

---

**Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions**

**Supplementary Questions for Matter 13 (Week Three)**

---

Following consideration of the written hearing statements for Matter 13, the Inspector will wish to consider the following supplementary questions at the hearing session. The Council is requested to provide a written response by **midday on Friday 10 November 2017**.

***Issue 13.3: Accommodating Main Town Centre Use Development***

***Cirencester Town Centre***

*182A. Are each of the four mixed use sites, which the Council confirm are proposed for a range of main town centre uses including retail, in accessible locations well connected to the Primary Shopping Area of Cirencester town centre?*

***Moreton-in-Marsh Town Centre***

*183A. What is the justification for excluding the Budgens supermarket site from the Moreton-in-Marsh town centre as defined on the Policies Map?*

***B1 Office Developments***

The Council's response to Preliminary Question 25 [ED005] advises that the identified need for additional office accommodation [EB037 and EB038] will be met across the Principal Settlements on allocated sites, and this is confirmed in its hearing statement. The Council's response to Further Preliminary Question 14 [ED008] advises that policies DS1, S1-S19, and EC1-EC6 are permissive of B1 offices subject to the criteria set out in those policies, and that the sequential test set out in policy EC8 will not be applied to allocated sites

*185A. Why are employment allocations sequentially preferable for B1 offices to other potential sites within development boundaries (which the Council say would be subject to policy EC8 sequential test)?*

*185B. Are ease of access by private motor vehicle and higher rents appropriate justification for proposing B1 developments in out of centre locations?*

*185C. If, as the Council's response to FPQ14 indicates, the sequential test set out in policy EC8 is not intended to apply to B1 offices on any of the sites*

*allocated for employment uses, would the development of the whole of one or more of those sites as an office park be in accordance with the Plan? Would an impact assessment be required? Would such a development be consistent with national policy?*

*William Fieldhouse*

Inspector

2 November 2017