

PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO DRAFT LOCAL PLAN: VERSION – 5 DECEMBER 2017

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	6.1.1	<p>The Local Plan has identified sufficient land to provide <u>The District's OAN is 8,400 new dwellings (420 dwellings per annum on average) across the Plan period, this. The OAN includes market, affordable, sheltered and extracare dwellings. It does not include nursing and residential care home bedspaces.</u></p> <p><u>The delivery of the housing requirement will be monitored annually to ensure the Council meets the District's OAN in full and maintains a five year housing land supply.</u></p>	As per the Council's response to the Inspector's Week One Actions (ED041). A modification is proposed to paragraph 6.1.1 of the Local Plan to clarify which types of housing are included in the OAN.
	6.1.2	<p>Providing for the maximum baseline forecast plus a 5 year buffer would requires in excess of 24 hectares of B Class employment land ⁽¹⁹⁾ for the period 2011-2031. Having regard to the economic forecasts, trends in employment land completions and the need to align with the GFirst SEP, the Local Plan, proposes to allocate 27ha<u>23ha</u> of B Class land, <u>support the delivery of its extant planning permissions for B Class employment development (14ha)</u>, whilst also...</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The baseline forecast plus a 5 year buffer is not a maximum. 2. To reflect the loss of two employment allocations (TET_E2A in Tetbury and MOR_E11 in Moreton-in-Marsh). 3. To clarify that extant planning permissions contribute towards meeting the Local Plan employment land requirement.
	DS1	Sufficient land will be allocated, which together with commitments, will deliver at least 8,400 dwellings and at least 27 <u>24</u> hectares for B class employment use...	The identified need for employment land is 24 ha.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION																		
	Table 1 - Housing Requirement and Land Supply 2011-2031	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="506 209 1339 300">Overall Housing Requirement and sources of Land Supply</th> <th data-bbox="1339 209 1547 300">Number of units</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="506 300 1339 357">Housing Land Requirement</td> <td data-bbox="1339 300 1547 357">8,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="506 357 1547 411">Housing Land Supply</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="506 411 1339 469">Completions 1st April 2011 to 31st March 20167</td> <td data-bbox="1339 411 1547 469">2,3853,176</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="506 469 1339 596"><u>Deliverable¹ and developable² extant planning permissions at 1st April 20167 (including -27 dwelling lapse rate)</u></td> <td data-bbox="1339 469 1547 596">3,3672,870</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="506 596 1339 651"><u>Chesterton</u> strategic Site</td> <td data-bbox="1339 596 1547 651">2,350</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="506 651 1339 708">Other new land allocations in this Local Plan</td> <td data-bbox="1339 651 1547 708">760574</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="506 708 1339 799">Windfalls estimate 2019 <u>1st April 2017 to 31st March 2031</u> @ XX p.a.</td> <td data-bbox="1339 708 1547 799">960 <u>1,191</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="506 799 1339 890">Total <u>expected housing delivery over the plan period</u> Supply</td> <td data-bbox="1339 799 1547 890">9,822 <u>10,161</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Overall Housing Requirement and sources of Land Supply	Number of units	Housing Land Requirement	8,400	Housing Land Supply		Completions 1st April 2011 to 31st March 2016 7	2,385 3,176	<u>Deliverable¹ and developable² extant planning permissions at 1st April 20167 (including -27 dwelling lapse rate)</u>	3,367 2,870	<u>Chesterton</u> strategic Site	2,350	Other new land allocations in this Local Plan	760 574	Windfalls estimate 2019 <u>1st April 2017 to 31st March 2031</u> @ XX p.a.	960 <u>1,191</u>	Total <u>expected housing delivery over the plan period</u> Supply	9,822 <u>10,161</u>	Factual change resulting from the Housing Land Supply Report (November 2017) and the Residential Land Monitoring Statistics Report (September 2017) [EB020]
Overall Housing Requirement and sources of Land Supply	Number of units																				
Housing Land Requirement	8,400																				
Housing Land Supply																					
Completions 1st April 2011 to 31st March 2016 7	2,385 3,176																				
<u>Deliverable¹ and developable² extant planning permissions at 1st April 20167 (including -27 dwelling lapse rate)</u>	3,367 2,870																				
<u>Chesterton</u> strategic Site	2,350																				
Other new land allocations in this Local Plan	760 574																				
Windfalls estimate 2019 <u>1st April 2017 to 31st March 2031</u> @ XX p.a.	960 <u>1,191</u>																				
Total <u>expected housing delivery over the plan period</u> Supply	9,822 <u>10,161</u>																				
6.1.10		Based on past data <u>and expected future trends</u> , a realistic estimate of <u>146 windfalls are expected to be delivered between 1st April 2017 and 31st March 2020</u> and <u>95 windfalls per annum</u> 80 dwellings p.a. are anticipated over the remainder of the Plan period from 1st April 2019.	Factual change resulting from the Housing Land Supply Report (November 2017)																		
	New paragraph after 6.1.10	<u>Full details of the housing supply can be accessed in the Housing Land Supply Report. An updated version of Table 1 will be included in subsequent reviews of the Housing Land Supply Report, which will be published around May each year.</u>	To provide clarity on how the housing land supply is calculated and how it will be updated in future.																		
6.1.11 (replace with four paragraphs)		Local plans need to demonstrate that a five year housing land supply is available at the time of adoption and maintained through the plan period. The target for the five year supply is five times the annual target (i.e. 420 x 5 =	To provide clarity on the calculation of the five year housing requirement and how it																		

¹ As set out by Footnote 11 of the NPPF

² As set out by Footnote 12 of the NPPF

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>2,100) plus any shortfall from the earlier years of the plan period from 2011. Government also asks authorities to include a buffer of 5% (or 20% where there has previously been 'persistent under delivery'). Cotswold has not been persistently under delivering, therefore a 5% buffer has been applied. Indeed, an over supply of 285 dwellings has been recorded over the period 2011-2016 when measured against the increased housing requirement figure resulting from the May 2016 OAN. <u>The calculation of the District's five year housing requirement is based on a residual requirement approach for the remaining years of the plan period. This deducts net completions since 2011 from the requirement for the plan period of 8,400 dwellings. The base date for the five year residual requirement is 1 April 2017.</u></p> <p><u>Between 1 April 2011 and 31 March 2017, 3,176 net additional dwellings had been completed in the District. The residual requirement for the remainder of the plan period is therefore 5,224 dwellings (i.e. 8,400 - 3,176 = 5,224).</u></p> <p><u>The annualised average residual requirement is 373 dwellings, which is calculated by dividing the total residual requirement by the 14 remaining years of the plan period (i.e. 5,224 / 14 years = 373). This method is similar to the 'Liverpool approach', whereby any shortfalls in delivery are equally distributed across the remainder of the plan period.</u></p> <p><u>Multiplying the residual annual requirement by five gives a five year requirement of 1,866 dwellings (i.e. 373 x 5 years = 1,866). The NPPF requires authorities to include a buffer of 5% (or 20% where there has previously been 'persistent under delivery'). Given that Cotswold District has not persistently under delivered, a 5% buffer is appropriate. The five year requirement plus 5% buffer is therefore 1,959 dwellings (i.e. 1,866 + 93 = 1,959).</u></p> <p><u>The five year requirement will be recalibrated annually to take account of further dwelling completions over the remainder of the plan period with a 5% (or 20%) buffer added in accordance with the NPPF. This will be set out in the Housing Land Supply Report, which will be published around May each year.</u></p>	will be updated in future.
6.1.12		<p>At 1st April 2016, the five year housing land requirement for the plan area was recorded as:</p>	To provide clarity on the calculation of the five year housing requirement and how it will be updated in future.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION																																
	Table 2	<table border="1" data-bbox="504 183 1236 231"> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 183 1003 231">Annual requirement (420) x 5</td> <td data-bbox="1003 183 1236 231">2,100</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="504 240 1290 272">Table 2— Five year Housing Land Requirement 2016-2021</p>	Annual requirement (420) x 5	2,100	Factual change resulting from the Housing Land Supply Report (November 2017)																														
Annual requirement (420) x 5	2,100																																		
	Table 3	<table border="1" data-bbox="504 325 1547 836"> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 325 1189 472">Deliverable extant planning permissions at 1st April 2016 (with expected lapses totalling 48 units (20))</td> <td data-bbox="1189 325 1547 472">3,136_z (3,184 subtract 48)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 472 1189 563">SHELAA sites over 5 units within Development Boundaries</td> <td data-bbox="1189 472 1547 563"><u>27</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 563 1189 624">Windfalls (2 years x 80 units)</td> <td data-bbox="1189 563 1547 624"><u>160</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 624 1189 671">Total supply</td> <td data-bbox="1189 624 1547 671"><u>3,323</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 671 1189 727">Housing requirement 2016-2021</td> <td data-bbox="1189 671 1547 727"><u>2,100</u> (420 p.a.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 727 1189 783">5% buffer on requirement</td> <td data-bbox="1189 727 1547 783">105</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 783 1189 836">Supply in equivalent years ((3,323 / 2,205) x 5)</td> <td data-bbox="1189 783 1547 836">7.54</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="504 850 1290 882">Table 3— Five year Housing Land Requirement 2016-2021</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="504 927 1518 1471"> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="504 927 1518 983"><u>Residual Requirement</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 983 674 1074"><u>A</u></td> <td data-bbox="674 983 1312 1074"><u>Total Residual Requirement for 2017 to 2031 (i.e. 8,400 - 3,176)</u></td> <td data-bbox="1312 983 1518 1074"><u>5,224</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 1074 674 1206"><u>B</u></td> <td data-bbox="674 1074 1312 1206"><u>Residual requirement for 2017 to 2031 expressed as an annual average (i.e. 5,224 / 14 years)</u></td> <td data-bbox="1312 1074 1518 1206"><u>373.1</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 1206 674 1297"></td> <td data-bbox="674 1206 1312 1297"><u>Total residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 (i.e. 373.1 x 5 years)</u></td> <td data-bbox="1312 1206 1518 1297"><u>1,866</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 1297 674 1388"><u>C</u></td> <td data-bbox="674 1297 1312 1388"><u>Total residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 plus a 5% buffer (i.e. 1,866 + 93)</u></td> <td data-bbox="1312 1297 1518 1388"><u>1,959</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="504 1388 674 1471"><u>D</u></td> <td data-bbox="674 1388 1312 1471"><u>Residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 (including 5% buffer) expressed as an</u></td> <td data-bbox="1312 1388 1518 1471"><u>392</u></td> </tr> </table>	Deliverable extant planning permissions at 1st April 2016 (with expected lapses totalling 48 units (20))	3,136 _z (3,184 subtract 48)	SHELAA sites over 5 units within Development Boundaries	<u>27</u>	Windfalls (2 years x 80 units)	<u>160</u>	Total supply	<u>3,323</u>	Housing requirement 2016-2021	<u>2,100</u> (420 p.a.)	5% buffer on requirement	105	Supply in equivalent years ((3,323 / 2,205) x 5)	7.54	<u>Residual Requirement</u>			<u>A</u>	<u>Total Residual Requirement for 2017 to 2031 (i.e. 8,400 - 3,176)</u>	<u>5,224</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>Residual requirement for 2017 to 2031 expressed as an annual average (i.e. 5,224 / 14 years)</u>	<u>373.1</u>		<u>Total residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 (i.e. 373.1 x 5 years)</u>	<u>1,866</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>Total residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 plus a 5% buffer (i.e. 1,866 + 93)</u>	<u>1,959</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>Residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 (including 5% buffer) expressed as an</u>	<u>392</u>	<ol data-bbox="1615 309 2069 539" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Factual change resulting from the Housing Land Supply Report (November 2017) 2. To provide clarity on the calculation of the five year housing requirement and how it will be updated in future.
Deliverable extant planning permissions at 1st April 2016 (with expected lapses totalling 48 units (20))	3,136 _z (3,184 subtract 48)																																		
SHELAA sites over 5 units within Development Boundaries	<u>27</u>																																		
Windfalls (2 years x 80 units)	<u>160</u>																																		
Total supply	<u>3,323</u>																																		
Housing requirement 2016-2021	<u>2,100</u> (420 p.a.)																																		
5% buffer on requirement	105																																		
Supply in equivalent years ((3,323 / 2,205) x 5)	7.54																																		
<u>Residual Requirement</u>																																			
<u>A</u>	<u>Total Residual Requirement for 2017 to 2031 (i.e. 8,400 - 3,176)</u>	<u>5,224</u>																																	
<u>B</u>	<u>Residual requirement for 2017 to 2031 expressed as an annual average (i.e. 5,224 / 14 years)</u>	<u>373.1</u>																																	
	<u>Total residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 (i.e. 373.1 x 5 years)</u>	<u>1,866</u>																																	
<u>C</u>	<u>Total residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 plus a 5% buffer (i.e. 1,866 + 93)</u>	<u>1,959</u>																																	
<u>D</u>	<u>Residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 (including 5% buffer) expressed as an</u>	<u>392</u>																																	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION																											
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 60%;"><u>annual average (i.e. 1,959 / 5 years)</u></td> <td style="width: 30%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"><u>Five Year Supply for 2017 to 2022</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>E</u></td> <td><u>Deliverable sites with planning permission on 1 April 2017 (including -27 dwelling lapse rate)</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>2,503</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>F</u></td> <td><u>Chesterton strategic site</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>306</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>G</u></td> <td><u>Other land allocations</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>0</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>H</u></td> <td><u>Windfalls</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>336</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>I</u></td> <td><u>Total supply for 2017 to 2022</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>3,145</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>J</u></td> <td><u>Supply available at 1 April 2017 expressed as number of years against the residual requirement (including 5% buffer) (i.e. (3,145 / 1,959) x 5 years)</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>8 years</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>Table 32 – Five-year Housing Land Requirement and Supply 20167-20212 * NB: All subsequent table numbers need to be updated because of tables two and three being replaced by the single table.</p>		<u>annual average (i.e. 1,959 / 5 years)</u>		<u>Five Year Supply for 2017 to 2022</u>			<u>E</u>	<u>Deliverable sites with planning permission on 1 April 2017 (including -27 dwelling lapse rate)</u>	<u>2,503</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Chesterton strategic site</u>	<u>306</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>Other land allocations</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>H</u>	<u>Windfalls</u>	<u>336</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>Total supply for 2017 to 2022</u>	<u>3,145</u>				<u>J</u>	<u>Supply available at 1 April 2017 expressed as number of years against the residual requirement (including 5% buffer) (i.e. (3,145 / 1,959) x 5 years)</u>	<u>8 years</u>	
	<u>annual average (i.e. 1,959 / 5 years)</u>																													
<u>Five Year Supply for 2017 to 2022</u>																														
<u>E</u>	<u>Deliverable sites with planning permission on 1 April 2017 (including -27 dwelling lapse rate)</u>	<u>2,503</u>																												
<u>F</u>	<u>Chesterton strategic site</u>	<u>306</u>																												
<u>G</u>	<u>Other land allocations</u>	<u>0</u>																												
<u>H</u>	<u>Windfalls</u>	<u>336</u>																												
<u>I</u>	<u>Total supply for 2017 to 2022</u>	<u>3,145</u>																												
<u>J</u>	<u>Supply available at 1 April 2017 expressed as number of years against the residual requirement (including 5% buffer) (i.e. (3,145 / 1,959) x 5 years)</u>	<u>8 years</u>																												
Footnote 20		Further details on the calculations are provided in the latest Five Year Housing Land Supply Report, which is available to download from the Council's Forward Planning Evidence and Monitoring pages at www.cotswold.gov.uk	Factual change resulting from the Housing Land Supply Report (November 2017)																											
6.1.14		Over the five-year period 20167-20212, there is a land supply capable of delivering 3,323 <u>3,145</u> homes. The identified supply exceeds five years' worth of housing requirements (2,100 <u>1,866</u>) by 1,223 <u>1,186</u> dwellings. This is equivalent to 7.54 <u>8</u> years' supply of land and is sufficient to provide ample flexibility and choice over the next five years.	Factual change resulting from the Housing Land Supply Report (November 2017)																											

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION																																																															
	Figure 1	<p>Figure 1 Cotswold Housing Trajectory 2011-2031, May 2016 <u>at 1 April 2017</u></p> <table border="1"> <caption>Data for Figure 1: Cotswold Housing Trajectory 2011-2031</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Housing trajectory year</th> <th>Completed dwellings</th> <th>Housing supply</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2011/12</td><td>528</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2012/13</td><td>393</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2013/14</td><td>399</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2014/15</td><td>505</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2015/16</td><td>597</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2016/17</td><td>754</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2017/18</td><td>907</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2018/19</td><td>680</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2019/20</td><td>483</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2020/21</td><td>504</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2021/22</td><td>571</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2022/23</td><td>501</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2023/24</td><td>439</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2024/25</td><td>395</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2025/26</td><td>402</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2026/27</td><td>398</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2027/28</td><td>433</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2028/29</td><td>398</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2029/30</td><td>426</td><td>441</td></tr> <tr><td>2030/31</td><td>455</td><td>441</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Housing trajectory year	Completed dwellings	Housing supply	2011/12	528	441	2012/13	393	441	2013/14	399	441	2014/15	505	441	2015/16	597	441	2016/17	754	441	2017/18	907	441	2018/19	680	441	2019/20	483	441	2020/21	504	441	2021/22	571	441	2022/23	501	441	2023/24	439	441	2024/25	395	441	2025/26	402	441	2026/27	398	441	2027/28	433	441	2028/29	398	441	2029/30	426	441	2030/31	455	441	Figure 1 has been updated to reflect the latest Housing Land Supply Report (November 2017)
Housing trajectory year	Completed dwellings	Housing supply																																																																
2011/12	528	441																																																																
2012/13	393	441																																																																
2013/14	399	441																																																																
2014/15	505	441																																																																
2015/16	597	441																																																																
2016/17	754	441																																																																
2017/18	907	441																																																																
2018/19	680	441																																																																
2019/20	483	441																																																																
2020/21	504	441																																																																
2021/22	571	441																																																																
2022/23	501	441																																																																
2023/24	439	441																																																																
2024/25	395	441																																																																
2025/26	402	441																																																																
2026/27	398	441																																																																
2027/28	433	441																																																																
2028/29	398	441																																																																
2029/30	426	441																																																																
2030/31	455	441																																																																
6.1.16		<p>Policy DS1 states that at least 27 hectares B-class employment land will be allocated within the District over the plan period the Local Plan employment land requirement of 24 hectares will be delivered through site allocations and committed developments.</p>	To reflect the Main Modification to Policy DS1																																																															
	Proposed new section and Policy (DS4): Open Market Housing outside Principal and Non-Principal Settlements	<p>Insert the following new sub-section, entitled '<u>Open Market Housing outside Principal and Non-Principal Settlements</u>', after section 6.3:</p> <p><u>NPPF 55 states that, to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The Local Plan's Development Strategy promotes this by focussing the main growth in 17 Principal Settlements, notably Cirencester (Policy DS2), while facilitating small-scale residential development in non-Principal Settlements (Policy DS3).</u></p>	To plug a policy 'gap' identified at a recent planning appeal hearing 16/01256/OUT (The Leasows, Chipping Campden).																																																															

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>NPPF 55 is clear that, in the absence of special circumstances, local planning authorities should avoid permitting new isolated homes in the countryside. Besides the provisions of NPPF 55, the Local Plan includes policies that allow for:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>affordable housing on rural exceptions sites (Policy H3);</u> • <u>housing for rural workers (Policy H5);</u> • <u>accommodation for gypsies and travellers (Policy H7); and</u> • <u>conversion of rural buildings (Policy EC6).</u> <p><u>There is normally no justification for allowing new-build open market dwellings in the countryside. However, Policy DS5 facilitates flexibility to consider sites adjacent to Development Boundaries at times when the District Council's monitoring indicates that a housing land supply shortfall is looming.</u></p> <p><u>POLICY DS4: OPEN MARKET HOUSING OUTSIDE PRINCIPAL AND NON-PRINCIPAL SETTLEMENTS</u></p> <p><u>Subject to Policies DS2 and DS5, there is a presumption against permitting new-build open market housing outside Principal and Non-Principal Settlements.</u></p> <p><u>The Local Plan's Development Strategy facilitates sufficient development in sustainable locations, to meet the District's identified housing needs over the Plan period. Other than when there is a housing supply shortfall, there is no reason to consider new-build open market housing beyond Development Boundaries, although small-scale development may be acceptable in non-Principal Settlements.</u></p> <p><u>Policy DS4 is designed to preclude the development of speculative open market housing which is not needed in rural locations and includes land adjacent to Development Boundaries. A rare exception, referred to in NPPF 55, might be a proposal for a country house that is truly outstanding or innovative and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas.</u></p> <p><u>Policy DS4 does not preclude the creation of all open market housing in rural locations; for example dwellings resulting from the replacement or sub-division of existing dwellings, or housing resulting from conversions of rural buildings. It also would not prevent, in principle, alterations and extensions to existing buildings, or the development of domestic outbuildings within the curtilages of existing dwellings.</u></p>	
	Proposed new section and Policy (DS5):	<p><u>Insert the following new section, entitled 'Ensuring a Five Year Housing Supply during the Plan Period':</u></p> <p><u>The timely delivery of housing is a key objective of the NPPF.</u></p>	This Policy is proposed as a fall-back position in the event of the supply position falling to five

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	Ensuring a Five Year Housing Supply during the Plan Period	<p><u>To boost significantly the supply of housing, NPPF 47 requires local planning authorities to produce robust evidence to ensure that Local Plans meet the full, objectively assessed, needs for market and affordable housing, and identify and update annually a supply of specific, deliverable sites. Sufficient land should be identified to demonstrate five years’ worth of deliverable land supply against housing requirements.</u></p> <p><u>Failure to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land³ means that relevant policies for the supply of housing can no longer be considered up-to-date, irrespective of the age of the Plan. In that situation, NPPF 49 requires applications for housing development to be considered in the context of the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’. For decision-taking, this means that NPPF 14 would be engaged. In these circumstances, the practical reality is that housing proposals should be approved - even if they do not conform with the Local Plan’s housing policies – unless any adverse impacts of doing so would “<i>significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits</i>” or if specific NPPF policies indicate that development should be restricted.</u></p> <p><u>To avert this risk, Policy DS5 seeks to manage the delivery of housing by addressing any emerging housing supply shortfall before it reaches the point where NPPF 14 would be engaged. The policy directs any resulting additional development towards the periphery of the most sustainable settlements, adjacent to Development Boundaries.</u></p> <p><u>POLICY DS5 – ENSURING A FIVE YEAR HOUSING SUPPLY DURING THE PLAN PERIOD</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>If the District Council’s residential land monitoring indicates that the District’s housing land supply is 5.5 years or less, proposals for residential development on land adjoining a Development Boundary will be approved provided that they are in accordance with other policies in the Plan.</u> 2. <u>Applicants will be required to demonstrate the measures that will be taken to ensure proposals contribute to the District’s five year housing land supply.</u> 3. <u>If the District Council’s residential monitoring demonstrates less than 5.5 years’ worth of deliverable housing land, and there has been no recovery in the supply position over two successive monitoring years, this will trigger an</u> 	years plus a 5% buffer, and to ensure that a continuous supply of deliverable land is in place to meet the District’s objectively assessed need for housing throughout the plan period.

³ In reality, 5.25 years for most local planning authorities (i.e. 5 years plus 5% buffer). For authorities deemed to have persistently under delivered, a 20% buffer (equivalent of 6 years’ supply) must be applied.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>increase from 5% to a 20% buffer.</u></p> <p>4. <u>If, after applying a 20% buffer, the District Council’s residential monitoring indicates that it has not been possible to demonstrate at least 5.5 years’ worth of deliverable housing land over further two years, this will trigger a full or partial review of the Local Plan.</u></p> <p><u>The delivery of housing across the District is assessed through the production of annual residential monitoring reports, including the maintenance of an up-to-date housing trajectory and five year housing supply position statement. These are normally published around May each year.</u></p> <p><u>Section 6.1 explains how the five year requirement will be calculated throughout the Plan period. It also sets out the land supply position at 1st April 2017, which demonstrated a healthy 8.0 years’ worth of supply at that date. About 650 dwellings over and above the housing requirement for the District were delivered over the first six years of the Local Plan period (2011-2017). Cotswold District therefore does not considered to be a persistent under deliverer and a 5% (rather than 20%) buffer applies to the District’s land supply calculations.</u></p> <p><u>Although the Council has significantly boosted supply over the last six years, it is not complacent and Policy DS5 has been introduced with the following, primary, aims:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>To ensure that the supply of deliverable housing land continues to remain healthy.</u> • <u>To address any looming housing shortfall before it occurs.</u> • <u>To ensure that any temporary housing supply shortfall is addressed by directing additional development towards the most sustainable, off-plan, locations adjacent to Principal Settlements.</u> <p><u>NPPF 14 would normally be engaged if the annual housing monitoring reports demonstrated a supply of less than 5 years plus a 5% buffer, i.e. the equivalent of 5.25 years. Such a scenario would potentially leave the District Council vulnerable to speculative planning applications in almost any location, which would compromise the sustainability objectives upon which the Local Plan’s Strategy is based.</u></p> <p><u>For this reason, the flexibility afforded by Policy DS5 would be applied at a time when monitoring demonstrates that the housing land supply had, at that date, dipped below 5.5 years. This is considered to be a reasonable measure because it represents a further 5% buffer over and above 5.25 years, which would normally indicate a supply shortfall.</u></p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>It is anticipated that the flexibility afforded by Policy DS5 will be sufficient to help restore housing supply to a healthy position by the time the next annual monitoring report is published. In the unlikely event that this does not happen, the policy would continue to be applied. If the supply does not return to a healthy position after two years, the Council will increase the buffer, for supply calculation purposes, from 5% to 20% - a rationale that is consistent with the theme of boosting significantly the supply of housing in NPPF 47.</u></p> <p><u>If increasing the buffer failed to boost the housing supply sufficiently within two years, this would trigger a full or partial review of the Local Plan.</u></p> <p><u>The underlying reason for Policy DS5 is to ensure that a continuous supply of deliverable land is in place to meet the District's objectively assessed need for housing over the period 2011-2031. The Council will expect any resulting dwellings to be built within a reasonable timeframe. To that end, the policy requires applicants to demonstrate what measures will be taken to ensure that new dwellings will be available for habitation within five years. This would be set out in a legal agreement.</u></p> <p><u>Development Boundaries are an important tool for focussing the majority of growth on the Principal Settlements. They have been carefully defined to enable the Plan to deliver sufficient land to meet its housing requirement in the most sustainable locations to 2031. This helps to prevent urban encroachment onto the surrounding countryside. It also helps to 'future proof' the District's sustainability by ensuring that housing delivery continues to be focussed on the Principal Settlements. The Council, however, recognises that there may be occasions when there is no option but to boost the supply of housing land by permitting developments outside Development Boundaries.</u></p> <p><u>Without prejudice to the consideration of any sites under Policy DS5, land adjacent to Development Boundaries is, in principle, potentially more sustainable than land in other locations. Such sites, assessed against the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development, offer the most suitable opportunities for boosting housing supply without compromising the principles underpinning the Local Plan's Development Strategy.</u></p> <p><u>In this context, it is important to appreciate that, just because a site is located adjacent to a Development Boundary, this does not, in itself, make it suitable. Any proposals would also need to be considered against other policies in the Local Plan as well as any other material considerations.</u></p> <p><u>For land to be considered as adjacent to a Development Boundary, this must be interpreted literally. Sites that do not directly abut a Development Boundary,</u></p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<u>including for example being separated by a road, do not qualify.</u>	
	6.3.5	Small-scale residential development means housing which is proportionate to, and complementary with, the size and character of the settlement and its surroundings, including, for example, two bed properties. In this context, the policy applies to the provision of any new residential units through the alteration, replacement, conversion or sub-division of an existing dwelling, as well as through new build. Any development provided through this policy, besides being proportionate in scale and ...	The deleted text that was included in error. Its deletion removes doubt and improves clarity
	7.0.1	<p>A total of at least 8,400 houses is planned to be delivered in the settlements over the plan period to 2031 together with 27 ha of employment land. Housing and employment sites are allocated. The Local Plan includes site allocations that will meet the District's identified needs, which are set out in the settlement strategy policies set out below. The level of growth planned for each settlement will also help to address local affordable housing needs, sustain existing facilities and maintain the each settlement's role as a service centre.</p> <p><u>As part of the site allocation process, various constraints and issues (including flood risk, archaeology, landscape, form, scale and access) have been taken fully into account. In some instances, these considerations have resulted in fewer units or smaller areas being proposed for development than might otherwise have been anticipated. Further high level guidance on such considerations, and possible means by which they might be addressed, are included in the Local Plan evidence base, particularly the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To avoid repetition of DS1 + the employment land need is 24ha, not 27ha. 2. The paragraph currently does not account for mixed use or retail allocations. 3. To add clarity and explain that constraints and assets to be retained in sites when they have been developed have been considered in setting the site capacities in the allocations and ensuring that they are deliverable.
	7.0.12	<p>7.0.12 The strategic infrastructure required in each sub area is set out in policies SA1, SA2 and SA3. The policies for each individual settlement are numbered S1-S19 and are located in the relevant sub area section. They identify specific land allocations, including housing and employment <u>as well as local non-strategic infrastructure</u>. The land allocations, development boundary and other land use planning designations are shown on the inset map for each settlement.</p> <p><u>7.0.13 The non-strategic infrastructure items referred to above were identified during engagement and consultation with local communities. Whilst these items are not critical or essential to delivery of the Local Plan, many may be regarded as contributing to local place-making. On this basis, it is reasonable to anticipate that the delivery of non-strategic infrastructure should normally be funded from the local apportionment of</u></p>	To clarify the delivery mechanism for infrastructure items identified in settlement policies.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>CIL revenue (which can only be spent on infrastructure provision). Alternative or supplementary funding routes may be available and could be pursued providing national policy and legislative rules governing the imposition of planning obligations are satisfied. It follows from this that parish and/or town councils could in the first instance consider managing the implementation process, using their CIL apportionment to procure delivery. Including the items in Neighbourhood Plans would also assist in the delivery process as a "made" Neighbourhood Plan will increase the CIL apportionment from 15% to 25%.</u></p>	
	SA1	<p>Existing text of Policy SA1 to be deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <p>Policy SA1 STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA</p> <p>Within the context of policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:</p> <p><i>Healthcare</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Romney House surgery (Tetbury) - expansion or relocation; and • New doctors' surgery (Cirencester). <p><i>Flood management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk. <p><i>Highways</i></p> <p>Junction improvements at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A429 Cherry Tree junction; • A417 (High Street)/ A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade; • A417 / Whelford Road; • A429 / A433; and • A433 (London Road) / A433(Long Street)/ Hampton Street/ New Church Street; and • A433 (Long Street) / A433 (Bath Road) / B4014 (Fox Hill) / Chipping Street. <p><i>Sport & Recreation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-use of old former railway line for cycling between Tetbury, and Kemble and Cirencester; and • Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors. 	<p>To simplify the policy and clarify the delivery mechanism for the infrastructure proposals in the Sub-Area.</p> <p>Having regard to the updated Highways Capacity Assessment. Struck-through item is no longer required</p>
	7.1.1.1.6	As a Town Centre SPD. The existing Cirencester Archaeology Review <u>Archaeological Assessment (January 2014)</u> and any further assessment required	To ensure clarity in the text. Change as proposed by Historic

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>should also be taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the <u>heritage</u> asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. Although the potential difficulties for development are inescapable, the historic environment should, wherever feasible, <u>heritage assets should be conserved, unless fully justified, and be used as a key driver and focus for inward investment, regeneration and redevelopment.</u></p>	England
	Policy S1 Cirencester Town	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. C_39 – delete allocation 2. C_97 – reduce capacity from 11 to 9 dwellings 	To accord with updated information in the SHELAA Review (September 2017)[EB012]
	Policies: S1; S5; S8; S9; S10; S11; S12; S14; S15; S16; S17; S18 and S19	<p>Protected existing <u>Established</u> employment sites:</p> <p>NB – consequential changes to the reasoned justification will result from the standardised use of 'established employment site'. For the avoidance of doubt, these changes are located at paragraphs 9.1.5, 9.2.1.2, 9.2.1.4, 9.2.1.7 and Table 8 (Minimum Disabled Parking Provision).</p>	The submitted Plan uses the terms established employment site, existing employment sites and protected existing employment sites to describe the same thing. To add clarity and to ensure that the Plan is clear and therefore effective, the different terms will be standardised to established employment site.
	7.1.1.2.9	<p>'It is anticipated that a neighbourhood centre will provide small-scale convenience and shopping service uses...of the existing town centre. <u>Retail uses will form an integral part of the neighbourhood centre and will contribute towards community cohesion, however</u> In addition, the scale and format of units and floorspace within the neighbourhood centre should be limited. <u>This is so that they primarily serve the day-to-day needs of residents of the strategic site, and not a wider catchment. though it is inevitable that some existing, neighbouring residents will also patronise the new facilities.'</u></p>	<p>Amend the supporting text to provide clarity on meaning of 'small-scale' shopping and service units and further explanation on the role of the neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>More clarity is needed, resulting from the Inspector's MIQ 182</p>
	<u>Sub-section 7.1.1.3 - Cirencester Town Centre</u>	<p>Delete entire sub-section 7.1.1.3 and replace with the following:</p> <p>7.1.1.3 Cirencester Town Centre</p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.1 Cirencester's retailing and commercial importance far outstrips anywhere else in the District. The town draws in large numbers of shoppers, commuters and others who, together with numerous visitors, help to create a vital and viable town centre economy.</u></p> <p><u>The rural nature of the surrounding areas, along with relatively poor public transport coverage, inevitably means that the majority of people from outside</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To clarify the proposed approach to off-street car parking provision, including the net gain in spaces being pursued. 2. To clarify how redevelopment of existing surface level car parks and other elements of the town centre strategy are

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>Cirencester travel into the town by car, thus fuelling the need for parking spaces. Parking capacity has been a growing issue for a number of years, but it has come to a head since 2015.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.2 Critical to Cirencester’s attraction is its exceptional heritage - most of the buildings in the Primary Town Centre being statutorily listed for their architectural and historic importance. It is generally acknowledged that, in addition to each building’s individual merits, their collective value creates a unified and exceptionally attractive historic townscape. Largely because of this and a healthy independent retailing offer, Cirencester has maintained a strong appeal both for users of, and visitors to, the town. However, the townscape in certain areas, particularly around some of the car parks, is of a significantly lower quality⁴.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.3 Like all town centres, Cirencester comprises a complex mix of uses, interactions and competing economic, social and environmental interests. To bring key principles and priorities together in a coherent, holistic manner, a flexible strategy is required which can respond to changing circumstances within the Plan’s broader policy context.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.4 Certain issues, however, require specific policy guidance, including future retail provision (see Policy EC7, clause 3), mixes of uses in the primary and secondary frontages, and parking provision. Policy S3 provides this guidance, while also requiring future development to adhere to the principles set out in the Cirencester Town Centre Strategy, which is set out after the following policy.</u></p> <p><u>POLICY S3 – CIRENCESTER TOWN CENTRE</u></p> <p><u>Town Centre Strategy</u></p> <p><u>1. Development within Cirencester Town Centre, the extent of which is indicated on Policies Map Inset 2, will be permitted, in principle, where it is consistent with the Cirencester Town Centre Strategy.</u></p> <p><u>Retailing and other main town centre uses⁵</u></p> <p><u>2. Class A1 uses should be concentrated in the Primary Frontage, defined on</u></p>	<p>expected to be implemented following the delivery of decked parking.</p> <p>3. To distinguish between matters of policy and strategy.</p> <p>4. To bring the contents of this section up-to-date.</p> <p>5. To generally better explain the strategy for the town centre.</p> <p>6. To provide clarity that the retail floor space need is for the whole of Cirencester and not just the ‘town centre’. This change is consistent with EC7 (FC054).</p>

⁴ NS026 Cirencester Town Centre Conservations Area Appraisals

⁵ Defined in the NPPF Glossary broadly as: retail development; leisure, entertainment facilities the more intensive sport and recreation uses; offices; and arts, culture and tourism development.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>Policies Map Inset 2. The loss of A1 uses from the Primary Frontage will be resisted where it would harm the vitality or viability of the Primary Shopping Area, or harm Town Centre investment, or cause amenity problems.</u></p> <p>3. <u>Within Secondary Frontages, identified on Policies Map Inset 2, class A1 uses and other main town centre uses will be permitted where they would complement and enhance the retailing offer of the Primary Shopping Area. The loss of main town centre uses in a Secondary Frontage will be resisted and, other than A1 uses, concentrations of single uses will not be permitted where this would adversely affect the vitality and viability of the Primary Shopping Area or harm wider Town Centre investment, or cause amenity problems</u></p> <p>4. <u>Where the loss of a main town centre use is proposed in either a Primary or Secondary Frontage, evidence must be submitted to demonstrate that the property has been continually, actively and effectively marketed for at least 12 months and that the use is no longer of commercial interest.</u></p> <p><u>Car parking</u></p> <p>5. <u>New development shall provide sufficient car parking capacity to meet its current and foreseeable needs.</u></p> <p>6. <u>Where appropriate town centre development is proposed on existing town centre car parks, alternative car parking provision shall be secured and implemented prior to the commencement of any development.</u></p> <p><u>The Strategy</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.5 A key aim for the town centre is to provide an attractive and vibrant place where people can access a good range of local services and facilities. This includes a diverse retail offer within the primary shopping area. Although Cirencester currently has a healthy town centre, it needs to evolve and improve to ensure that it continues to compete effectively by continuing to offer a different experience to larger neighbouring centres.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.6 Paragraphs 7.1.1.1.4 to 7.1.1.1.6 of this Plan explain the importance of Cirencester's rich heritage, including archaeology, and the acute challenges this presents for the 'planning balance' when considering</u></p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>development opportunities in the town centre.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.7 A major study of the town centre and resulting policy guidance⁶ confirmed as long ago as 2007 that a looming shortfall in off-street parking provision at Cirencester needed to be addressed. This has now come to a head and it is imperative to plan for future parking requirements as well as address existing capacity issues.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.8 Cirencester currently has several surface-level car parks, and a number of these sites present the most obvious opportunities for redevelopment in the town centre. This includes the option of creating decked parking which would maximise capacity, initially at a single location. This will help to address the looming shortfall, which has been assessed at around 350 parking spaces over and above existing capacity (c. 1,310 spaces)⁷.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.9 Once sufficient additional car parking has been provided, the redevelopment potential of other car park(s), which may no longer required for parking, could be 'unlocked'. Such sites could be then be considered for alternative uses that would both enhance the town centre's role and function and benefit its economy. In considering any redevelopment options for existing car parks, it is important to bear in mind that land might well be required to satisfy potential additional parking needs in the longer term.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.10 Maximising parking in a single location and putting other existing car park(s) to alternative use(s) would also present the opportunity to consider options for managing traffic more effectively in the town centre.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.11 Cirencester has always lacked a purpose-built public transport 'hub' in the town centre. Prior to 2016, Southway was the main place where bus services terminated; however, since the Market Place environmental improvements were implemented, Southway's use by buses and taxis has intensified. It is self-evident that improvements around Southway are required and, ideally, a purpose-built transport hub created. Depending on future land availability in the Southway - Forum area, redevelopment options could be considered to create this much-needed facility.</u></p>	

⁶ Including Cirencester Town Centre SPD (November 2008) [EB071]; Cirencester Traffic and Movement Study (June 2007, Hyder Consulting) [NS021]

⁷ Cirencester Town Centre Off-Street Parking Study (Atkins, 3 February 2017):

<http://www.cmis.cotswold.gov.uk/CMIS5/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShqo=Gzrb2ku8AbRAY5ODiakIh0awggJqwQwyMYwPo91QoZcn%2bYv7Ym3%2fIQ%3d%3d&rUzWRPf%2bZ3zd4E7Ikn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNlh225F5QMaQWctPHwdhUfCZ%2flUQzqA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlq%3d%3d=hFflUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFflUdN3100%3d&uJovDxwdjMPoYv%2bAjvYtyA%3d%3d=ctNJff55vVA%3d&FgPIIEJYlotS%2bYGoBi5oIA%3d%3d=NHdURQburHA%3d&d9Qjj0ag1Pd993jsyOJqFvmyB7X0CSQK=ctNJff55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNR9xqBux0r1Q8Za60lavYmz=ctNJff55vVA%3d&WGewmoAfeNQ16B2MHuCpMRKZMwaG1PaO=ctNJff55vVA%3d>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>CIRENCESTER TOWN CENTRE STRATEGY</u></p> <p><u>Historic Environment</u></p> <p><u>1. The town centre’s historic environment should form an integral part of future redevelopment and/or other proposals that are aimed at improving Cirencester’s role, function and economy, including future transport and parking schemes. Wherever feasible, the historic environment should be a key driver of, and focus for, inward investment, regeneration and redevelopment.</u></p> <p><u>2. Any planning applications for redevelopment within the town centre should be fully cognisant of both the Cirencester Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan and the Cirencester Town Centre SPD. The Cirencester Archaeology Review (January 2014) and any further assessment required should also be taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset.</u></p> <p><u>Transport, Parking and Access</u></p> <p><u>3. Through the implementation of Transport and Parking Strategies, future improvements should be directed towards supporting and facilitating an attractive, vibrant, town centre environment.</u></p> <p><u>4. The aim of providing a net increase of at least 350 car parking spaces over and above the existing off-street parking capacity (c. 1,310 spaces), while reducing congestion and pollution, should be addressed through complementary measures, including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. The rationalisation and intensification of off-street parking, including decking at least one existing car park (ideally The Waterloo) to meet identified parking needs, including for retailing and long-stay commuting⁸;</u> <u>b. Where justified, and subject to sufficient off-street parking being provided, considering the removal of on-street car parking where appropriate;</u> <u>c. Creating an improved public transport interchange in the Southway - Forum area;</u> <u>d. Making walking and cycling safer, convenient, accessible, and more attractive by considering pedestrian priority schemes; access restrictions to discourage unnecessary through traffic; better segregation between cars and cycles; and by ensuring pedestrian and cycle routes, and associated facilities, are maintained to an appropriate standard⁹.</u> 	

⁸ Cirencester Parking Survey (GCC, August 2015)

⁹ Cotswold Cycling Strategy SPG - aims and objectives

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>5. Through the design of new development schemes, opportunities should be taken to enhance the quality of pedestrian access and permeability within and to the town centre.</u></p> <p><u>Redevelopment Opportunities, Vitality and Viability</u></p> <p><u>6. Subject to any land that is currently used for off-street public car parking becoming surplus to requirements, and sufficient off-street parking has been provided elsewhere in the town centre to meet current and future parking needs, consideration should be given to redevelopment for alternative, beneficial, town centre purposes.</u></p> <p><u>7. The Brewery and Forum car parks have been identified as potentially favourable locations for retailing.</u></p> <p><u>8. Any comprehensive redevelopment of key sites¹⁰ should be guided by a master plan prepared by Cotswold District Council as a supplementary planning document. The master plan would include detailed guidance on such matters as: design; movement (including parking provision); and the general distribution of activities and uses in the wider area.</u></p> <p><u>9. Wherever possible, redevelopment of town centre sites should be encouraged to contribute towards the town centre's employment base, including class B1 office provision, and possibly studio/ start-up space.</u></p> <p><u>10. Seek to improve the town centre's vitality and viability by maintaining a rich and varied cultural and retail offer, and a locally-distinctive shopping experience, with some national multiples supporting niche independent shops, resulting in greater retention of shopping expenditure.</u></p> <p><u>11. Tourism and cultural proposals should be encouraged where they strengthen the local economy and the attractiveness of Cirencester as a visitor destination throughout the year. Opportunities should be pursued to encourage the development of a hotel or similar type of tourist accommodation in and/ or adjacent to the town centre.</u></p> <p><u>Enhancing Environmental Quality</u></p> <p><u>12. Improve the environmental quality of the town centre by supporting proposals and interventions that create an attractive public realm, including:</u></p> <p><u>a. Enhanced streetscape, urban environment, amenity, safety and the</u></p>	

¹⁰ Key sites are likely to include existing off-street car parks, potentially together with adjoining areas.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>improvement of the 'active' street frontage;</u></p> <p>b. <u>Improving the public realm with clear signposting and routing to key town centre destinations utilising distinctive local materials;</u></p> <p>c. <u>Securing public art proposals and high quality and distinctive street furniture.</u></p> <p>d. <u>Improving the provision of additional play space and facilities for children and young people, including restoring and upgrading Cirencester's open air swimming pool; and sustaining/ enhancing green infrastructure, community spaces, open spaces and key landscape features.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.12 To ensure that the town centre can continue to fulfil its important role in the District and support the wider local economy, new development and the intensification of existing uses is desirable. It is therefore important that the town centre's vitality and viability maintains a rich and varied cultural and retail experience. A locally-distinctive shopping offer, with some national multiples supporting niche independent shops, is expected to produce the greatest retention of retail expenditure. Therefore, a competitive and attractive retail sector needs to be promoted within the town centre through sensitive expansion, redevelopment and intensification, including making more effective use of upper floors.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.13 The exceptional built heritage and wealth of listed buildings, however, present challenges for intensification and redevelopment when seeking to meet modern retail requirements. A balance needs to be struck between protecting heritage assets and the public benefit of promoting a vibrant and vital centre, which includes viable uses for historic buildings. Opportunities should therefore be taken, wherever possible, to put heritage at the heart of any development proposals in the town centre.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.14 The most substantial sites in the town centre that have potential for redevelopment, including for decked parking, are wholly or partly occupied by the following public car parks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Abbey Grounds car park (97 spaces)</u> • <u>Beeches Road car park (144)</u> • <u>Brewery car park (298)</u> • <u>Forum car park (191)</u> • <u>Leisure Centre (122)</u> • <u>Memorial Hospital, Sheep Street (77)</u> • <u>Station/ Sheep Street 'island' (149)</u> 	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Waterloo car park (233)</u> <p><u>7.1.1.3.15 The District Council, through the auspices of the Cirencester Car Parking Project Board, is actively reviewing parking provision in Cirencester and developing remedial options¹¹. Decked parking has emerged as the optimum solution for increasing parking capacity, with the Waterloo car park identified as the preferred location. This is reflected in Policy S1 (site CIR E14).</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.16 Not all of the car parks, notably the 'off centre' ones at Abbey Grounds, Leisure Centre and Beeches, would necessarily be suitable or desirable options for redevelopment.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.17 The amount of redevelopment at any 'surplus', surface level car parks will depend on how far the additional parking, provided through decking, goes towards meeting identified parking needs, whilst being mindful of the possible need to accommodate further needs in the longer term.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.18 The Cotswold Retail Study¹² also indicates that opportunities within and adjoining the town centre are largely limited to the potential redevelopment of certain car parks and service areas, notably at the Brewery and Forum. This could enable the provision of modern A1 retail space (currently lacking), as well as a range of evening and leisure uses to complement existing provision. This would serve both local and sub-regional consumers and tourists, thereby providing an alternative to competing centres for A1 comparison shopping.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.19 In common with most town centres, ease of movement is a crucial issue in Cirencester. The town's historic street pattern and narrow pavements can make pedestrian access inconvenient. Despite this, the town centre has seen enhancements in permeability in recent years through schemes such as Swan Yard/ post office. More, however, could be done to increase pedestrian permeability, helping to strengthen Cirencester's reputation as a shopping destination with improved accessibility around the town centre, including to and from car parks.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.20 Currently, too much unnecessary traffic passes through the town centre and this is exacerbated by the location of certain car parks, which help to dictate the current traffic management regime. Once decked parking has been introduced, it will be possible to better manage town centre-bound traffic more</u></p>	

¹¹ <http://www.cotswold.gov.uk/residents/environment/parking-and-public-toilets/cirencester-parking-project/>

¹² Bilfinger GVA, June 2017

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>effectively. Subject to parking capacity being increased, traffic management measures should be devised which:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>make most effective use of off-street parking;</u> • <u>encourage through traffic onto the ring road; and</u> • <u>improve road safety for pedestrians and cyclists.</u> <p><u>7.1.1.3.21 The quality of the public realm throughout the town centre is variable, though in some instances there have been considerable improvements, notably Market Place, Gosditch Street/ West Market Place, Black Jack Street, Silver Street, Park Street and Park Lane. However, beyond these improved areas, the public realm throughout much of the town centre is generally mediocre, particularly Cricklade Street and areas that were redeveloped during the 1960s and 1970s, including around the car parks. There is sometimes a sharp contrast in the quality of townscape between the fronts and the backs of buildings.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.22 Proposals to improve Cirencester’s townscape in line with the provisions of the Cirencester Town Centre SPD are supported in principle, focussed on making the town centre a more pedestrian-friendly environment.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.23 The Town Centre will, in the longer term, deliver significant retail and business opportunities along with new homes. This would be guided by a Town Centre Master Plan that will be produced by the District Council in association with other stakeholders, including the Town Council, Gloucestershire County Council, the local community, businesses and the Civic Society. The master plan will update and review the existing SPD and build upon the principles that are essentially still valid and supported. It will seek to develop Cirencester Town Centre in a holistic manner, balancing the need to manage traffic, and improve the appearance of the public realm with other competing, environmental, social and economic objectives.</u></p>	
	Policies S4 to S16 (except S12 and S14)	<p>Amend all policies as follows:</p> <p><u>Non-Strategic (Local) Infrastructure</u></p> <p>Once contributions to delivery of infrastructure required in the South Cotswolds Sub Area (Policy SA1) have been made, development proposals will, subject to viability, be expected to help deliver or make appropriate contributions towards</p> <p><u>Delivery of the following non-strategic infrastructure items will be funded from local CIL revenue apportionment unless regulatory requirements governing the imposition of planning obligations can be met:</u></p>	To help enable delivery of locally-identified non-strategic infrastructure having regard to the tests set out at paragraph 204 of the NPPF and within Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	Policy S5 Fairford	F_44 – reduce capacity from 28 to 12 dwellings	To accord with updated information in the SHELAA Review (September 2017)[EB012]
	Policy S6 Kemble	The allocation of 12 dwellings at K_2 has been reduced from 12 to 8 dwellings.	Reason for modification – Factual change to reflect that the allocation of 12 dwellings at K_2 has been reduced to 8 dwellings
	7.1.4.7	<u>...before any planning proposal can be approved. Development proposals will be expected to take account of the positive contribution the Local Green Space makes to the character of the wider site, including mitigating any potential impacts on natural features such as trees. In accordance with the Design Code in Appendix D, proposals will need to be carefully proportioned and new buildings should not dominate their surroundings. Proposals will need to complement the existing landscape and sit comfortably within the setting of the Local Green Space, for example, the height of buildings should provide a gentle transition from the open Local Green Space to the existing dwellings that border the site. Applications will also be required to investigate opportunities to locate Sustainable Urban Drainage, in accordance with Policy EN14, in the south-west part of the site.</u>	To provide clarity of what will be expected of development proposals, which makes the policy effective.
	Policy S7 Lechlade	L_19 – reduce capacity from 9 to 6 dwellings	To accord with updated information in the SHELAA Review (September 2017)[EB012]
	7.1.5.6	7.1.5.6 'Developers are advised that sites L_18B and L_19 are located within Source Protection Zone 1. Development in these locations have the potential to cause pollution and require precautions to be taken in consultation with the Environment Agency. A proportion of sites L_18B and L_19 lies...'	To correct an error – the two sites are not within Source Protection Zone 1. Resulting from Inspector's Actions AP6.1
	Policy S9 Tetbury	T_24B – delete allocation TET_E2A – delete allocation	To accord with updated information in the SHELAA Review (September 2017)[EB012]
	Policy SA2	Existing text of Policy SA2 to be deleted and replaced with the following: Policy SA2 STRATEGY DELIVERY – MID- COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA Within the context of policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are: <i>Highways</i>	To simplify the policy and clarify the delivery mechanism for the infrastructure proposals in the Sub-Area.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068) Stow-on-the-Wold. 	
	Policy S11 Bourton-on-the-Water	B_32 – delete allocation	To accord with updated information in the SHELAA Review (September 2017)[EB012]
	Policy S11 Bourton-on-the-Water	<p>Insert additional text (new para. 7.2.2.5):</p> <p><u>The redevelopment and re-use of the Countrywide Stores and former Co-op site for retail and leisure uses, will offer the opportunity to maintain the position of Bourton-on-the-Water in the retail hierarchy and stem the amount of shopping trips outside of the village. Proposals which would result in the primary re-use of the site for Class A1 retail use and other retail, food/beverage and Class D leisure uses will be supported in principle, subject to a sequential test and assessment of their impact on the health of, and investment within, Bourton Key centre.</u></p>	Consideration of site B_32 (former housing allocation) for the use or redevelopment of the site for retail purposes, following SHELAA Review [EB012] and Actions Required by Inspector for week 2.
	Policy S12 Northleach	N_13B – delete allocation	To accord with updated information in the SHELAA Review (September 2017)[EB012]
	Policy S13 Stow-on-the-Wold	S_8A – delete allocation	To accord with updated information in the SHELAA Review (September 2017)[EB012]
	Policy SA3	<p>Existing text of Policy SA3 to be deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <p>Policy SA3 STRATEGY DELIVERY - NORTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA</p> <p>Within the context of policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:</p> <p><i>Healthcare</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery (Chipping Campden). <p><i>Flood management</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood alleviation bund and channel (northwest and south of Moreton-in-Marsh). <p><i>Highways</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements for Fosse Way, Moreton-in-Marsh; Junction improvements at A429 (Roman Road)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and Junction improvements at A429 (Roman Road)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh. 	To simplify the policy and clarify the delivery mechanism for the infrastructure proposals in the Sub-Area.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><i>Education</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School. 	
	Policy S15 Blockley	BK_14A – reduce capacity from 16 to 9 dwellings.	To accord with planning permission (refs: 16/05066/OUT and 16/03027/FUL)
	Policy S16 Chipping Campden	CC_23B and CC_23C – amend capacity to 36 dwellings.	To accord with planning permission (ref: 16/00937/OUT)
	Policy S18 Moreton-in- Marsh	M_12A – reduce capacity from 68 to 63 dwellings Delete the employment allocation MOR_E11	To accord with updated information in the SHELAA Review (September 2017)[EB012]
	Para 8.1.4	8.1.4 New housing should reflect the need and demand of the District’s existing and future communities and should improve the quality and mix of new market and affordable housing in the District. To support this, new housing is required to provide internal space standards contained in the 'Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard March 2015' or successor document. <u>In order to provide an appropriate transition period the requirement to comply with the nationally described space standard will come into effect 12 months from the date of the Plan being adopted.</u> For the purposes of this Policy, affordable housing is as defined in the NPPF and latest legislation. Current definitions are included in the Glossary. [MM096]	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.2
	H1 (3) Housing Mix and Tenure to Meet Local Needs	<p>3. Subject to the demand identified on the Local Planning Authority's Self Build and Custom Register, on sites of more than 20 dwellings, developers will be required to provide at least 5% of dwelling plots for sale as serviced self or custom build plots.</p> <p>3. Proposals of more than 20 dwellings will be expected to provide 5% of dwelling plots for sale as serviced self or custom build plots, unless demand identified on the Local Planning Authority's Self Build and Custom Register demonstrates there is a higher or lower level of demand for plots.</p>	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.4
	H2 (2) – Affordable Housing	In settlements in rural areas, as defined under s157 of the Housing Act 1985, all housing developments that provide 6 <u>to 10</u> new dwellings will make a financial contribution by way of a commuted sum towards the District’s affordable housing need subject to viability. <u>Where financial contributions are required payment will be made upon completion of development.</u>	To provide further clarity that the thresholds in criterion H1(1) apply and to provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP10.1

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	Para 8.1.7	8.1.7 Self build and custom build encompasses a range of different project types, indeed, the Self Build Portal identifies seven different types, ranging from a self build individual plot through to a developer led group project. <u>Self build and custom build housing is encouraged on all allocated and windfall sites that propose twenty or more dwellings.</u> On sites of twenty or more dwellings, where the developer is required to provide self-build or custom build plots it will be expected that:	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.3
	Para 8.1.7 (2 nd bullet point)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> plots which have been made available and marketed appropriately for at least 12 months from the <u>start of development, or earlier if appropriate</u> (for example, where the site is likely to be built out in less than a year) commencement of the first housing unit, and have not sold, may either remain on the open market as self build or custom build or be offered to the Council or a Registered Provider before being built out by the developer; and 	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.5
	Para 8.1.5	8.1.5 (3 rd sentence)... Developers will be expected to <u>demonstrate have regard to local evidence, for example the latest SHMA and parish needs surveys, to show</u> how the proposed mix of market housing provision will meet local need and local demand with regard to household size and income. using information sources such as local evidence in the SHMA and parish needs surveys, for example. [FC044]	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.1
	Para 8.2.3	8.2.3 of the Local Plan to clarify the District’s need for net additional affordable homes: The proposed 8,400 housing requirement for Cotswold District over the plan period 2011 to 2031 would deliver around 420 homes per year. The SHMA Update (April 2016) identifies that 1,423 net additional affordable homes are needed to adequately house the District’s population at 2031. This is snapshot in time and applicants must refer to the latest SHMA when submitting planning applications. The Council will continue to maximise the delivery of affordable homes <u>through the delivery of the 8,400 dwelling housing requirement</u> to meet the District’s <u>affordable</u> housing need, subject to development viability.	To clarify the District’s need for net additional affordable homes. As per Councils response to Inspector’s week one actions (ED041).
	H3 (1) – Rural Exception Sites	1. Land which may not be considered appropriate for residential development may be released for a rural exception scheme for affordable housing development where there is an identified need within that parish or community for affordable housing. Where a need for affordable homes has been identified, development of an appropriate scale will be permitted within, adjoining, or closely related to, the built up areas of villages <u>and towns</u> , taking into account Parish Housing Surveys and Parish Plans or other local evidence, and provided that:	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP10.2

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	Para 8.4.1	<p>The SHMA <u>Update (April 2016)</u> has identified that, given the dramatic growth in the older population and the higher levels of disability and health problems amongst older people, there is likely to be an increased a requirement for <u>665 sheltered and extracare housing units between 2017 and 2031. This forms part of the OAN. In addition, there is a requirement for 580 nursing and residential bedspaces between 2017 and 2031. This is in addition to the OAN. These identified needs are a snapshot in time and applicants must refer to the latest SHMA when submitting planning applications. for specialist housing in the District over the plan period. However, this provision</u> <u>Specialist accommodation for older people</u> should be one of <u>include</u> a range of tenures and should not contribute to unbalanced communities.</p> <p>A third modification is proposed to the monitoring indicator for Policy H4 to clarify the measurement of progress of delivery of specialist accommodation for older people:</p> <p>Net additional dwellings designed for the elderly — by type (sheltered housing, care homes and other types of residential care accommodation).</p> <p>Net additional sheltered accommodation units (dwellings).</p> <p>Net additional extracare accommodation units (dwellings).</p> <p>Net additional nursing and residential care units (bedspaces).</p> <p>Vacant nursing and residential care units in Gloucestershire (bedspaces). This will identify spare capacity to meet nursing and residential care need.</p>	<p>To quantify the need for Specialist Accommodation for Older People. As per Councils response to Inspector’s week one actions (ED041).</p> <p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.10</p>
	H4 – Specialist Accommodation for Older People	<p>Proposals for specialist accommodation for older people, including sheltered housing <u>and extra case housing</u>, care homes and other appropriate models of accommodation for the elderly and those with particular needs, will be permitted provided that the development:</p>	<p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.7</p>
	H4 (d) – Specialist Accommodation for Older People	<p>(d) where accommodation is provided on a freehold or leasehold basis, the development will be expected to include provides an appropriate percentage of affordable housing in accordance with Policy H2. In the case of sheltered accommodation and extra care accommodation a mix of tenures will be encouraged.</p> <p>d) where accommodation is provided on a freehold or leasehold basis, provides affordable housing in accordance with Policy H2. This includes proposals for self-contained units of accommodation within a residential institution (use class C2). In the case of sheltered accommodation and extra care accommodation a mix of</p>	<p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.8</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		tenures will be encouraged. Where a development site has been divided into parts, or is being delivered in phases, the site will be considered as a whole for the purpose of determining the appropriate affordable housing requirement.	
	Para 8.4.3	Applicants will be expected to have regard to provide evidence that the accommodation meets the strategic aims and objectives of Gloucestershire County Council and NHS Gloucestershire when, including demonstrating a local need for the service. and written support from Gloucestershire County Council and NHS Gloucestershire	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.9
	Para 8.4.5	All developments of specialist accommodation for the elderly that fall within use class C3 will be expected to include affordable housing in accordance with policy H2, and that developments that include self contained units as part of a larger residential care home scheme will also be required to provide a proportion of those self contained units as affordable homes in accordance with policy H2. Care developments containing units with their own front door will be regarded as dwellings in accordance with the DCLG definition and classified as C3 land use. Therefore, they will trigger an obligation to provide affordable accommodation on site. If the site is considered unsuitable, for example due to the location or affordability of the units, the local planning authority may wish to accept a commuted sum instead to meet the need off site.	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.8
	H7 – Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites	<p>Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Show people Sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing authorised sites for gypsy, and traveller and travelling showpeople uses will be safeguarded provided there remains a need for these uses within the District. 2. The following locations, indicated on the Policies Maps in Appendix C, are identified as preferred sites for accommodating the future needs of gypsies and travellers¹³: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorcote, near South Cerney – 5 pitches • Seven Springs, Coberley – 1 pitch • Meadowview, Fosse Way, Bourton-on-the-Water – 4 pitches • Green's Close, Great Rissington – 2 pitches 3. If any shortfall is identified in the supply of gypsy and traveller accommodation, the following reserve site, will be brought forward¹⁴: 	<p>To reflect the updated PPTS (August 2015) and latest evidence, including the GTAA (March 2017).</p> <p>[N.B. The position could change further in the light of the forthcoming review of G&T sites].</p> <p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP11.2</p>

¹³ Those households meeting the definition set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (DCLG, August 2015)

¹⁴ As above

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven Springs, Coberley (second site) – 2 pitches <p>4. The following sequential approach will be used to determine the acceptability, in principle, of planning applications for gypsy and traveller development¹⁵:</p> <p>(a) First preference will be sites specifically allocated in this Plan for gypsies and travellers.</p> <p>(b) Second preference will be to designate additional pitches /plots within the boundaries of existing suitable gypsy and traveller sites, including sites that have already been identified for this use.</p> <p>(c) Third preference will be to extend existing suitable gypsy and traveller sites adjacent to existing boundaries.</p> <p>(d) Only where a sufficient supply of pitches or plots cannot be achieved at the above locations will new sites be considered.</p>					
	Paras 8.7.3 to 8.7.8	<p>8.7.3 The most recent <u>A jointly-commissioned</u> assessment of pitches required by the travelling community across the Gloucestershire Housing Market Area was commissioned jointly <u>published in 2013 March 2017 (GTTSA GTAA)¹⁶</u>. <u>Essentially, the GTAA established three categories of gypsies and travellers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Households that meet the new planning definition¹⁷;</u> • <u>Households that could not be interviewed, hence their status is 'unknown'; and</u> • <u>Households that do not meet the new definition.</u> <p>The GTTSA GTAA, which was prepared in the context of the first PPTS (March 2012), concluded that there was a need to provide an additional 3 26 pitches for travellers who meet the 2015 definition over the period 2013 2016-2031 in Cotswold District, essentially broken down into five year periods as follows: Those needs, which originate from Shorncote, should be met by 2021 with no further pitch requirements anticipated for the remainder of the Plan period.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="775 1158 1218 1278" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Identified future-pitch requirements</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Period</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Pitches</td> </tr> </table>	Identified future-pitch requirements		Period	Pitches	<p>To reflect the updated PPTS (August 2015) and latest evidence, including the GTAA (March 2017).</p> <p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP11.1</p>
Identified future-pitch requirements							
Period	Pitches						

¹⁵ As above

¹⁶ The Gloucestershire County Gypsy, and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (Peter Brett Associates, October 2013 Opinion Research Services, March 2017)

¹⁷ Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (DCLG, August 2015)

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION										
		<table border="1" data-bbox="779 181 1218 427"> <tr> <td></td> <td>required</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-17</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2018-22</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2023-27</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2028-31</td> <td>7</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="504 483 1585 866"><u>Regarding 'unknowns', the GTAA concluded that a potential need for up to 11 more pitches may arise from gypsy and traveller households currently residing in Cotswold District. This is the maximum number that might be needed over the Plan period from those households who could not be interviewed and, therefore, whose status cannot currently be ascertained. Based on over 100 previous studies, the GTAA has indicated that around 10% of 'unknowns' can be assumed to meet the 2015 definition. The Council considers it inappropriate to allocate sites for an unspecified number of pitches, which could range anywhere between 0 and 11. In the circumstances, the criteria in clause 4 of Policy H7 will be used to assess planning applications for pitches from travellers whose current status is 'unknown', but who are subsequently found to meet the 2015 definition.</u></p> <p data-bbox="504 887 1585 1046"><u>Regarding gypsy and traveller households who did not meet the 2015 definition, the GTAA established a potential need for a further 13 pitches arising from those currently living in Cotswold District. Therefore, appropriate accommodation is likely to be needed for between 13 and 24 additional households who do not currently meet the 2015 definition.</u></p> <p data-bbox="504 1067 1585 1358">8.7.4 The GTTSAA indicated broad geographical locations where the need for sites tends to occur and where the search for future sites would ideally be concentrated. It suggested, secondly, that consideration could be given to other locations, including around sustainable settlements, where there is good access to the highway network. The GTTSAA GTAA concluded that there was is no requirement to provide pitches for travelling showpeople within Cotswold District. A review of the GTTSAA is being produced in the light of the updated PPTS and other material considerations. Further updating of this policy may therefore be required when the review has been completed.</p> <p data-bbox="504 1378 1585 1469">8.7.5 A report examining potential travellers' sites Gypsy and Traveller – Identification of Potential Sites for Cotswold District (WS Planning & Architecture, November 2014) concluded that sufficient land had been identified</p>		required	2013-17	5	2018-22	6	2023-27	8	2028-31	7	
	required												
2013-17	5												
2018-22	6												
2023-27	8												
2028-31	7												

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>to meet the need for 26 pitches in accordance with the GTTSSA. The report found there to be a potential over supply of specific sites for years 1-5 (2013-2017) and years 6-10 (2018-2022). Since then, in March 2016, permission was granted for 2 pitches on a new site in South Cerney parish. 15/05501/FUL.</p> <p>8.7.6 An advisory panel assessed all potential sites to determine their suitability for allocation in the Local Plan Evidence Paper: Advisory Panel on Gypsy and Travellers Site Allocations Assessment (CDC, November 2014). The outcome of that exercise resulted in sufficient, suitable sites being identified to meet the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers to 2022. After that date, some of the 'broad locations' identified in the November 2014 sites report, together with any others that may come forward in the meantime, would need to be assessed to help establish a sufficient supply of sites for the remainder of the plan period. A review of potential gypsies and travellers sites is currently being undertaken will be undertaken as soon as the latest GTTSSAA has been completed.</p> <p>8.7.7 On the grounds that sufficient and suitable land has been allocated to meet future identified needs within the District, any proposals for pitches will be directed to those allocations allocated sites in the first instance. The majority of future need for pitches arises from the growth of existing families that are resident within the District. Therefore, the proposed approach is to seek to meet the needs of those who meet the 2015 definition where they arise. A sequential approach towards future provision is proposed, which provides for the intensification, and then extension of existing suitable gypsies and travellers sites, before any new sites are sought. Should any of the allocated sites be considered unsuitable, compelling reasons must be produced as to why it is necessary to consider an alternative location.</p> <p>8.7.8 The position will be monitored carefully over the course of the Plan period and, while there is a sufficient supply of sites to 2022, an early review will be undertaken should a shortfall become evident at any point.</p>	
	Policy EC2	Existing Established and allocated employment sites will be retained for B Class employment uses	To ensure the plan uses the term 'established employment site' consistently, which makes the Plan clear and effective
	Policy EC4	Amend Policy EC4 (1): 1. Development that is directly associated with the business operations of existing users-The Special Policy Areas (defined on the Policies Map) will be master-planned and development implemented on a comprehensive basis at the	A modification is proposed to policy EC4, clause 1, to clarify the types of uses that would be appropriate at the three special

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>following locations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Royal Agricultural University, Cirencester. At this site, proposals for the expansion of the existing University campus, including associated development for educational, training, business and research development, student accommodation and other operational floorspace required for the existing lawful use of the site, will be permitted.</u> • <u>Campden BRI, Chipping Campden. At this site, proposals for new laboratories, business space, conference, training facilities, staff and visitor facilities, ancillary development, and associated infrastructure to facilitate the use of the site as a food testing and research establishment, will be permitted.</u> • <u>Fire Services College, Moreton-in-Marsh. At this site, proposals for development of operational fire, rescue and emergency responders training facilities and associated infrastructure, will be permitted.</u> 	<p>policy area locations. Resulting from the Inspector's Week Two Actions Question/Issue 6.5.</p>
	<p>Para 9.2.4.1</p>	<p>Agriculture and other land-based sectors, including energy, tourism and recreation, underpin the rural economy of the Cotswolds and support a considerable number of ancillary businesses. Changes in agriculture have made diversification increasingly important to the economic viability of farm units.</p>	<p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP12.3</p>
	<p>Policy EC5 – Rural Diversification</p>	<p>a) the proposal would not prejudice the continued viable operation of the existing use will not cause conflict with the existing farming operation including severance or disruption to the agricultural holding that would prejudice its continued viable operation;</p> <p>b) existing buildings are reused wherever possible</p> <p>c) a whole farm business plan is provided, where considered appropriate, to demonstrate how the proposal, either individually or cumulatively, would support the continued operation of the agricultural and/or other land-based rural business. the scale and design of the development contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area;</p>	<p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP12.3</p>
	<p>Para 9.2.4.5</p>	<p>When required, the whole farm business plan should include details of existing agricultural activities, the need for diversification, details of the proposal and implications of the proposal on the rural economy and the environment. Proposals that constitute substantial changes to a farm or agricultural estate will be assisted by the submission of a whole farm plan. A whole farm plan should include information on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the history of the farm and its locality</u> • <u>existing buildings and their uses;</u> • <u>features of biodiversity or landscape interest;</u> 	<p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP12.3</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>archaeological sites, and information on the historic landscape of the farm, the reasons for diversification and the viability of the proposal; and</u> • <u>details of the proposal including projected employment, environment and traffic implications.</u> 	
	New para 9.2.4.6	<u>A proposal that avoids conflict with the existing farming operations will be well integrated with the existing operation, and will not give rise to any conflict with the agricultural or forestry operation of the farm or estate. For example, farms may cause environmental health problems to some high quality business use development, or a new industrial use could lead to outdoor storage requirements, causing circulation problems on the farm.</u>	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP12.3
	New para 9.2.4.7	<u>The continued viability of farm holdings is important to the rural economy. Where proposals affect a significant part of the farm holding, information may be requested on its extent, and what is proposed for the remainder of the holding including, in some cases, evidence that, following the proposed development, the holding will continue to operate viably.</u>	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP12.3
	Policy EC6 – Conversion of Rural Buildings	Subject to Policy EN9 (Conversion of Non Domestic Historic Buildings (designated and Non designated Heritage Assets), The conversion of rural buildings to alternative uses will be permitted provided:	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP12.4
	Para 9.2.5.3	<u>This policy applies to the conversion of all rural buildings, whether of modern or traditional construction. There are also other policies that are likely to be relevant to proposals for the conversion of rural buildings these include, H6 (Removal of Occupancy Conditions), EC11 (Tourist Accommodation) and EN13 (Conversion of Non Domestic Historic Buildings (designated and Non designated Heritage Assets)).</u>	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP12.4
	9.3.1.3	‘...Provision will be made through the site allocations in Cirencester (See Policies S1, S2 and S3A and S3F S3)	Consequential change
	Policy EC7 (3)	‘...Cirencester over the plan period (in accordance with Policies S1, S2 and S3A and S3F S3)’.	Consequential change
	Policy EC8 (5)	‘Subject to Policy S3A Clause 3 and 4 S3 for Cirencester...’	Duplication
	Policy EC8 (7)	Amend Policy EC8 (7): 7(d) <u>except where the proposal is in conformity with an allocation for main town centre uses elsewhere in the Plan,</u> comply with the sequential test, by demonstrating that there are no sequentially preferable sites or premises to...	To clarify the Council’s approach to the sequential test (and impact assessment) in relation to B1 office use. Resulting from the

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
			Inspector's MIQ 185, and SQ 185A and 185C.
	Policy EC8 (8)	In addition to Clause 7 criteria (a)-(d) proposals for retail, leisure and office uses outside of defined centres will, subject to the provisions of Policy EC9, be assessed in relation to their impact on:	This should be moved to the reasoned justification.
	9.3.2.1	Amend the last sentence: In Cirencester, the Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas is <u>are</u> specifically defined and lies within the wider Town Centre Boundary (see Policy S3 clauses 2-4).	Cross reference to a settlement-specific policy, which has been deleted from EC8 (5).
	9.3.2.2	Additional explanatory text following Policy EC8, new paragraph 9.3.2.2. <u>'Policy EC8 and the requirements for a sequential test and impact assessment will apply to proposals for main 'town centre uses' beyond the identified centre boundary. The requirement will not apply to proposals which are consistent with site allocations for main town centre uses in the Plan'.</u>	To clarify change to EC8 (7).
	New para after 9.3.2.3	<u>Proposals for retail, leisure and office uses outside of defined centres will, besides Clause 7 criteria (a)-(d), be subject to the provisions of Policy EC9.</u>	Moved from EC8 (8)
	9.3.3.2	Additional explanatory text following Policy EC9 in para. 9.3.3.2. <u>'The impact test applies to retail, office and leisure proposals (for the latter two uses, the default national threshold will apply). The scope and level of detail required will vary according to local circumstance. For clarity, the impact assessment test will apply to proposals in established employment sites and those within the identified development boundaries, as supported in principle by Policies EC2 and EC3, and in these cases a proportionate approach can be taken. For main town centre uses, including B1 office use, where the proposed use is in conformity with the allocation and as such considered suitable and in accordance with the plan, no impact assessment is required'.</u>	Clarity is needed to explain when an impact assessment applies to B class development, resulting from the Inspector's MIQ 185, and SQ 185A and 185C.
	Policy EC11 (1)(3)	1. <u>'...will be permitted <u>only</u> where the proposal...'</u> 3. <u>'...will <u>only</u> be permitted where it:..'</u>	Modification to policy, to reflect the narrowly permissive nature of the policy, resulting from the Inspector's 'Actions Required' following Week 3 Hearing Sessions - AP12.6
	Policy EC11 (5)(6)	<u>'Removal of occupancy conditions – holiday lets</u> <u>5. Applications for the removal of occupancy conditions on holiday accommodation that has been built or converted for that purpose outside</u>	To provide a specific clause(s) and clarity for consideration of holiday let / occupancy

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>Development Boundaries will not be permitted.</u></p> <p><u>6. Applications will be permitted where the original building was used as a dwelling or the building is located within Development Boundaries'.</u></p>	<p>conditions, in addition to Policy H6. Reinstate policies EC11, Clauses 5 and 6, that were deleted by FC061, resulting from the Inspector's 'Actions Required' following Week 3 Hearing Sessions - AP12.7</p>
	10.2.2.3	<p>...on the Map in Appendix A. Site LGS7 is proposed as a Local Green Space which can accommodate both community gardens and (12 dwellings). It has, therefore, been included in the proposed housing allocations (Policy S6, Site K_2), subject to securing the local term protection of the community gardens.</p>	<p>The submitted plan allocated different uses on the same land under the references LGS7 and K_2. A modification is proposed to split the site to define the extent of the Local Green Space and the housing allocation. This paragraph can therefore be deleted, as it is no longer relevant.</p>
	EN3 Local Green Spaces	<p>New paragraph after 10.2.2.4</p> <p><u>LGS3: Manor Fields, Bourton-on-the-Water has planning permission, in conjunction with permitted development rights, as a temporary car park for 42 days per year (13/03379/FUL). It is appropriate to designate this site as a Local Green Space alongside its use as a car park.</u></p>	<p>Reason for modification – Factual change. To reflect, in the Reasoned Justification that Manor Fields has temporary planning permission for a car park.</p>
	10.3.1.1 (FC069)	<p>Amend as follows: For the avoidance of doubt, the assessment of 'significant detrimental impact' includes a judgement on whether any adverse impacts of a proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p>	<p>To ensure accordance with the meaning of NPPF and avoid reducing the protection and conservation of landscape in the District.</p>
	EN10 Designated heritage Assets, clause 1 [Focussed Changed FC072]	<p>In considering proposals that affect a designated heritage asset or its setting, great weight will be given to the asset's conservation in proportion with the importance of the asset. <u>The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.</u></p>	<p>To ensure consistency with national policy (NPPF paragraph 132). Historic England consider that the policy, as currently drafted, implies less than great weight will be applied to certain designated heritage assets although national policy applies great weight to all designated heritage assets but greater great weight to the more important</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
			types of designated heritage asset such as World Heritage Sites. Change as proposed by Historic England.
	Policy INF1	<p>Delete existing policy text and replace with the following:</p> <p>Policy INF1</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Development will be permitted where infrastructure requirements identified to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms can be met. Provision of infrastructure will be secured having regard to regulatory and national policy requirements relating to developer contributions.</u> <p><u>Where, on the basis of evidence, a need for on-site infrastructure and services is identified provision may, where necessary, be secured through planning obligations.</u></p> <p><u>Where, on the basis of evidence, a need for off-site infrastructure and services is identified and/or negative impacts on existing off-site infrastructure and services are expected to arise, provision will be secured through either planning obligations and/or CIL tariff contributions as appropriate. Infrastructure provision in this context will take account of delivery of the strategic off-site infrastructure set out in policies SA1, SA2 and SA3.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <u>New or upgraded infrastructure will be provided in accordance with an agreed, phased timescale. Provision will be made, where necessary, for the ongoing maintenance of infrastructure and services.</u> 3. <u>Where there is concern relating to the viability of the development having regard to infrastructure provision requirements, an independent viability assessment, in proportion with the scale, nature and/or context of the proposal, will be required to accompany the planning application. The reasonable costs of the viability assessment will be met by the applicant.</u> 	To clarify the delivery mechanism for infrastructure provision.
	Policy INF2	<p>INF2 paragraph 11.2.2. Add '<i>allotments</i>' to the list of types of open spaces.</p> <p>INF2 paragraph 11.2.9. <i>With regard to the loss of sporting/community facilities,</i></p>	To ensure INF 2 and INF7 refer to the updated evidence concerning the range of open spaces and

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<i>including open spaces, it should be demonstrated that they are surplus to requirements through the Emerging/adopted Play and Pitch Strategy. <u>as indicated in the Play and Pitch Strategy, the Pools and Halls studies and the Green Infrastructure, Open Space and Play Space Strategy.</u></i>	recreation facilities, the additional text below will be added to the supporting text of policies INF2 and INF7:
	Policy INF7	INF7 paragraph 11.4.9. <i>The Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Play Space Strategy September 2017 as well as the Playing Pitch Strategy (Assessment Report 2017 and the Strategy and Action Plan 2017) are relevant to the implementation of this policy.</i>	To ensure INF 2 and INF7 refer to the updated evidence concerning the range of open spaces and recreation facilities, the additional text below will be added to the supporting text of policies INF2 and INF7:
	Policy INF10	Amend Policy INF10 to include the policy requirements set out in paragraph 11.7.17.	The text added to paragraph 11.7.17 by FC092 is considered upon reflection, to be "policy" rather than "reasoned justification". To provide further clarity within the Policy. Resulting from the Inspector's SQ -197B on Matter 15 and AP15.2
	SP1 – Cheltenham and Gloucester Green Belt	Amend to read as follows: "Inappropriate development within the Green Belt will <u>not</u> be permitted, having regard to national policy."	To ensure Policy SP1 is consistent with NPPF Green Belt policy.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	SP2 – Cotswold Airport	<p>Amend Policy SP2 as follows:</p> <p>1. —The change of use of existing buildings and any new development within the areas at Cotswold Airport, shown on the proposals Policies Map, will be permitted provided it is they are compatible with the use of the land as an aerodrome.</p> <p>2. — Outside of the area shown on Proposals Map, re-use of existing hangars for employment purposes within use classes B1, B2 and B8 will be permitted.</p>	<p>1. To ensure that Policy SP2 provides an effective framework to consider proposals for development directly related/ not related to the continued operation of the airport, both through the change of use of existing buildings and through the erection of new buildings.</p> <p>2. To avoid encouraging uses that might result in more HGV movements along inappropriate routes (see amendment to paragraph 12.2.8).</p> <p>3. Deletion of superfluous second clause, which duplicates Policy EC3.</p>
	Para 12.2.5	<p>Add the following sentence at the end of para 12.2.5, which starts: "In March 2015, the Department for Transport wrote...": <u>The Department for Transport published the General Aviation Strategy, which reiterated the importance of general aviation, in March 2015.</u></p>	<p>To draw attention to this important national strategy for aviation.</p>
	Para 12.2.8	<p>Add the following sentence to the end of para 12.2.8: "<u>...Any proposals for small-scale employment development at Cotswold Airport outside the areas shown on the Policies Map would be subject to Policy EC3, clause 2.</u></p>	<p>To provide clarification on the deletion of the second clause of Policy SP2.</p> <p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP12.1</p>
	Appendix K: Glossary	<p>Include reference to a range of open spaces, including parks and gardens, amenity open space, open space of public or nature conservation value, and open space of a natural or semi natural nature.</p>	<p>To ensure the Local Plan's Glossary lists a range of local community facilities and services and not just built development</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
			examples of these.
	Appendix K: Glossary	Update the definition for Employment Land: "land <u>primarily</u> used, with planning permission, or allocated in a development plan, for <u>B1, B2 or B8 Class</u> employment uses."	To provide clarity on the definition of employment land to ensure plan is effective
	Appendix K: Glossary	Insert new definition for Employment Uses: "B1, B2 or B8 Class uses"	To provide clarity on the definition of employment uses to ensure plan is effective