

To be read only by the Planning committee members and associated CDC staff

As a result of several residents experiencing online harassment this statement has been submitted for Councillors to read. It's concerning that some residents have been subjected to a constant barrage of written and verbal intimidation by supporters of this scheme, merely for expressing their opinions as part of our democratic process.

The applicant claims that this resubmitted planning application addresses the refusal reasons given in June 2023. This is blatantly not true, and the case officer has recommended this application be refused. Policies in the local plan and national guidance which National Landscapes (AONBs) provide clear rational for a second refusal of planning permission.

Refusal reason 1: The application site lies within an area of open countryside outside of the defined settlement development boundary for Tetbury with inadequate provision of public transport.

Nothing has changed on this point. The proposed contributions for lighting and bus stops are tokenistic at best, and bus stops are pointless if there are no buses.

Refusal reason 2: The site is in the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the development would therefore result in landscape and visual harm to the special qualities of the AONB and would be contrary to Local Plan Policies EN4 and EN5, and Section 15 of the NPPF.

Nothing has changed on this point.

Refusal reason 3: The design of the development is of a poor quality, out of keeping with the local townscape and inconsistent with the requirements of the Cotswold Design Code. The development would therefore be contrary to Cotswold District Local Plan Policies EN1, EN2 and the Cotswold Design Code; Policy 2 of the Tetbury and Tetbury Upton Neighbourhood Plan 2015- 2030; and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Indeed, I understand the conservation officer summed it up well when he said...' and in design terms, far from being an improvement on the refused scheme, it's actually worse....'

The applicant has made minor amendments to the design of the houses, and no amends to the healthcare facility. As the Conservation officer rightly points out in his report, the applicant made an "attempt" to address specific points within the Design Code but "fail to grasp or understand the underlying principles" and that the proposed revisions appear to treat the design as "tick-box" exercise resulting in designs that look like "poor imitations".

Additionally, the following should be considered:

- We have a surgery. We have GICB stating services will continue at the current location for several years (implying the lease is extendable, a point others also believe) and that the NHS will provide services in the town until a SUITABLE location is found.
- There is no pressure for housing land since the local council can demonstrate a healthy 7.1 year housing land supply (Housing Land Supply Report 2022).
- The applicant has done nothing to address its previous failure to demonstrate that proper consideration had been given to alternative locations for the healthcare facility. These alternatives still exist but were discounted due to "cost and immediate delivery." As such the required sequential testing for a major development has not been satisfied.

Nothing is going to be as low cost as "free" (and there are financing options available, both NHS and private, for a private healthcare provider), and there is nothing "immediate" about this delivery, given the developer will not start to build the healthcare facility until the majority of houses are completed and sold.

- The proposed new healthcare facility is a hub for the entire patient population of the Phoenix Group's five locations, not a facility for the current three GPs who serve Tetbury (all via telephone in the first instance).

Positive action

We need, as a community, to identify the right location for the most vulnerable to site a new surgery. We need the key stakeholders to re-evaluate the opportunities in town, which do exist.

I can think of five areas that are worth [re-]considering. This aligns with the points made at the last meeting, namely '...that a total of 19 sites were investigated.... most were discounted'. All possible sites require compromises but not as great as the Worwell area. Tetbury is unique, but only in the same way that every town is unique in the Cotswolds.

Any new development should be stakeholder led, not driven by landowners and developers. It should be funded properly, just like EVERY other new NHS facility. It should not have this level of people objecting because they see how residents are being blinded by an opportunistic application allowing a residential development to be allowed ONLY because of a proposed new surgery squeezed into the site.

You have previously rejected this application 8-1. Barely anything has changed since June, other than a couple of minor design tweaks. This needs to be put to bed thus allowing a broader discussion to commence without threats and the fear associated with this site. A collective effort is required going forward. Please allow us this opportunity for the benefit of EVERYONE in the town.