



Fairford Neighbourhood Development Plan (Regulation 16 Consultation) Revised SA and Site Assessment Report only

Following a clarification meeting with the independent examiner, Mr Andrew Ashcroft, to consider points raised on the Sustainability Appraisal on 10 May, Fairford Town Council has submitted a revised Sustainability Appraisal and Sites Assessment. These two documents only are now subject to consultation for a six week period, from Friday 9th June 2017 till 17:00 on Friday 21st July.

Copies of these documents are available to view on the Cotswold District Council's website:
www.cotswold.gov.uk/neighbourhoodplanning/consultations

Hard copies are also available for inspection between 9:00 and 17:00 Monday to Friday at the Council offices on Trinity Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1PX.

Copies are also available for inspection at:

Fairford Community Centre
Monday – Friday 10:00 – 13:00

All comments must be received by 17:00 on Friday 21st July 2017.

There are a number of ways to make your comments:

- Complete this form and email it to: neighbourhood.planning@cotswold.gov.uk
- Print this form and post it to: Neighbourhood Planning, Cotswold District Council, Trinity Road, Cirencester, GL7 1PX
- We will accept other comments in writing (including electronic, such as e-mail, provided that a name and address is supplied. We cannot accept anonymous comments.

All comments will be publicly available, and identifiable by name and (where applicable) organisation. Please note that any other personal information provided will be processed by Cotswold District Council in line with the Data Protection Act 1998.

How to use this form

Please complete Part A in full, in order for your representation to be taken into account at the Neighbourhood Plan examination.

Please complete Part B overleaf, identifying which paragraph your comment relates to by completing the appropriate box. Please repeat this section for subsequent comments relating to other sections of the plan.

PART A	Your Details
Full Name	Oliver Taylor
Address	Sentinel House Ancells Business Park Harvest Crescent Fleet Hampshire
Postcode	GU51 2UZ
Telephone	01252 360354
Email	otaylor@mjgleeson.com
Organisation (if applicable)	Gleeson Strategic Land Limited
Position (if applicable)	Strategic Land Manager
Date	20 th July 2017

PART B

To which part of the document does your representation relate?

Paragraph Number	8.2	Policy Reference:	FNP16
------------------	-----	-------------------	-------

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)

Support Support with modifications Oppose Have Comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:

Environmental Quality – We agree that at the very least the proposed allocation will have a neutral effect. A Flood Risk Assessment will accompany our planning application in due course and a suitable surface water drainage strategy devised to ensure that there are no increases in flood risk from any potential flood sources, including groundwater. A surface water drainage strategy for the site is currently being prepared which will ensure that the site's impermeable areas are limited to mimic greenfield runoff rates for the 1-year, 30-year and the 100-year return periods and sufficient attenuation provided to accommodate up to the 100-year return period flows when including a 40% climate change allowance.

Biodiversity – It is correct that there are no habitats or European protected species impacts identified on-site. The site comprises an arable field bounded by woodland, species poor hedgerows with trees and ditches as well as strips of marginal grassland. Whilst the site lies adjacent to the Woodpasture and Parkland BAP – designated a Strategic Nature Area (“**SNA**”) – we do not consider that the proposed allocation for up to 80 dwellings would have a ‘possible negative effect’. Gleeson is of the opinion that the effect would be ‘neutral’ as the BAP/SNA is off-site. Furthermore, in bringing the site forward for development all the hedgerows and trees are to be retained, save for a small removal of hedgerow (not more than 10 metres) to facilitate the site access/entrance. The loss of this small section of species poor hedgerow is in our opinion not sufficient enough to warrant a ‘negative effect’, especially when new structural and landscape planting will be delivered on-site as part of the development proposal.

Climate Change – We agree with the assessment that the effect would be neutral.

Historic Environment – The town’s Grade I and other Grade II listed buildings and a scheduled Anglo-Saxon burial ground lie at least 500m south of the site. Although the Grade I church tower can be glimpsed from near the site, the site itself does not contribute to the significance or an appreciation of significance of any of the listed buildings within the town. The north eastern tip of the Fairford Conservation Area adjoins the south western corner of the site. However, substantial screening provided by trees and other vegetation encloses the designated area and the southern edge of the site. Suitable further planting on the edge of the site will avoid any adverse effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore we agree that the negative effect identified will be lessened to a great extent as it should be acknowledged that there is no statutory duty to enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area – the Courts have confirmed that development that ‘preserves’ them is acceptable; and the statutory duty only covers development that is within a conservation area – the ‘setting’ of a conservation area is addressed by planning policy.

Land Resources – We agree the site is greenfield and current in arable use. It is not however ‘best and most versatile’. According to the Agricultural Land Classification South West Regional Map the land is classified as Grade 3 (Good to moderate) agricultural land. Within the immediate vicinity of the site and Fairford there is a substantial amount of Grade 3 agricultural land and as such its loss would not cause a negative effect.

Population & Communities – The allocation and site has the ability to deliver much need community infrastructure and as such we agree that this is a positive effect.

Health & Well-being – Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is some distance to the town centre, it is still within an acceptable walking distance. The Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (“**CIHT**”) has recently published updated guidance regarding the provision of sustainable travel in conjunction with new developments and this concludes that most people will walk to a destination that is less than one mile (see ‘Planning for Walking’ published 2015). In addition, Manual for Streets (“**MfS**”) identifies ‘walkable neighbourhoods’ as being characterised by having a range of facilities within 10 minutes’ (up to about 800 m) walking distance of residential areas which residents may access comfortably on foot. MfS sets out that 800m is not a maximum walking distance and that up to 2km offers the greatest opportunity for walking to replace car trips. It should be acknowledged that the distance from the site to the High Street is exactly 786 metres and therefore within 10 minute on foot journey time. As such we dispute that the FNP16 has a negative effect, it should be reclassified as a ‘positive effect’.

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

See above comments.

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

Please make sure any additional pages are clearly labelled/ addressed or attached.

To which part of the document does your representation relate?

Paragraph Number	Table D	Policy Reference:	FNP16
------------------	---------	-------------------	-------

Do you support, oppose, or wish to comment on this paragraph? (Please tick one answer)

Support Support with modifications Oppose Have Comments

Please give details of your reasons for support/opposition, or make other comments here:

Gleeson considered that in light of the above-mentioned comments table D should be update to reflect our changes. The Health & Well-being category should be update to show a positive effect rather than being recorded as a negative effect.

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

What improvements or modifications would you suggest?

See above comments.

(Continue on separate sheet if necessary)

Please make sure any additional pages are clearly labelled/ addressed or attached.