removal of garage
- Parking problems, including a suggestion of using the pub car parks
- No more large developments

### **Business Survey**

A survey was sent to the business community for return by the 28th February 2017. It is included as **Appendix 4**.

In Summary the responses were as follows:

- Main business was retail distribution with a wide variety of others
- 300 employees in total, with 77 living more than 10 miles from South Cerney
- Premises and employment were the main attraction to South Cerney
- With 88% of employees travelling to work by car, traffic congestion and parking were the main issues

### **Business Open Day**

An open day was held for the business community on 20th April 2017 to share their survey results.

Feedback focused upon the problem of traffic congestion, lack of double yellow lines and parking. Better communication with Kemble railway station was mentioned and a call for more eating places for staff.

### **Vision and objectives feedback open day**

An open day for all was held on 16th September 2017 to consider and confirm that the draft Vision and Objectives met their priorities as presented in March and April 2017.

The event was supported by 20 residents, publicity before the event included an article in Cerney News, Parish Council and Plan websites and circulation to the various social club members.

Positive and supportive feedback was received using a “post it” note process. The vision and objectives were satisfactory and comments provided in finer detail helped frame policies.

Examples of comments were:

- “New owners should be encouraged to engage with the village”
- “Maintain the separation but improve the links”
- “New developments to have high proportion of affordable housing”
- “Bowling green to be protected”
- “Ensure businesses are appropriate to village setting”
- “Campaign to purchase the garage and create a delightful village centre”

### **Lakeside Homes Questionnaire**

A questionnaire was distributed to the owners of lakeside homes on 29th June 2018. It is included as **Appendix 5**.

22 questionnaires were returned, a disappointing response but the owners of the lodges do not live permanently in the Parish, visiting for weekends and holidays. Some of the properties are let on a business basis.

The responses can be summarised as follows:

- Important aspects of South Cerney; countryside, peaceful and safe neighbourhood, local shops and services, community spirit, facilities for leisure and sport.
- Walks and rural paths were very highly rated.
- The Water Park was valued for its’ tranquility and access for walking and cycling.
- Reducing traffic speed limits attracted support.

The correlation with the priorities of residents provided confirmation that we were identifying the main issues.

## **Regulation 14 Consultation**

The statutory consultation in accordance with Regulation 14 ran from 14 September 2020 until 6 November 2020.

The process for the completion of Regulation 14 consultation was discussed with Cotswold District Council in light of the COVID19 situation. The recommendations of the Council were followed which incorporated extending the time available for submitting responses and having copies of the plan available upon request from the Clerk of the Council.

## **Summary of issues raised during Regulation 14 Consultation**

The issues have been tabulated with the responses documented in each case and appear in a spreadsheet at the end of the Appendices.

## **Conclusion**

At the start of the process the Parish Council had no preconceived ideas about what should be in the Plan. It was feedback from the public and businesses in the Plan area which informed and directed the Vision, Objectives and Policies.

The Parish has seen considerable growth in the numbers of properties over the last five years. In addition there has been continued development of holiday homes around the lakes. The consequent increase in traffic volumes and related parking problems was reflected in the feedback. This issue, whilst not one that can be directly dealt with by planning policies has been tackled with a Community Action policy included in the Plan.

The Vision that was adopted for the Plan articulates the balance of new development with historical buildings alongside the preservation of the landscape and separation of the Parish. It specifically mentions the individuality and strength of the Community. Finally, it records the need to build stronger connectivity and services.

The feedback from all of the surveys link to the nine Plan objectives (objective numbers in brackets);

Green space/Countryside (2,8 and 9),

Community (2 and 4),

Peaceful/quiet/secure (1,5,7 and 9),

Amenities and shops (3,4 and 7),

Attraction to business (4 and 6),

Traffic congestion and speeding (7 and 8).





## **Appendices**

	<b>Pages</b>
1. Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Terms of Reference	9-12
2. List of Consultees	13-15
3. Household Questionnaire	16-22
4. Business Questionnaire	23-26
5. Lakeside Homes Questionnaire	27-31
6. Regulation 14 Consultation spreadsheet and actions taken	

## **Terms of Reference for the Neighbourhood Plan steering group**

**Purpose of the steering group:** To oversee and co-ordinate the production of a sound Neighbourhood Plan (NP) covering the parished area of South Cerney in the Cotswold District, as identified in the designated neighbourhood area, working with members of the community and the parish council to achieve this aim. The NP will make use of GRCC's framework template for best practice and refer to previously successful neighbourhood plans. The NP will define the spatial planning policy priorities identified by the community taking into account material representations made during the plan-making process and having regard to all relevant existing plans and evidence. The Plan will include or be supported by appropriate evidence and, where relevant, a delivery plan setting out the means by which these policy priorities may be implemented.

### **Membership**

The steering group will have a minimum membership of 5 with members from the Parish Council, the South Cerney Trust, and other local residents.

The quorum will be set at 60% with a minimum of two parish councillors.

The Neighbourhood Plan steering group will elect a chair and define how secretariat and publicity roles will be carried out. The role of the Chair will be to oversee and chair meetings defining agenda and ensuring actions are followed up as necessary. The chair will also ensure that members' potential conflicts of interest are recognised and measures taken to address them, especially during meetings.

### **In order to carry out this purpose, the steering group will have the power to:**

- a) Develop a timetable and strategy for undertaking the NP
- b) Make recommendations regarding use of the NP budget, for approval at full parish council meetings.
- c) Co-ordinate community consultation activities.
- d) Gather additional evidence about the geographical area covered by the NP and evidence to test proposed solutions and policies.
- e) Use evidence collected, including that from consultations, to prioritise and develop a comprehensive NP.
- f) Oversee the drafting and finalising of the NP.

Please note that South Cerney Parish Council will approve the Submission Draft of the NP prior to publication for consultation and submission to the local authority, Cotswold District Council, for independent examination.

## **Governing principles**

All members of the group recognise that, while they may represent a particular group in the community, their role is to move forward the NP in a way that benefits the whole community. Members of the group will recognise and declare any potential conflicts of interest.

The group accepts the following principles:

- a) A steering group which is open and transparent
- b) An inclusive consultation and plan making process
- c) Active participation by members
- d) Robust evidence gathering
- e) Evidence-based recommendations
- f) The NP must have regard for the National Planning Policy Framework and the strategic policies of the emerging/adopted Cotswold District Council Local Plan

Group members also accept the following principles in conducting their role (known as the Nolan Principles as recommended by the Committee of Standards in Public Life 1995)

**Selflessness:** Holders of public office should take decisions solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends.

**Integrity:** Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might influence them in the performance of their official duties.

**Objectivity:** In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

**Accountability:** Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.

**Openness:** Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

**Honesty:** Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.

**Leadership:** Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

## **Other aspects**

- a) People who wish to be involved in the Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to become steering group members will be welcome to observe at steering group meetings. They will effectively form a means of communicating with others in the parished area. The communications plan will detail means of involving and communicating with residents and other stakeholders. At NP steering group meetings non steering group members will have the opportunity to speak at the invitation of the Chairman.
- b) The steering group will review its membership from time to time and those wishing to cease their membership of the steering group will notify the chair in writing.

### **Conduct of meetings**

- a) Notes will be kept of meetings and made available to steering group members within 7 days of the meeting, then made available to the parish council and other interested parties
- b) An ongoing record of consultation and other evidence gathering work will be kept.
- c) If members of the steering group have a conflict of interest they will declare it by; completion of a declaration of interest form and during meetings as appropriate.
- d) The steering group may form sub groups or theme groups to undertake specific tasks, made up of interested residents and representatives of local organisations. Each theme group should include a member of the steering group. Terms of reference will be drawn up for the theme groups and membership will be open.
- e) Members will aim to make steering group decisions by consensus. However should a vote be required each member will have one vote and a simple majority will be required to support any motion. The Chair (or in their absence, Acting Chair) will have one casting vote. Show of hands will suffice for voting but names can be recorded if required by any steering group member present.

GLoucestershire  
 Planning  
 Unit

Agency	Contact	Comment
Cotswold District Council	<a href="mailto:Joseph.walker@cotswold.gov.uk">Joseph.walker@cotswold.gov.uk</a>	
Wiltshire Council	<a href="mailto:neighbourhood.planning@wiltshire.gov.uk">neighbourhood.planning@wiltshire.gov.uk</a>	
Swindon	<a href="mailto:psmith@swindon.gov.uk">psmith@swindon.gov.uk</a>	
Police	<a href="mailto:Mark.Murphy@gloucestershire.pnn.police.uk">Mark.Murphy@gloucestershire.pnn.police.uk</a>	Gloucestershire
Glos Highways	<a href="mailto:Richard.GRAY@gloucestershire.gov.uk">Richard.GRAY@gloucestershire.gov.uk</a>	Local Highways Manager See map for relevant one at <a href="https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/communities-and-parishes/parish-and-member-services/">https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/communities-and-parishes/parish-and-member-services/</a>
Natural England	<a href="mailto:consultations@naturalengland.org.uk">consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</a>	
Historic England	<a href="mailto:David.Stuart@HistoricEngland.org.uk">David.Stuart@HistoricEngland.org.uk</a>	
Glos County Council	<a href="mailto:Rob.niblett@gloucestershire.gov.uk">Rob.niblett@gloucestershire.gov.uk</a>	
Environment Agency	<a href="mailto:planning-wallingford@environment-agency.gov.uk">planning-wallingford@environment-agency.gov.uk</a>	
LEP	<a href="mailto:info@gfirst.co.uk">info@gfirst.co.uk</a>	
Local Nature Partnership	<a href="mailto:info@gloucestershirewildlifetrust.co.uk">info@gloucestershirewildlifetrust.co.uk</a>	
AONB	<a href="mailto:john.mills@cotswoldsaonb.org.uk">john.mills@cotswoldsaonb.org.uk</a>	
Water Park	<a href="mailto:Matthew.Millett@waterpark.org">Matthew.Millett@waterpark.org</a>	

Thames Water	<a href="mailto:townplanningpolicy@thameswater.co.uk">townplanningpolicy@thameswater.co.uk</a>	
Clinical Commissioning Group	<a href="mailto:GLCCG.enquiries@nhs.net">GLCCG.enquiries@nhs.net</a>	
MOD		
All surrounding parish councils, including outside Gloucestershire		
Siddington Parish	<a href="mailto:siddingtonclerk@gmail.com">siddingtonclerk@gmail.com</a>	
Preston parish	<a href="mailto:clerk@prestonpc.org.uk">clerk@prestonpc.org.uk</a>	
Somerford Keynes	<a href="mailto:skpcclerk@gmail.com">skpcclerk@gmail.com</a>	
Driffield	<a href="mailto:dhparishclerk@googlemail.com">dhparishclerk@googlemail.com</a>	
Latton parish	<a href="mailto:clerk@lattonparishcouncil.org.uk">clerk@lattonparishcouncil.org.uk</a>	
Cricklade	<a href="mailto:admin@crickladetowncouncil.gov.uk">admin@crickladetowncouncil.gov.uk</a>	
Leigh Parish	<a href="mailto:LeighParishCouncil@yahoo.com">LeighParishCouncil@yahoo.com</a>	
Ashton Keynes Parish	<a href="mailto:clerk@akpc.org.uk">clerk@akpc.org.uk</a>	
Elected members:		
Shaun Parsons	<a href="mailto:Shaun.parsons@gloucestershire.gov.uk">Shaun.parsons@gloucestershire.gov.uk</a>	
Mike Evemy	<a href="mailto:Mike.evemy@cotswold.gov.uk">Mike.evemy@cotswold.gov.uk</a>	
Juliet Layton	<a href="mailto:Juliet.layton@cotswold.gov.uk">Juliet.layton@cotswold.gov.uk</a>	
National Grid	<a href="mailto:n.grid@amecfw.com">n.grid@amecfw.com</a>	
CPRE	<a href="mailto:lisa.belfield@cpreglos.org.uk">lisa.belfield@cpreglos.org.uk</a>	
South Cerney Trust	<a href="mailto:chairman@southcerneytrust.org.uk">chairman@southcerneytrust.org.uk</a>	

# South Cerney Neighbourhood Plan Household Survey



## Introduction

Local communities can make a Neighbourhood Plan to influence what type of development takes place in the area. This survey will be part of the evidence for South Cerney's Neighbourhood Plan, which will apply until 2031. The area covered is the Parish of South Cerney, which includes Cerney Wick and the Duke of Gloucester barracks. The information you supply will be treated as confidential, and will only be used for the Neighbourhood Plan. Comments made will be anonymous in the analysis. Your replies will be processed by Gloucestershire Rural Community Council, on behalf of South Cerney Parish Council. If you do not have a view on a particular question, you don't have to answer it and please leave it blank (do not cross through).

To return completed forms, see details on the [last page](#).

Please provide the following

Street Name:

Please complete your postcode: **GL7**

--	--	--

## Part A: ABOUT YOUR HOME AND HOUSEHOLD

**A1 How many people of each age group live in your home?** Please include students living away during term time.

	1	2	3	4	5+
0-18 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19-40 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41-59 years old	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aged 60+	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**A2 How many bedrooms are there in your home?**

1     
  2     
  3     
  4     
  5+

**A3 How many people of each group live in your home?** Please include students living away during term time.

	1	2	3	4	5+
Employed/self-employed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Main homemaker or full-time carer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unemployed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Retired	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, please state below	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ann Edwards School	<a href="mailto:head@annedwardsprimary.co.uk">head@annedwardsprimary.co.uk</a>	
Chapter Manor		
Boxbush Farm		
Coop		
Canals Trust	<a href="mailto:mail@cotswoldcanals.com">mail@cotswoldcanals.com</a>	
Lakes Management Company		
FWAG		
Holborne and Owners		
Watercraft and Owners		
Lock keepers Cottage Spine Road/ Gateway		
Cerney Wick Round House		
Linden Homes		
Blue Cedar Homes		
Talland House		
Lock House		
Sustrans	<a href="http://www.sustrans.org.uk">www.sustrans.org.uk</a>	



**A4 How many in your household work or are studying at the following?**

	1	2	3	4	5+
At home	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Elsewhere in South Cerney	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cirencester	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Swindon	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gloucester or Cheltenham	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Elsewhere in Gloucestershire or Wiltshire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Further away	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**A5 How many in your household regularly use the following as transport to work or study?**

	1	2	3	4	5+
Own car/van/motorcycle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Train	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bicycle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Walking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Car-share/lift-share	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**PART B: YOUR VIEWS ON SOUTH CERNEY**

**B1 How important to you are the following aspects of South Cerney and Cerney Wick?**

	Very important	Important	Not important	No opinion
The surrounding countryside	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilities for leisure and sport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community spirit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Peaceful and safe neighbourhood	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local shops and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lots of things going on e.g. events, clubs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good public transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Appropriate housing available	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local employment opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B2 What top three things does your household like most about living in the Parish of South Cerney?**

**B3 What top three things does your household most dislike about living in the Parish of South Cerney?**

**B4 How important to you are the following facilities within the Parish?**

	Very important	Important	Not important	No opinion
Allotments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Churches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local health services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Post Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pubs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School or Playgroup	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sports facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Village Hall and Fenton's	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Walks and rural paths	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B5 What additional facilities are needed?**

**B6 What improvements could be made to existing facilities?**

**Roads, pavements and paths**

**B7 Are you concerned about parking issues?**

Yes  No

**B9 Are you concerned about other traffic issues?**

Yes  No

**B8 If yes, in which areas?**

**B10 If yes, in which areas?**

**B11 What parking or traffic improvements would you like to see? Tick all that apply**

- Yellow lines       Off-street parking       New car parks  
 Reducing speed limits       Traffic calming measures       None  
 Other, please specify;

**B12 What changes for pedestrians or cyclists would you like to see, and where?**

## Housing

**B13** Which types of new homes are needed in the Parish? Tick all that apply

- Affordable homes for sale or rent
- Bungalows
- Private semi-detached/terraced houses (2 or 3 bedrooms)
- Private detached houses (3 or more bedrooms)
- Sheltered accommodation for older people

**B14** What scale of housing development schemes should be given priority? Tick one only

- Less than 5 dwellings
- 5 to 10 dwellings
- 11 to 50 dwellings
- Schemes of over 50 dwellings
- No opinion

**B15** If new homes are built, which locations would you prefer? Tick all that apply

- Greenfield sites outside the village boundaries
- Infill sites within South Cerney village
- Redevelopment of existing housing areas
- Green spaces within South Cerney village
- No opinion

## Natural and historic heritage

**B16** Which buildings or places in South Cerney and Cerney Wick are most important to your household?

**B17** Which views in and around South Cerney and Cerney Wick are most important to your household?

**B18** Which green spaces in or around the Parish are the most important to your household?

## Flooding and Sewerage

**B19** Has your home been affected by any of the following? Tick all that apply

- Flooding of your drains or sewers
- Flooding of your buildings or garden
- Flooding of the public road by your property

**B20** How concerned are you about flood risk in your area? *Tick one only*

- Very                       Moderately                       Not at all                       No opinion

**B21** Which of the following flood measures would you like to see? *Tick all that apply*

- Effective use of flood meadows
- Monitoring and managing silt levels in the River Churn
- Embankments along the river
- Better use and maintenance of field drainage ditches
- No opinion

**B22** What other flood risk improvements would you like to see?

**Duke of Gloucester Barracks - the Army Camp**

If you are a resident at the Duke of Gloucester Barracks, please answer questions B23 and B24. Otherwise, please go to question B25.

**B23** How important to you are the following?

	Very important	Important	Not important	No opinion
Use of village facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Being part of the village community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Being independent of the village	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B24** As a resident at the camp, how could it be better integrated into the village?

**Holiday Homes**

**B25** What are your views on the lakeside holiday homes in the Parish of South Cerney? *Tick all that apply*

- Too many already
- About the right number now
- More would be appropriate
- Holiday occupancy restrictions should be fully enforced
- No opinion

### Cotswold Water Park

**B26 How important to you are the following aspects of the Water Park around the Parish of South Cerney?**

	Very important	Important	Not important	No opinion
Tranquillity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sport and leisure facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access for walking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access for cycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fishing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wildlife and biodiversity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Employment

**B27 Which types of employment do you think are important for the future of our Parish?**

	Very important	Important	Not important	No opinion
Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Businesses on industrial estates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People working from home	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Retail/Service companies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tourism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gravel and aggregates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HM Forces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B28 How important to you are the following in our Neighbourhood Plan?**

	Very important	Important	Not important	No opinion
Small office spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Small industrial units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Large office buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Large industrial units	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shared work spaces for home workers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Identifying further employment sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Climate Change

**B29 How important to you are the following for the Parish of South Cerney?**

	Very important	Important	Not important	No opinion
Home renewable energy generation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reduction in energy use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Better insulation of existing homes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conversion to LED street lighting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Greater recycling of waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Install electric vehicle charging points	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Improved public transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increase walking and cycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Learning from the past

**B30** What aspects from past development or changes in land-use do you think should be taken into account when considering the future of South Cerney?

### Vision for the Future

**B31** What other planning issues would you like to be addressed for the future of South Cerney?

### Return of forms

Please return completed forms **by Monday, 16th January 2017**, to any of these addresses:  
Atkyns Manor; Bakers Farm House, Cerney Wick; 4 Brambling Mews; 35 Broadway Lane; The Stables, High Street; 1 Lakeside; 1 The Old School, School Lane; Cherry Orchard, The Langet; The Cottage, High Street; Rivendell, Meadow Way; 1 Kingfisher Place; Laburnum, Silver Street; 6 The Lennards; the Post Office.

If you need further copies of this form, please download from [www.southcerneyplan.org.uk](http://www.southcerneyplan.org.uk) or collect from the Post office.

### More information

On 25th March 2017 there will be a public event in South Cerney so that everyone can come and discuss our Neighbourhood Plan. This will be a further opportunity for you and other members of your household to provide your evidence to shape and support the policies in our Neighbourhood Plan.  
More details can be found at: [www.southcerneyplan.org.uk](http://www.southcerneyplan.org.uk)

Thank you.

South Cerney Parish Council - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

December 2016

# South Cerney Neighbourhood Plan Business Survey 2017



## The Future of South Cerney We would like your opinion

Dear Business Owner/Manager

We are currently putting together the content for our Neighbourhood Plan that will steer the development of the Parish of South Cerney, which includes Cerney Wick and the Duke of Gloucester Barracks, for the period up to 2031. We have already recently sent out a Household questionnaire.

As a local business, your opinion really does count and by providing us with it, the plan can take account of your needs, hopes and aspirations for the future.

The information you supply will be treated as confidential, and will only be used for the Neighbourhood Plan. Comments made will be anonymous in the analysis.

### What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

The Neighbourhood Plan is a document that informs the way in which the future face of the Parish of South Cerney, Cerney Wick and their environs will develop over the forthcoming years. It is vitally important for the future development of the area that an evidence based plan is constructed that reflects the views and aspirations of its residents and businesses.

Businesses are essential to the vitality and sustainability of our community; therefore we want to understand your needs. We have already been working to establish residents' views by a separate questionnaire. The next step is to obtain further evidence and statistics specifically from business owners within the parish through this questionnaire. This will help us to gather information regarding business issues which should be included within the plan.

**PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BY 28 FEBRUARY 2017 AND RETURN IN THE SAE PROVIDED.**

### PART A: Your Business

**A1 What is the street name and Postcode of your business?**

Street:

Postcode: **GL7**

--	--	--	--

**A2 Which of the following best describes the nature of your business? (Tick all that apply)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Building, Construction & Property Maintenance | <input type="checkbox"/> Business Support e.g. call centres, IT consultancy etc. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering/Manufacturing                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Health & Beauty   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Horticulture                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Pubs, Leisure, Tourism                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Retail/Distribution                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Creative/Artistic                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Repair, Servicing, Restoration                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Care Services                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please specify;                                  |

**A3 How many people are currently employed by your South Cerney based business?**

Full time equivalent

Part time

**A4 How many of these employees live within South Cerney or elsewhere? (if known)**

South Cerney

--	--	--

Cirencester

--	--	--

Swindon

--	--	--

Within 10 miles of South Cerney  
(excl. Cirencester above)

--	--	--

Further than 10 miles of South  
Cerney (excl. Swindon above)

--	--	--

**A5 Where is your business carried out from?**

- An office
- Retail Premises
- Hotel/Inn
- Restaurant/Cafe
- Your home
- Industrial Premises
- Agricultural Premises
- Nursing Home
- Other, please specify;

**A6 In which area of the parish is your business located? e.g. Village Centre, Industrial Estate**

**A7 For how long has your business operated within the parish?**

**A8 What attracted your business to locate and remain in South Cerney? (Tick all that apply)**

- Close proximity to M4, M5
- Rail links to London
- Availability of employment/industrial/office premises
- Historically the business was already established within the parish
- Availability of staff
- Environment
- Live in the parish
- The attraction of being located in a Cotswold village
- Other, please specify;

**A9 What improvements in facilities and infrastructure would you like to see?**

**A10 Is your location in the parish important to the success of your business?**

Yes

No

**A11 If 'yes', why?**



**A12** What developments in the village would enable you to reduce your environmental impacts?

**A13** How are your business activities in the parish expected to change over the next;

	Increase	Stay about the same	Reduce
5 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**A14** What factors (such as infrastructure, connections, availability of staff and land etc.) will influence your decisions to expand or contract your business in South Cerney?

**A15** Are there any areas of the parish where more land should be available for business activities?

Yes  No

**A16** If 'yes', where?

**PART B: Transport, Parking & Traffic**

**B1** How strongly do you agree that the following changes are needed in South Cerney?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
More parking spaces	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More frequent bus services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Better network of cycle paths and footpaths	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**B2** Do you feel that traffic congestion in South Cerney is a problem?

Yes  No

**B4** Does your Business implement a car share policy?

Yes  No

**B3** If 'yes', what would you implement to reduce traffic congestion?

**B5** How many car parking spaces does your business have?

**B6** Approximately what % of your workforce travel to work by the following methods of transport?

Car	<input type="text"/>
Bus	<input type="text"/>
Taxi	<input type="text"/>
Motorcycle/Scooter	<input type="text"/>
Bicycle	<input type="text"/>
Walk	<input type="text"/>

**B7** Do you have adequate spaces for you needs?

Yes

No

**B8** Please use the space below to add any further comments you would like to make.

On Saturday, 25th March 2017 there will be a public event for residents in South Cerney so that everyone can come and discuss our Neighbourhood Plan.

**On Thursday, 20th April 2017 between 12 and 3pm, we would like to invite you to Fenton's Community Centre in Teal Way to discuss the findings of this business questionnaire.**

More details on both events can be found at: [www.southcerneyplan.org.uk](http://www.southcerneyplan.org.uk)

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire.

**South Cerney Parish Council - Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  
February 2017**



## **South Cerney Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Important - Household Questionnaire**

Dear Owner,

Local communities can make a Neighbourhood Plan to influence what type of development takes place in the area. This survey will be part of the evidence for South Cerney's Neighbourhood Plan, which will apply until 2038.

The area covered is the Parish of South Cerney, which includes Cerney Wick and the Duke of Gloucester barracks.

The information you supply will be treated as confidential, and will only be used for the Neighbourhood Plan. Comments made will be anonymous in the analysis.

As an owner of a holiday home in the Parish we would like to collect your views on a number of questions and have constructed a simple questionnaire.

We hope that you would be prepared to contribute your views to this process and thank you in advance for taking time during your holiday to take part.

We will be arranging a public consultation to share the first draft of the plan in due course.

Could you complete the form and return by email to:

[clerk@southcerney.org.uk](mailto:clerk@southcerney.org.uk)

by **Friday 29th June**

Thank you.

**How important to you are the following aspects of the Parish of South Cerney?**

	Very important	Important	Not Important	No opinion
The surrounding countryside	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Facilities for leisure and sport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community spirit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Peaceful and safe neighbourhood	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local shops and services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lots of things going on eg events, clubs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good public transport	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**What top three things do you like most about coming to the Parish of South Cerney?**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

**What top three things do you most dislike about coming to the Parish of South Cerney?**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

**How important to you are the following facilities?**

	Very important	Important	Not Important	No opinion
Churches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local health services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Playgrounds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pubs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shops	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sports facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Village Hall and Fentons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Walks and rural paths	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**What additional facilities are needed?**

**What improvements could be made to existing facilities?**

**Are you concerned about parking issues?** Yes

No

**If yes, in which areas?**

**Are you concerned about other traffic issues?** Yes

No

**If yes, in which areas ?**

**What parking or traffic improvements would you like to see? Tick all that apply**

- |                          |                          |                       |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Yellow Lines             | <input type="checkbox"/> | Off street parking    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| New car parks            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Reducing speed limits | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Traffic calming measures | <input type="checkbox"/> | None                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Other, please specify;

**What changes for pedestrians or cyclists would you like to see, and where?**

**Which buildings or places in the Parish of South Cerney are most important to you?**

**Which views in and around the Parish of South Cerney are most important to you?**

**Which green spaces in and around the Parish of South Cerney are most important to you?**

**How important to you are the following aspects of the Water Park?**

**Very important    Important    Not Important    No opinion**

Tranquillity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sport and leisure facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access for walking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access for cycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fishing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wildlife and biodiversity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>





Date	Comment from:	Policy/para or General	Summary of Comment	Response
14-Oct-20	David, Enid and Adnan Chubb, Boxbush Farm,	LGS1 SC12	Objection to designation as Local Green space and footpath	Explanation provided to resident in order to allay fears and provide reassurance. Footpath is a defined footpath on the County Plan
8-Oct-20	Alan Fisher	Footpaths	Support for cycle way to Cirencester and linking of footpaths	Noted
28-Sep-20	The Environment Agency	Para 5.14	Your plan refers to flood risk but mainly in relation to groundwater flooding but you may wish to consider reflecting the need to ensure the Sequential and Exception Tests are applied in line with the NPPF. However, it would not be necessary to include a policy if the Cotswold Local Plan adequately covers this requirement.	Local Plan Policy EN14 covers the requirement
7-Sep-20			Comment in relation to traffic issues and problems	Advised that this is not a subject that can be resolved in a Neighbourhood Plan. Attention drawn to Community Action.
28-Aug-20	Gloucester Wildlife Trust		We receive a lot of requests to review and contribute to NDP's. As a charity, we have limited resources and have a large workload looking after our nature reserves and trying to reverse countywide declines in biodiversity. Sadly, this means that we rarely have capacity to review draft Neighbourhood Development Plans or respond to consultation requests.	Noted
2-Nov-20	Thames Water	SC14	Thames Water is currently working with the developer for the Chesterton development and a strategic solution is being delivered which will improve flooding resilience for the existing sewer system. Part of the existing sewage in Cirencester will be diverted and connected to a new sewer system that will provide more resilience to groundwater infiltration affecting foul sewers and receiving sewage treatment works.	Noted

1-Sep-20	Mike Barton, Gloucester County Council		As you probably know we, in the PROW team, do try to promote easier access path furniture and we try to work with landowners to remove stiles and replace with pedestrian gates or kissing gates. In fact we did a big project with CWP and SCPC about 10 years ago when we replaced 50 stiles. However, we do not seek to try and replace stone stiles with kissing gates as a matter of course, despite the fact they are not always the easiest things to negotiate. They are part of the historic countryside. Furthermore, path furniture is the responsibility of the landowner and if he or she decides that they want to keep a stone stile or replace it then it is their choice. I do not have the authority to force them to do so even if I wanted to.	Noted
13-Sep-20	Oliver Collins, Avison Young, 65 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NQ On behalf of Hoborne Cotswold Holiday Park	General	SC4, SC7 and SC16 support, SC6 "we recommend a clarification that in accordance with policy EC11 of the Cotswolds District Local Plan the policy SC6 should only relate to built hotels, holiday accommodation and self catering accommodation and not to the use of land for caravans that are permitted outside development boundaries"	The Local Plan Policy EC11 permits the expansion, upgrading or redevelopment of existing accommodation at static caravan and holiday parks provided that it addresses an identified weakness in the local tourist economy. No policy amendment made.
14-Oct-20	Cricklade Town Council		Declined to comment	Noted
3-Nov-20	Natural England		No specific comments	Noted
3-Nov-20	MOD Room 106 (EOC), Building 420, MOD Corsham , Corsham, Wiltshire, SN13 9NR	NDP Area	Object to the MOD Duke of Gloucestershire Barracks (DOGB) within the designated Plan Area.	A parish is automatically granted neighbourhood area status when a parish council is applying for the whole parish and no more.
		SC2	Objects to the inclusion of the DOGB in the area of exclusion and the duplication with Cotswold District Council Local plan policy DS4	Advised that the requirements of Policy SC2 do not apply to the Duke of Gloucestershire Barracks where development for defence purposes will always be permitted. Policy SC2 amended accordingly.

5-Nov-20	Cotswold Canals Trust	Page 5 2.1.6	<p>Rewording from "the canal was never a success" to read "The canal was quite successful for many decades; the management having largely overcome the technical challenges of water supply and leakage. The biggest limit to sustained success was the very poor state of the River Thames navigation between Lechlade and Oxford. Improvements to this were only completed in the 20th century and after the canal closed.</p> <p>The canal was used to import materials for the local railways in the 1840s and the arrival of the railways certainly did not help. Once the canal's income fell, the maintenance deteriorated and that in turn reduced the reliability of the canal thus creating a vicious circle. In its turn, the railway carried the locally extracted gravels for the new motorways and dual carriageway.</p> <p>The railway closed in the 1960s.</p>	Amended
		SC12	Suggest amending order of list to group all Thames and Severn Canal heritage assets.	List is in order
		SC16 bullet 3	Add clarity - 'restoration & Maintenance of Thames and Severn Canal Towpath'	Amended
		Page 11 4.8	Add canal towpaths to sentence	No amendment. SC6 refers to lakes not canal
		Page 11 4.9	Add 'improving access to canal and lakeside areas'	No amendment. SC6 refers to lakes not canal
		Page 16 5.7	The canal has not been considered in this section. We know that the canal does and will continue to make huge contributions to the visitor economy and should be included as a local asset that draws visitors in response to the heritage, wildlife, conservation and general attractiveness. By the end of this NDP the canal restoration will be much more advanced and will benefit the visitor economy even further.	The footpath makes the contribution, not the canal itself - no evidence for otherwise. Policy does not exclude canal in any way.

		Page 20 5.10	Canal benefits-The NCA profiles (provided as supporting documentation to this consultation) of both South Cerney and Thames Clay Vales note the importance of canals towards improvements and enhancements of environment and natural habitats derived from canals and their environs. The plan to meet the government target of 10% for Biodiversity net Gain could be supported by the restoration of the Thames and Severn canal.	No green corridor exists in the Parish at present and the canal restoration has not been formally discussed or agreed.
		Appendices Page 6	Amend 15 & 16 to read 'Thames and Severn canal'	Amended
		Page 27	Refer to Cotswold Canals website alongside CCIP	Corrected website address
		Page 37	Add reference to Cotswold Canals Trust website	Corrected website address
4-Nov-20	Hannah Gillet, Lichfields, The Quorum, Bond Street, Bristol, BS1 3AE on behalf of the Vistry Group	NDP Overall	Assertion that the plan is not positive in its intentions in accordance with NPPF/NPPG requirements	Positive policies such as; employment SC3, renewable energy SC15, tourist facilities SC7, the redevelopment of the garage SC13 and policy SC9 encouraging community facility improvements show positivity.
		SC2	Objection to the inclusion of land at Crossroads Farm in the area of separation	Area of separation amended, plan included in text and policy SC2 reworded.
		NCA	Contents that it has not been drawn up with professional advice or in accordance with industry standards	No need to employ a professional for NCA.
6-Nov-20	Steven Sykes, Lock House, Cirencester Road, South Cerney, GL7 6HU	SC12 Local Heritage Assets	Objects to the inclusion of the Lock House as a Local Heritage Asset on the grounds; that it has not been discussed with him, that it has been renovated internally and externally since being scheduled for demolition and that it is his family home. Agrees with the retention of the lock but wants to be able to fill it in the future.	Consultation facilitated by this process. Reassured that there is no intention to restrict his enjoyment. Policy SC 12 has been amended to clarify designation.
6-Nov-20	Brian Hudson, Cirencester Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	General	The CMP SG strongly endorses the desire to maintain the physical separation of the village of South Cerney from Cirencester, Siddington and Preston.	Noted

			<p>It is the understanding of the CNP SG that the major Steadings (aka Chesterton) development will require an overall upgrade of the sewage system. The SG is not aware of the details but your document has alerted us to investigate further and, in particular, whether the plant at Shornocote will be able to cope with the full local requirements and thus avoid the discharge of untreated sewage</p>	Noted
			<p>The document mentions the Lakeside Business Park but does not make reference to the CDC's Green Economic Growth Strategy which identifies Cirencester and South Cerney as suitable locations for high technology manufacturing</p>	It is confirmed that Policies SC4, SC5 and SCI17 support the draft CDC Green Economic Growth Strategy
			<p>The CNP SG strongly endorses the need for a cycle path between South Cerney and Cirencester. This requirement will be an element of the Cirencester Neighbourhood Plan</p>	Noted
			<p>The CNP SG supports the concern expressed about access to the lakes in the residential developments.</p>	Noted
6-Nov-20	Matthew Millet, Cotswold Water Park Trust		<p>The Plan does not make reference to the Cotswold Water Park Vision and Implementation Plan 2008, it is mentioned in the Local Plan.</p>	We support the CWP Vision and Implementation Plan of which the non-technical summary has been reviewed and there is no conflict with our aims or policies.
6-Nov-20	Historic England		<p>Support, no comments to make</p>	Noted
6-Nov-20	Gloucester County Council		<p>Please note that Key Wildlife Sites are now called Local Wildlife Sites (as of early 2019).</p>	Policy has been rewritten.

SC10	Proposed Policy SC10 refers to Appendix F: Local Ecology (sites) but only SSSIs and SACs are shown in contrast to the SEA Screening report. It is recommended that Appendix F is expanded to show the presence of Local Wildlife Sites. The locations of Key Wildlife Sites (now LWSs) are already shown on page 10 of the SEA Screening report. However, current boundaries and presence of LWSs should be re-checked with GCR (https://www.gcr.co.uk/). It is also worth being aware that the boundaries of the Cotswold Water Park SSSI are under review/re-notification by Natural England and so some reference to this should be made in the text at section 5.10. Please also note that the requirement for development to achieve a 10% biodiversity net gain has not yet been confirmed by government (as at 09/10/2020). It is recommended that proposed policy SC10 could be improved with alternative wording as follows:	Policy and justification has been rewritten following new SSSI notification.
6-Nov-20	Lutton Parish Council	POLICY SC10 suggested rewording- Biodiversity Important Biodiversity Sites shown in Appendix F: Local Ecology, are to be conserved so that the wildlife value of the sites are protected and, where possible, enhanced. Where the benefits of development are so great that it is considered harm to these sites or priority habitats or species* is justified, then adequate mitigation and conservation measures will need to be drawn up and included in any planning application. These measures and future maintenance of biodiversity value, are required to be a condition of any planning permission granted. All developments are normally expected to achieve an overall biodiversity net gain that at least matches that required by legislation and national or other local plan
28-Sep-20	Gill and Roger Scott, Rivendell, Meadow Way, South Cerney, GL7 6HY	No Comments Support policies
7-Sep-20	Susan Cooksley, 3 Edwards College, Silver Street, South Cerney, GL7 5TR	Very strongly in support

5-Nov-20	Cotswold District Council	Page 6 para 2.2	<p>It might be helpful in the landscape section to refer to the various landscape character assessments that have been undertaken of this area -</p> <p><a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/586554770395136?category=587130">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/586554770395136?category=587130</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/media/6800/glca_report_severn__other_vales_text_2006-51673.pdf">https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/media/6800/glca_report_severn__other_vales_text_2006-51673.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/3xrnffaz/cotswold-water-park-landscape-character-assessment.pdf">https://www.cotswold.gov.uk/media/3xrnffaz/cotswold-water-park-landscape-character-assessment.pdf</a></p> <p>These provide useful descriptions of the area and its landscape character and also highlight opportunities and potential landscape constraints.</p>	Listed in the NCA
		2.2.2	<p>'Within the parish lies a large part of the CWP' is a bit clumsy, given the full extent of the CWP, covering some 40 sq. miles. This is not to underplay the significance of the Water Park landscape or its significance to residents. 'South Cerney lies at the heart of the Cotswold Water Park, which provides an open landscape...' or similar would spell out the significance of the CWP.</p>	No planning implications
		Page 8 2.3.7	<p>references the number of people working from home at the time of the 2011 Census. It could be worth a further reflection on this paragraph that this number is likely to have risen in line with general trends, and will have spiked substantially during the Covid-19 lockdown, likely to lead to a significantly higher rate in the future.</p>	Agreed paragraph amended
		Page 9 2.4.1	<p>This para states 'Over 75% of the Parish's permanent population ... are working' - This seems too high, given numbers of young people and retirees - is this the percentage of adults of working age, or adults generally?</p>	Amended to "over 75% of the population are economically active, that is, either working or unemployed"

SC1	<p>Proposed re wording-Design guidelines for South Cerney</p> <p>Proposals for new development, including extensions to existing buildings, should be of the highest design standards, in accordance with the relevant policies of the Cotswold Local Plan, including the Cotswold Design Code or their successor documents. The proposals should have specific regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Retaining and, where appropriate, enhancing key views and vista as identified on map X</li> <li>II. Reflecting and respecting local character and features, as assessed within the NCA, the relevant Conservation Area appraisal and other local character assessments</li> <li>III. The design guidance within the NCA and in particular – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Reflecting the open green character of many of the streets within South Cerney</li> <li>· Taking design clues from some of the narrower lanes in the parish when designing new footpaths and cycleways</li> <li>· Using the palette of local building materials found within the parish</li> <li>· The inclusion of drystone walls for boundaries</li> <li>· Taking opportunities to remove existing overhead wires and to ensuring that cabling is installed underground in new developments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· addressing negative issues, features and sites as described in the NCA.</li> </ul> </li> <li>· Ensuring that any new development in the Lakes Character Area is in keeping with its lakeside location</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Conservation Area Statement, including its accompanying maps, drawn up by CDC in 2002, although somewhat dated, was used as an important reference document in preparing the NCA and continues to be an important consideration for future development proposals.</p>	<p>Policy SC1 amended.</p>
Para 5.1.1	<p>Important Views, Important Approaches, and/or Focal Features are set out in the Conservation Area Character Map (Appendix C). Additional Views and Vistas from the NCA are detailed in Appendix E. It is quite difficult to see the numbers on the first of the views maps.</p>	<p>NCA is included as an appendix</p>
Para 5.1.2-5.1.5	<p>It might be easier to show these areas on a map rather than people having to refer to a separate document.</p>	<p>See map 4.1.3 in NCA</p>



			6.2 "in all of the sub-areas excluding the Lakes sub-area, new developments should take account of the Cotswold Design Code (which is Appendix D to the 2011-2131 CDC Local Plan) and this NCA report."	NCA amended
			The Cotswold Design Code is relevant to all development in the District and the Lakes area is no exception.	Noted
			At 6.3, the guidance advocates the continued use of a "New England" style although it is positive in its comments on the De Vere hotel which is in a different style. It would be better if this paragraph stated something along the lines of the increased emphasis on contemporary design in this area or something like that.	Paragraph amended
		SC2	CDC consider this superfluous	Policy SC2 has been amended and the area of separation clarified
		SC3	While we welcome the aspiration of this policy, it is not really clear how this support translates into development proposals. Homeworking and microbusiness developments are not a class of development - homeworking development would be residential whereas microbusiness could be either residential or business premises.	Comments noted but no change in policy
			Most development that may support such activity will be permitted development - more so as there are current proposals to enhance permitted development rights and change use classes.	
			An alternative could be to focus the policy on the development of small scale business premises where permission is required - either through an allocation or through an enabling or criteria based policy.	

	Policy title amended	
SC4	<p>As with our closing comment on SC2 above, the title of the policy does not relate well to the actual content - which may prompt a modification from the examiner. The current wording does not establish a test against which development proposals will be measured - and as worded, sits better as a community action than a planning policy. In theory, an action could be required, rather than encouraged, which might fit better as a planning policy. It should also be noted that the policy wording does not set a standard that must be achieved - thus the action sought could be 'demonstrated' by a wholly inadequate proposal.</p>	
	<p>Comparable policies often promote support for 'employment locally' in the area, rather than promote work 'for local residents'.</p>	
	<p>A further thought would be that it could be linked to Policy SC16 Sustainable Transport.</p>	
	<p>'Proposals which support local employment... and include measures to provide/ improve walking and cycling routes...'</p>	
SC5	<p>We are concerned that this policy largely achieves the same as the Local Plan EC policies 1-3, but with different wording. Lakeside is already protected as an employment site.</p>	Policy wording amended.
	<p>EC3 covers employment-generating uses outside of the Development boundary - as indeed referenced in the policy. LP para 9.3.4 sets out that proposals must be in 'keeping in terms of scale, size and function with the location' in any case, which should ensure that adverse impacts on holiday settlements are taken into account.</p>	

			<p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF (<a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/810197/NPPF_Feb_2019_revised.pdf</a>) sets out the expectation of how policies should be prepared, and flags that they should not be duplicatory.</p>	
			<p>That being said, there may be some room for a policy that provides 'local flavour', and that highlights that development outside of the development boundaries could impact on the existing holiday villages. Should you wish to retain a policy, it may need some review to reflect recent changes to use classes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- B2 and B8 remain their own use class.</li> <li>- In the second line, B1 (business) is now subsumed within Class E. So the phrase 'Class B' only refers to B2 and B8.</li> </ul> <p>Change of use to another use within Class E will be allowed without the need for planning permission.</p> <p>As a general point, we would suggest the Local Plan reference is to the 'Local Plan policies' with the specific policy referenced in the reasoned justification, to future proof against the changes to the Local Plan.</p> <p>The final clause referencing the NCA is unnecessary - any development proposal is already expected to have regard to the NCA as a consequence of SC1.</p>	
	SC6		We'd encourage you to review the Local Plan policy SP5.	Policy wording amended

			<p>The policy as drafted expects development - of any scale - to improve public access to the lakes and South Cerney Village. Small scale changes to properties could be classed as development, but would not be able to effect such a change - there needs to be some modifier in this policy to developments of a scale where such a consideration is appropriate and financially viable.</p>	
			<p>The second part of the policy – allowing redevelopment and improvements if they led to minor adverse visual impacts – would be contrary to a range of policies. We could not require one of the improvements to be access as the proposals could be offering a range of other public benefits. Is a visual impact the only adverse impact possible and how is this adverse ‘limited’? Development could impact on traffic, biodiversity, contamination, and so forth.</p>	
			<p>That said, the introductory line of this paragraph suggests that it is simply referencing EC11, in which case it could be omitted or moved to the reasoned justification.</p>	
			<p>The two references to ‘new holiday accommodation’ in the two clauses of this policy seem rather contradictory - the second clause notes that such developments will not normally be permitted, whereas the first sets expectations for the access that such sites should provide.</p>	

	SC7	<p>The policy states that development that significantly harms the tranquility of lakes used for quiet recreational pursuits (...) will not normally be permitted. 'Not normally' is vague -it would be useful to state what the 'abnormals' are that might enable this development – otherwise this policy is simply restrictive, and may not be considered as supportive of sustainable development. We don't believe this policy adds anything to the wording of LP EC10 - Development Of Tourist Facilities and Visitor Attractions and SP5 - Cotswold Water Park: Post-mineral Extraction After Use. New or extended tourist facilities and visitor attractions (excluding accommodation) will be permitted provided the proposal : - a. has a functional relationship and special affinity with the historic and natural heritage of the area; · b. is well related to the main tourist routes; · c. is an identified opportunity that is not met by existing facilities; and · d. as far as possible, use is made of existing buildings, particularly agricultural buildings in the countryside, with the number and scale of new buildings kept to a minimum. It would be helpful if your plan supported EC10 and then highlighted that the special affinity should include the tranquillity referenced in your policy. 'Special affinity' - see LP 9.10.4. In addition, tranquillity issues are covered in the local plan at LP EN4 - Development will be permitted where it does not have a significant detrimental impact on the natural and historic landscape (including the tranquillity of the countryside) of Cotswold District or neighbouring areas.</p>	Policy title amended
		<p>We suggest that the word tourist is not inclusive of use of facilities by residents and second home owners. We'd suggest using the word 'Visitor' in the policy title and text as a better reflection on the use of Water Park facilities</p>	
	SC8	<p>The allotments at Upper Up are part of a designated Local Green Space, and thus subject to a stronger constraint than this policy creates. Accordingly they need to be removed from the list.</p>	Policy amended and Appendix G included.

			It would also be useful if a map was provided to illustrate the location of these assets - as the locations may not be apparent to non-residents. Appendix G maps some, but not all of these spaces	
	SC9		It would be useful if the preliminary line of this policy advises whether this list is exhaustive or indicative.	Policy has been amended
			There are a number of facilities on the list where the use could be significantly altered without any need for development - the pharmacy and post office are not distinctive use classes from other forms of retail. Similarly, the veterinary surgery is likely to fall under class E.	
			Class F.2 is new 'local community uses' - e.g. small shops, community halls and swimming pools etc. Changes of use within these classes do not require planning permission.	
			We suggest some rewording, along the following lines, to ensure the policy is positively worded:	
			Development proposals that will result in the loss of use, or redevelopment, including or significant reduction in the scale and value of a community and cultural facility, will be resisted unless: only be supported where...(in order of priority?)	
			alternative facilities of equal or better accessibility, size and suitability are provided; at an alternative site nearby in the NDP area?[ Is location a consideration for the NDP?]	
			Regarding the final clause - the explanation of economically viable could be put in the RJ rather than the policy text itself - the approach taken in the Local Plan.	

	Page20 5.10.1	states "under pressure from the 500,000 annual visitors" - there are a range of pressures on the biodiversity of the area and not just visitors (we'd be interested to know whether this figure is just 'tourists' or whether it is inclusive of day 'visitors' from Swindon and Cirencester, or indeed from within the Waterpark). Other pressures include pollution, invasive species (e.g. mink); disturbance by dog walkers (many of whom could be very local); farming practices etc. - see para 5.10.5.	
	5.10.2	Is an NDP the place for an anecdotal remark from a ranger? Some of the lakes on which there are holiday homes are still high in conservation value - it will be interesting to see if any of them are included in the potential new SSSI boundary.	Ranger comment is relevant
	5.10.3	The CWP Biodiversity Action Plan has now passed its "sell-by date" as it was an action plan for 2007-2016. That said, that much of the content is still relevant. A new CWP Biodiversity Strategy is currently in preparation and should hopefully go out for public consultation in the new year	Plan remains relevant evidence
	5.10.4	The reference to ridge and furrow which is more a landscape archaeology issue than an ecology one	Included in SC12
	SC10	This is not in general conformity with the NPPF (or the local plan) and it is very confusing.	Accepted and policy has been rewritten following notification of SSSI's

			<p>Firstly the policy title refers to "important local ecology sites", however the map at appendix 7 shows SSSIs which are of national importance, so the term "local" should not be used. The policy text then refers to "key Wildlife sites". KWS are a local Gloucestershire designation and are sites of county importance for wildlife (they are also sometimes referred to as "local sites" - particularly in government guidance as this type of designation has historically been called various different things in different parts of the country.)</p>	
			<p>Assuming that policy SC10 is about SSSIs, it will need re-drafted to be in general conformity with both the local plan and the NPPF since it states that "key wildlife sites ...and where possible, enhanced". The NPPF requires biodiversity net gain (BNG) - not just no net loss, where possible. The policy then refers to BNG later on, which makes the policy unclear.</p>	
			<p>In addition there are likely to be new SSSIs designated in the future, as part of the SSSI re-notification process so this policy should not be restricted to sites listed in appendix F.</p>	
			<p>The section in the policy - "Where the benefits of development are so great that it is considered harm to these sites is justified, then adequate mitigation and conservation measures will need to be drawn up and included in any planning application, and these proposals, and future maintenance and application, are required to be a condition of any planning permission with adverse effect on the local wildlife site." is not clear - what are you trying to say that is not already included in the local plan or NPPF?</p>	



			<p>The policy goes on to state that " Overall, a 10% increase in biodiversity will be required, in line with Government guidance." The local plan does not currently have a quantum for biodiversity net gain (BNG) (nor does the NPPF) although the emerging Environment Bill does state 10%. To include a quantum in the NDP would be a first for the District, but it will require careful policy wording.</p>	
			<p>All developments should provide 10% measurable biodiversity net gain, measured using the most up-to-date DEFRA net gain metric or equivalent.</p>	
			<p>This raises a whole series of questions. Do we mean all developments? What happens if it is a householder application for a small extension? Should the 10% be provided on the development site or off-site, and if so, in the parish or in the District? Does the 10% only refer to developments within or affecting SSSIs? The Parish will need to decide what approach they want to take; noting the NPPF does say that all development should provide net gain.</p>	
			<p>Other than the BNG point we are unclear what this policy provides that goes beyond the local plan policy; in addition it does not cover other levels of site designation. Having both this policy and the local plan policy covering SSSIs could be quite confusing for decision-makers.</p>	
	SC11		<p>National policy determines the circumstances where development on Local Green Space is permissible. The second paragraph of this policy seeks to introduce a different test, which does not meet the Basic Conditions - a similar approach has recently been struck out by the Court of Appeal (<a href="https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2020/1259.html">https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2020/1259.html</a>).</p>	Policy wording amended

			We'd suggest this is changed to something like 'Proposals for development within the two designated Local Green Spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances	
	SC12		We support the intention and wording of this policy	Policy wording clarified
			The list of local NDHAs is great, but it is slightly confusing in appendix 1 where you refer to "Serving of Article 4 Directions" - should this be "subject to article 4 directions"?	
			There are a set of photos of the additional NDHAs (that are not referenced in article 4s or in the CA appraisal) but it would also be helpful if they could be shown on a map - including their extent, for example it may be difficult to locate such structures as stiles from photos and the full extent of the canal remains needs to be identified.. This will ensure that the public, land-owners, decision makers etc are clear what is and what is not a NDHA.	
			Isis Lake holiday homes have been included in the list of NDHAs, we would suggest that they are not sufficiently old to be counted as a heritage asset, as they are less than 30 years old and are not of a sufficiently high architectural quality.	Would prefer to include them as a local listing
			Taking listing as a parallel process. Government guidance for listed buildings can be found at -	
			<a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/757054/Revised_Principles_of_Selection_2018.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/757054/Revised_Principles_of_Selection_2018.pdf</a>	

	<p>19. Buildings less than 30 years old: such buildings are not normally considered to be of special architectural or historic interest because they have yet to stand the test of time. It may nevertheless be appropriate to list some modern buildings despite their relatively recent construction – for example, if they demonstrate outstanding quality (generally interpreted as being equivalent to Grade I or II*). The Secretary of State calculates the age of a building from the point at which the ground was first broken.</p>	
	<p>Para 5.12.2</p> <p>We are not sure on the relevance of this para on the canal - is it a reflection on preserving the heritage, in which case a clearer reference could be made to those assets linked with the canal.</p>	<p>Reference to canal locks appears in the paragraph</p>
	<p>SC13</p> <p>The policy is probably acceptable as an aspirational policy, providing a steer on the future use of this site. Given the property sits within the Development Boundary of a principal settlement, it is unlikely that existing planning policy stands in the way of the redevelopment sought by this policy, but a community backed position on the property may encourage action</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p>SC14</p> <p>It is unnecessary to specify 'residential or other development', as 'development' would suffice.</p> <p>para 5.14.2 We would suggest the assertion that the South of Chesterton development will lead to a greater risk of flooding is speculative, and not evidence based so should not sit in the plan as a statement of fact, although could be included as a statement of resident concern/belief.</p>	<p>Justification amended and policy wording clarified</p>

			<p>The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) process already exists - either in Flood Zone 1 (FZ1) with flooding from other sources (such as groundwater), or in FZ 2 and 3 with fluvial flooding; with differing levels of requirements an FRA for a minor extension, which may need a less detailed FRA. If the site is found in a high risk area then an FRA may be required following the relevant NPPG/EA guidance.</p>
			<p>Where a FRA is required, it 'should' include monitoring of groundwater levels (as recommended in the SFRA – which could be explained/quoted in the RJ). This needs to be clear as it is based on the SFRA recommendation which is not compulsory in FRA requirements in the PPG.</p>
			<p>The RJ could mention something about the assessment being proportional based on type/ scale of development, or could advise developers to 'seek Environment Agency advice' (as per national guidance (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-for-planning-applications">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-for-planning-applications</a>)).</p>
			<p>We are a little surprised there is no mention of surface water flooding (which is often linked with groundwater flooding) or from other sources?</p>
			<p>The policy could also add;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● that developers need to demonstrate that flooding will not be exacerbated by the development, including any adverse impact groundwater regime (or other sources), within the development or surrounding area</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● where possible, ensure the incorporation of sustainable drainage techniques.</li> <li>● Take into account all relevant local and national policies and guidance</li> </ul>

			There is a lot of technical FRA guidance - which we'd avoid direct reference to within policy, as it may change during the Plan lifetime.	
	SC15		Please note that this is an issue that will be explored through the update of the Local Plan, and thus any policy could be superseded by a new Local Plan policy. This policy states that environmental improvements should outweigh other considerations, but does not explain how to weigh up benefits. This could be interpreted as allowing upvc on heritage buildings - or external cladding. We suggest it needs tempering with some recognition of planning balance.	Policy reworded
			In addition this policy SC15 implies an equal weighting however national policy requires decision makers to give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets.	
			Does the Parish have any suggestions as to how these benefits or impacts should be measured? e.g. sometimes solar panels applications are submitted and given their position they may generate little electricity and the property has not actually been insulated to prevent energy loss. A nuanced approach is required around conserving energy first, and then generating additional energy if appropriate.	
			RJ could note evidence to support the need for the policy - did it come out in the household survey? ONS data? The policy is quite generally supportive, but does not seem particularly related to the South Cerney area.	
			Unacceptable landscape and other impacts should be avoided or mitigated, but what would be acceptable?	

		Perhaps could add something like 'the impacts should be assessed with reference to national planning policy and other relevant policies applying in the area.'	
	SC16	We suggest that the word 'maintain' needs to be replaced - it could be read as 'maintain' as in 'support the upkeep'. Instead we'd suggest 'retain'.	Policy amended
		'Support will be given to proposals (including tourism and leisure) that retain, improve and extend the existing footpath and cycle path network. The following infrastructure projects are priorities for improvements: ...'	
	SC17	Policy SC17 refers to "developments" - does this really mean all developments including household developments?  There is no reference to local plan policy and para 10.4.11 which refers to the national dark skies mapping information.  The policy is not that clear as to when a lighting scheme will be required - is it only for those lighting schemes which in themselves require PP or is wider than that?  The policy does not cover the landscape impacts of lighting on both landscape character and appearance, and thus to that extent, does not go as far as the NPPF statement at 5.17.2. We suggest this needs to be picked up in the policy to ensure is fully reflects the NPPF/	Policy wording amended and justification clarified
		10.4.11 LP mentions tranquility and 'dark skies' and sources of evidence to have regard to, and recommends 'A landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) should include reference to tranquility, lighting and Dark Skies where appropriate'.	

			<p>It would be useful to understand the impetus for this policy - and to point this out in the introductory text. Is there something about the landscape character which makes the area special (reference the evidence Landscape Character Assessment?) and role of development within it, i.e. external lighting? Together, these points would route the policy a bit more clearly in the local context.</p>	
			<p>For comparison, See Malpas and Overton NDP – Policy LC1, 2nd clause.</p>	
			<p>External lighting, associated with new development, must be designed to minimise its impact on landscape character whilst providing the required level of lighting for personal security. This should include consideration of the timing of lighting use and effective technologies to minimise light spillage (such as down lighting).</p>	

