

## Comments

### Community Infrastructure Levy: Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (27/06/16 to 08/08/16)

Comment by	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
Comment ID	11
Response Date	02/08/16 10:43
Consultation Point	COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY: PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

#### Comments field

The Town Council has considered the following issues in relation to the document:

#### - Neighbourhood Plan

The greatest potential CIL contributions will arise from the Strategic Site, however, this has been charged as a zero rate. The remaining CIL from development within the town's boundaries would result in a 15% fee for the Town Council which would go up to 25% if a Neighbourhood Plan was in place.

The Town Council may produce a Neighbourhood Plan once the Local Plan has been adopted. It is well on the way towards this goal and the adopted Planning Policy Statement could form the basis of a Neighbourhood Plan.

The principle of transferring CIL for locally determined priorities should be carried forward in Cirencester. As long as there is no Neighbourhood Plan in place, the Planning Authority should ensure that at least 15% of developer contributions can be controlled by the Town Council to be put towards its locally identified priorities.

If a Neighbourhood Plan is produced, the Planning Authority should ensure that 25% of developer contributions can be similarly managed by the Town Council.

#### - How well the draft Reg. 123 list sits beside the Town Council's stated infrastructure objectives as set out in the Planning Policy Statement

The Town Council has identified its own infrastructure priorities in the Planning Policy Statement. These are too detailed to feature in the IDP.

The Town Council has adopted the Planning Policy Statement. That contains an Appendix 1 which, when completed, would be the key to securing significant benefits from development for Cirencester in the long term. It will be created in partnership between the Town Council, community groups and other stakeholders including the planning authority.

The 123 list should complement, and where possible, assist in delivering locally identified infrastructure priorities where these do not relate to the (excluded) strategic development, for instance:

- 1 Highways infrastructure and sustainable transport infrastructure that will benefit the wider District;

- 2 Higher education facilities that will benefit the wider District;
- 3 Flood management that affects the wider catchment area;
- 4 Special social and community facilities that may address a wider population than Cirencester (for instance specialist care homes or an expansion of the hospital);
- 5 Conservation and enhancement of nationally recognised historic infrastructure (such as Scheduled Ancient Monuments);
- 6 Strategic "blue light" infrastructure that supports a wider population than Cirencester.

The planning authority should work closely with the Town Council to identify strategic infrastructure that may be located in Cirencester but serves a wider catchment area. CIL collected elsewhere in the District may need to be directed towards Cirencester for the wider benefit of the District.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	12
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:44
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Appendix B Draft Regulation 123 List ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

#### Comments field

It appears that the draft 123 list omitted the category of "Health". The IDP noted a need for additional healthcare facilities but the heading is not on the table. An example would be a GP surgery.

## Local Plan Submission Draft Reg.19 (June 2016) (27/06/16 to 08/08/16)

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	182
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:45
<b>Consultation Point</b>	6.1 Development Strategy (POLICY DS1) ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Comments field

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Justified:** The Plan's reliance upon the Strategic Site in South Chesterton is not justified because no compelling evidence has been provided that the market can sustain the projected level of completions sufficient to meet the needs of the District as a whole over the plan period. It has not been demonstrated that the South Chesterton site can meet housing need for all parts of the District, particularly the Mid and North Cotswolds, despite the inclusion of windfall sites.

**Effective:** If the completions on the Strategic Site cannot be achieved at the projected rate, the Plan will not meet its overall housing target. The IDP identifies a number of infrastructure requirements and a gap in funding that should be met through CIL. However, since there are very few development opportunities outside Cirencester, and the Strategic Site is not subject to CIL (as proposed), it is unclear how the District's overall infrastructure requirements will be met.

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its previous Reg. 18 responses.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	183
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:46
<b>Consultation Point</b>	6.4 Monitoring of Development Strategy Policies ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Comments field

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Justified:** The Plan's reliance upon the Strategic Site in South Chesterton is not justified because no compelling evidence has been provided that the market can sustain the projected level of completions sufficient to meet the needs of the District as a whole over the plan period. In particular, it has not been demonstrated that the South Chesterton site can meet housing need for all parts of the District, particularly the Mid and North Cotswolds, despite the inclusion of windfall sites. For this reason, it is necessary to monitor the contribution made by the South Chesterton strategic site to the housing and employment needs of the District.

- 1 Completions per annum on the South Chesterton Site (residential units, square metres employment)
  - 2 Completions per annum by sub-area (south/mid/north) (residential units, square metres employment).
- 

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	189
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:51
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy S3E GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND PLAY SPACE ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

#### Comments field

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Justified:** The Town Council has provided significant evidence about green infrastructure priorities in its Our Future Cirencester Community Plan, Green Spaces Strategy, Cirencester Town Centre Public Realm Design Code and Planning Policy Statement which sets out clear priorities identified by local people during extensive consultation. The planning authority has been included as a stakeholder during all these exercises. This policy lists different priorities that do not reflect the work of the Town Council and has provided no explanation or justification why it has done so.

**Effective:** The policy lies under the Cirencester Strategy Area yet refers primarily to sites outside that area. The policy is therefore not effective.

**Recommendation :** The policy should include the justified priorities for green space improvements proposed by the Town Council's Planning Policy Statement. The policy should stand outside SC3 where it refers to sites outside the Cirencester Strategy Area.

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its Planning Policy Statement.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	190
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:51
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy EC2 SAFEGUARDING EMPLOYMENT SITES ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

#### Comments field

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Justified:** The policy does not protect employment land allocations despite compelling evidence that this land will be required to enable sustainable development over the plan period.

---

**Effective:** The policy should make provision for employment land allocation alongside established employment sites.

**Recommendation :**

Reword the policy as follows:

- 1 Within established and allocated employment sites provisions for B Class employment development including intensification of the site, will be permitted.
- 2 Existing established and allocated employment sites will be retained for B Class employment uses.

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its Reg 18 (1)(2) responses and Planning Policy Statement.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	191
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:52
<b>Consultation Point</b>	10.1 Design (POLICY D1) ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

**Comments field**

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Effective:** The supporting text should make reference to local design codes, such as the Cirencester Town Centre Public Realm Design Code, which should sit beside the more strategic Cotswold Design Code. This would add a level of refinement to the approach to design in line with the NPPF (57, 58, 66).

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its Planning Policy Statement.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	192
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:53
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy INF3 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

**Comments field**

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Effective:** The policy does not stipulate that when justified, sustainable transport infrastructure will be required "synchronised with the scale, timing/phasing and needs" of the development as was the case in policy INF 2(1)(a). The overall approach to infrastructure provision should be consistent across

the plan. This safeguard is necessary to protect local communities to ensure that sustainable transport is in place when needed to overcome potential harm from development.

Recommended addition to policy (insert before (a)):

provision is synchronised with the scale, timing/phasing and needs of the associated development.

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its Planning Policy Statement.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	193
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:54
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy INF10 RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

#### Comments field

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Consistent with National Policy** : The plan does not take proper regard of provisions in the NPPF regarding the need to promote low carbon and renewable energy in new and existing developments and the need to make provision for reductions in overall carbon impacts. The supporting text relies on changes to the Building Regulations and future requirements for zero carbon development. However, this does not satisfy the intentions of the NPPF to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources (95-97).

**Recommendation** : The policy should be modified:

(New number) New development will be expected to produce zero carbon impacts and, where possible, further reduce the need for energy, or help meet or exceed its own energy needs, though good design and appropriate technologies.

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its Planning Policy Statement.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	184
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:47
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy S1 CIRENCESTER TOWN ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

#### Comments field

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Justified:** The inclusion of the "mixed use" sites is premature because the parking study has not completed stage 2 which will give clarity on the best use of the town centre mixed use sites, with particular reference to the need to safeguard appropriate land for increased parking provision. The prioritisation of infrastructure is premature to the adoption of the CIL charging schedule. The approach to prioritisation has not been explained in the text and is therefore not justified since no evidence has been presented why some infrastructure projects are more important than others. This is particularly relevant to the non-critical/essential projects which are community aspirations but do not reflect the priorities set by the Town Council in its Planning Policy Statement.

**Effective:** The provisions for "mixed use", "C/E Infrastructure project", and prioritisation of other infrastructure delivery, (because it is not justified), is at risk of blocking the effective delivery of other policies in the plan.

**Recommendation :** that the mixed use and infrastructure elements of the policy are removed.

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response, its previous Reg. 18 responses and in tis Planning Policy Statement.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	185
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:48
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy S2 STRATEGIC SITE SOUTH OF CHESTERTON, CIRENCESTER ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

#### Comments field

The policy on the timing of delivery of completions on the strategic site is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Effective:** The decision made by developers whether to proceed with development is made according to commercial, and not planning, considerations. The planning system cannot control when development proposals can come forward, only the rate at which development proceeds once planning permission has been granted. This policy cannot therefore meet its objective of delivering its target of 214 dwelling per annum to meet the requirements of providing the five-year housing land supply.

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its previous Reg. 18 responses.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	186
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:49
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy S3 CIRENCESTER TOWN CENTRE ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Comments field

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Justified:** The Town Council has prepared a Planning Policy Statement that is relevant to all policies that relate to Cirencester Town Centre, and Cirencester generally, and as such should be explicitly referred to in the supporting text. This is a key element of the supporting evidence and will help promote sustainable development. In addition, the SPD referred to in the text is now very much out of date and reference to it should be removed because it will have only limited capacity to promote sustainable development.

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its Planning Policy Statement.

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	187
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:49
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy S3A RETAIL AND MAIN TOWN CENTRE USES ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.1

### Comments field

The policy is **UNSOUND** in the following regard:

**Effective:** The presumption to concentrate A1 uses on the primary frontage, effectively excluding A3 and A4 uses, will limit the vitality and viability of the town centre, particularly in terms of the night-time economy, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (23) and the evidence supplied by the Town Council in its Planning Policy Statement.

**Recommendation** : modify text as follows:

3 Class A1, A3 and A4 uses should be concentrated on the Primary Frontage to add to the vibrancy and viability of the town centre ....

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its Planning Policy Statement.

Recommendation: introduce specific monitoring measures for the Primary and Secondary Frontages to consider the ongoing impact on the vibrancy and viability of the town centre:

- 1 Monitor completions for new A1, A3 and A4 uses
- 2 Monitor change of use

---

<b>Comment by</b>	Cirencester Town Council (Mr Andrew Tubb)
<b>Comment ID</b>	188
<b>Response Date</b>	02/08/16 10:50
<b>Consultation Point</b>	Policy S3D ENHANCING ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ( <a href="#">View</a> )
<b>Status</b>	Submitted
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web



**Comments field**

The policy is **UN SOUND** in the following regard:

**Justified:** The Town Council has recently adopted a Cirencester Town Centre Public Realm Design Code that will seek to secure streetscape improvements to areas adjoining the Market Place Improvement Scheme. This should be directly referred to in the policy and supporting text. In addition, the issue of street and signage clutter is well understood by the planning authority and is also a feature of the Planning Policy Statement and should be reflected in this policy.

**Effective:** the policy will be more effective if applicants are made aware of the provisions of the Cirencester Town Centre Public Realm Design Code and Planning Policy Statement.

**Recommendation :** modify text as follows:

*(a)-(c) Reference in the supporting text should be made to the Cirencester Town Centre Public Realm Design Code and Planning Policy Statement with regard to policy provision for "enhanced streetscape, public realm, routing, public art, etc".*

*(b) improved public realm with clear signposting, reduction of street clutter and redundant signage wherever possible , urban environment....*

The justification for this response is set out in the Town Council's full Reg. 19 response and its Planning Policy Statement which includes the Cirencester Town Centre Public Realm Design Code.