

PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATIONS TO DRAFT LOCAL PLAN: 19/12/2017

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
6. LOCAL PLAN STRATEGY			
	6.1.1	<p>6.1.1: ...The Local Plan has identified sufficient land to provide The District's OAN is 8,400 new dwellings (420 dwellings per annum) across the Plan period; this. The OAN includes market, affordable, sheltered and extra care dwellings. It does not include nursing and residential care home bed spaces. 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.</p>	<p>This modification clarifies which types of housing are included in the OAN, which makes the plan effective. The modification is associated with Matter 9 Action AP9.6 to AP9.8.</p>
	<p>DS1 – Development Strategy 6.1.2 and 6.1.16</p>	<p>AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY AND REQUIREMENT</p> <p>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...</p> <p>6.1.2: Providing for the maximum baseline forecast plus a 5 year buffer would <u>requires</u> 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>23 hectares</u> of B Class land, <u>support the delivery of extant planning permissions for B Class employment development (14 hectares)</u>, whilst also...</p> <p>6.1.16: Policy DS1 states that at least 27 hectares B-class employment land will be allocated within the District over the plan period <u>the Local Plan employment land requirement of 24 hectares will be delivered through site allocations and committed developments.</u></p>	<p>To reflect the Council's response to the MIQs on Session 6b (ED017.6b), Matter 8 (ED017.8) and Matter 12 (ED037). The modification clarifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the baseline forecast plus a 5 year buffer is not a maximum; • two employment allocations have been deleted (TET_E2A in Tetbury and MOR_E11 in Moreton-in-Marsh); • extant planning permissions contribute towards meeting the Local Plan employment land requirement; and • the identified need for employment land is 24

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION																		
			<p>hectares.</p> <p>The modification ensures that the plan is based on proportionate evidence and is justified.</p>																		
	<p>Tables 1 to 3 and Figure 1 6.1.10, 6.1.11, 6.1.12 and 6.1.14, and new paragraphs</p>	<p>AMENDMENTS TO THE HOUSING LAND SUPPLY AND REQUIREMENT</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Overall Housing Requirement and sources of Land Supply</th> <th>Number of units</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Housing Land Requirement</td> <td>8,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Housing Land Supply</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Completions 1st April 2011 to 31st March 20167</td> <td>2,3853,176</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Deliverable¹ and developable² extant planning permissions at 1st April 20167 (including -27 dwelling lapse rate)</u></td> <td><u>3,367</u>2,870</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Chesterton</u> strategic site</td> <td>2,350</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Other new land allocations in this Local Plan</u></td> <td><u>760</u>574</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Windfalls estimate 2019 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2031 @ XX p.a.</u></td> <td><u>960</u> 1,191</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Total expected housing delivery over the plan period</u> Supply</td> <td><u>9,822</u> <u>10,161</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 1 - Housing Requirement and Land Supply 2011-2031</p> <p>6.1.10: ...Based on past data <u>and expected future trends</u>, a realistic</p>	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>	<u>3,367</u> 2,870	<u>Chesterton</u> strategic site	2,350	<u>Other new land allocations in this Local Plan</u>	<u>760</u> 574	<u>Windfalls estimate 2019 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2031 @ XX p.a.</u>	<u>960</u> 1,191	<u>Total expected housing delivery over the plan period</u> Supply	<u>9,822</u> <u>10,161</u>	<p>Responds to Action AP16.1 to AP16.5 (ED069) – This modification clarifies how the housing land supply and requirement are calculated and how they will be updated in future. This change also updates the baseline position to 1 April 2017, as per the results of the Residential Land Monitoring Statistics Report (September 2017) (EB020) and the Housing Land Supply Report (November 2017) (ED046). The modification ensures that the plan is based on proportionate evidence and is justified. It also ensures that the plan is effective and deliverable over the plan period.</p>
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>	<u>3,367</u> 2,870																				
<u>Chesterton</u> strategic site	2,350																				
<u>Other new land allocations in this Local Plan</u>	<u>760</u> 574																				
<u>Windfalls estimate 2019 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2031 @ XX p.a.</u>	<u>960</u> 1,191																				
<u>Total expected housing delivery over the plan period</u> Supply	<u>9,822</u> <u>10,161</u>																				

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>estimate of <u>146 windfalls are expected to be delivered between 1st April 2017 and 31st March 2020 and 95 windfalls per annum 80 dwellings p.a. are anticipated over the remainder of the Plan period from 1st April 2019.</u></p> <p>New paragraph: <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></p> <p>6.1.11: 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 = 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. 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.</p> <p>New paragraph: <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>New paragraph: <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</u></p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION														
		<p><u>plan period.</u></p> <p>New paragraph: <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>New paragraph: <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> <p>6.1.12: <u>At 1st April 2016, the five-year housing land requirement for the plan area was recorded as:</u></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Annual requirement (420) x 5</td> <td>2,100</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Table 2 – Five-year Housing Land Requirement 2016-2021</u></p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Deliverable extant planning permissions at 1st April 2016 (with expected lapses totalling 48 units (20))</td> <td>3,136_± (3,184 subtract 48)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SHELAA sites over 5 units within Development Boundaries</td> <td><u>27</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Windfalls (2 years x 80 units)</td> <td><u>160</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total supply</td> <td><u>3,323</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Housing requirement 2016-2021</td> <td><u>2,100 (420 p.a.)</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5% buffer on requirement</td> <td>105</td> </tr> </table>	Annual requirement (420) x 5	2,100	Deliverable extant planning permissions at 1st April 2016 (with expected lapses totalling 48 units (20))	3,136 _± (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 (420 p.a.)</u>	5% buffer on requirement	105	
Annual requirement (420) x 5	2,100																
Deliverable extant planning permissions at 1st April 2016 (with expected lapses totalling 48 units (20))	3,136 _± (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 (420 p.a.)</u>																
5% buffer on requirement	105																

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION		REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		Supply in equivalent years $((3,323 / 2,205) \times 5)$	7.54	
		Table 3 – Five-year Housing Land Requirement 2016-2021		
		<u>Residual Requirement</u>		
		<u>A</u>	Total Residual Requirement for 2017 to 2031 (i.e. 8,400 - 3,176)	<u>5,224</u>
		<u>B</u>	Residual requirement for 2017 to 2031 expressed as an annual average (i.e. 5,224 / 14 years)	<u>373.1</u>
			Total residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 (i.e. 373.1 x 5 years)	<u>1,866</u>
		<u>C</u>	Total residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 plus a 5% buffer (i.e. 1,866 + 93)	<u>1,959</u>
		<u>D</u>	Residual requirement for 2017 to 2022 (including 5% buffer) expressed as an annual average (i.e. 1,959 / 5 years)	<u>392</u>
		<u>Five Year Supply for 2017 to 2022</u>		
		<u>E</u>	Deliverable sites with planning permission on 1 April 2017 (including - 27 dwelling lapse rate)	<u>2,503</u>
		<u>F</u>	Chesterton strategic site	<u>306</u>
		<u>G</u>	Other land allocations	<u>0</u>
		<u>H</u>	Windfalls	<u>336</u>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION			REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		I	Total supply for 2017 to 2022	3,145	
		J	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)	8 years	
		<p>Table 32 – Five-year Housing Land Requirement and Supply 20167-20212</p> <p>Footnote 20: Further details on the calculations are provided in tThe 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</p> <p>6.1.14: Over the five-year period 20167-20212, there is a land supply capable of delivering 3,323 3,145 homes. The identified supply exceeds five years' worth of housing requirements (2,100 1,866) by 1,223 1,186 dwellings. This is equivalent to 7.54 8 years' supply of land and is sufficient to provide ample flexibility and choice over the next five years.</p>			

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION																																																																																																																																																			
		 <p>Figure 1 – Cotswold Housing Trajectory 2011-2031, May 2016 at <u>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> <th>Average annual housing requirement (8,400 dwellings / 20 years = 420)</th> <th>Average annual housing requirement + 5% buffer ((8,400 dwellings / 20 years = 420) + 5% of 420) = 441</th> <th>Remaining annual housing requirement (subtracting cumulative supply surplus)</th> <th>Remaining annual housing requirement (subtracting cumulative supply surplus) + 5% buffer</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2011/12</td><td>528</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2012/13</td><td>393</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2013/14</td><td>399</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2014/15</td><td>505</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2015/16</td><td>597</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2016/17</td><td>754</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2017/18</td><td>907</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2018/19</td><td>680</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2019/20</td><td>483</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2020/21</td><td>504</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2021/22</td><td>571</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2022/23</td><td>501</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2023/24</td><td>439</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2024/25</td><td>395</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2025/26</td><td>402</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2026/27</td><td>398</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2027/28</td><td>433</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2028/29</td><td>398</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2029/30</td><td>426</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> <tr><td>2030/31</td><td>455</td><td>430</td><td>420</td><td>441</td><td>43</td><td>48</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Housing trajectory year	Completed dwellings	Housing supply	Average annual housing requirement (8,400 dwellings / 20 years = 420)	Average annual housing requirement + 5% buffer ((8,400 dwellings / 20 years = 420) + 5% of 420) = 441	Remaining annual housing requirement (subtracting cumulative supply surplus)	Remaining annual housing requirement (subtracting cumulative supply surplus) + 5% buffer	2011/12	528	430	420	441	43	48	2012/13	393	430	420	441	43	48	2013/14	399	430	420	441	43	48	2014/15	505	430	420	441	43	48	2015/16	597	430	420	441	43	48	2016/17	754	430	420	441	43	48	2017/18	907	430	420	441	43	48	2018/19	680	430	420	441	43	48	2019/20	483	430	420	441	43	48	2020/21	504	430	420	441	43	48	2021/22	571	430	420	441	43	48	2022/23	501	430	420	441	43	48	2023/24	439	430	420	441	43	48	2024/25	395	430	420	441	43	48	2025/26	402	430	420	441	43	48	2026/27	398	430	420	441	43	48	2027/28	433	430	420	441	43	48	2028/29	398	430	420	441	43	48	2029/30	426	430	420	441	43	48	2030/31	455	430	420	441	43	48	
Housing trajectory year	Completed dwellings	Housing supply	Average annual housing requirement (8,400 dwellings / 20 years = 420)	Average annual housing requirement + 5% buffer ((8,400 dwellings / 20 years = 420) + 5% of 420) = 441	Remaining annual housing requirement (subtracting cumulative supply surplus)	Remaining annual housing requirement (subtracting cumulative supply surplus) + 5% buffer																																																																																																																																																
2011/12	528	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2012/13	393	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2013/14	399	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2014/15	505	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2015/16	597	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2016/17	754	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2017/18	907	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2018/19	680	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2019/20	483	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2020/21	504	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2021/22	571	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2022/23	501	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2023/24	439	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2024/25	395	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2025/26	402	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2026/27	398	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2027/28	433	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2028/29	398	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2029/30	426	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
2030/31	455	430	420	441	43	48																																																																																																																																																
	<p>NEW SUB-SECTION 6.4 and Policy (DS4): Open Market Housing Outside Principal and Non-Principal Settlements</p>	<p><u>6.4 Open Market Housing outside Principal and Non-Principal Settlements (POLICY DS4)</u></p> <p><u>6.4.1: To promote sustainable development in the countryside, NPPF 55 expects housing to be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. In the absence of special circumstances, local planning authorities should avoid permitting new isolated homes in the countryside.</u></p> <p>POLICY DS4: OPEN MARKET HOUSING OUTSIDE DEVELOPMENT</p>	<p>Responds to Matter 2 Action 2.2 – This will plug a policy ‘gap’ identified at a planning appeal hearing (The Leasows, Chipping Campden – 16/01256/OUT). In so doing, this modification will ensure that the plan is consistent with national policy.</p>																																																																																																																																																			

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>BOUNDARIES AND NON-PRINCIPAL SETTLEMENTS</u></p> <p><u>New-build open market housing will not be permitted outside Principal and Non-Principal Settlements unless it is in accordance with other policies that expressly deal with residential development in such locations.</u></p> <p><u>6.4.2: The Local Plan’s Development Strategy seeks to promote sustainability by focussing most growth in 17 Principal Settlements, notably Cirencester (Policy DS2), while facilitating small-scale residential development in non-Principal Settlements (Policy DS3). The Strategy facilitates sufficient development within Development Boundaries to meet, in full, the District’s objectively assessed housing needs over the Plan period.</u></p> <p><u>6.4.3: Besides the provisions of NPPF 55, which makes an exception for country houses that are truly outstanding or innovative, the Local Plan has policies that potentially allow for certain types of housing development in the countryside including:</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>6.4.4: Policy DS4 is intended to preclude, in principle, the development of speculative new-build open market housing which, for strategic reasons, is not needed in the countryside. The policy does not, however, preclude the development of all open market housing in rural locations; for example, dwellings resulting from the replacement or sub-division of existing dwellings, or housing created from the conversion of rural buildings. It would also not prevent alterations to, or extensions of, existing buildings.</u></p> <p><u>6.4.5: Although there is normally no justification for allowing new-build open market dwellings in the countryside, Policy DS5 does facilitate flexibility to consider sites adjoining Development Boundaries. However,</u></p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>this would only be triggered in the unlikely event that the District Council's monitoring indicates a looming housing land supply shortfall.</u></p> <p><u>6.4.6: For the purposes of Policy DS4, any land that falls outside Development Boundaries and Non-Principal Settlements is referred to as countryside, even if it is technically previously developed land.</u></p>	
	<p>NEW SUB-SECTION and Policy (DS5): Ensuring a Five Year Housing Supply during the Plan Period</p>	<p><u>6.5 Ensuring a Five Year Housing Supply during the Plan Period (POLICY DS5)</u></p> <p><u>6.5.1: The timely delivery of housing is a key objective of the NPPF. 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>6.5.2: Failure to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land 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 planning applications for housing development should be permitted - even if it does not conform with the Local Plan's housing policies - unless any adverse impacts of doing so would "significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits" or if specific NPPF policies indicate that development should be restricted.</u></p> <p><u>6.5.3: This is a position the Council neither expects, nor wants, to find itself in; hence, it has introduced a policy to manage housing supply should the need arise.</u></p> <p>POLICY DS5 – ENSURING A FIVE YEAR HOUSING SUPPLY DURING THE</p>	<p>Responds to Matter 2 Action 2.2 – This Policy is proposed only as a fall-back position in the unlikely event of the housing supply falling to below 5.5 years, and to help ensure that a continuous supply of land is delivered in sustainable locations.</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>PLAN PERIOD</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>If the District Council’s annual residential land monitoring indicates that the District’s housing land supply is less than 5.5 years, proposals for residential development on land adjoining a Development Boundary will be considered favourably where they accord with other policies in this 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>The provisions of this policy will remain operative until the next, or subsequent, annual monitoring report demonstrates that there is at least 5.5 years’ worth of housing land supply.</u> <p><u>6.5.4: Although the housing supply has been significantly boosted since 2011 and a shortfall is not anticipated, the Council is not complacent. Accordingly, 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 supply 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 adjoining the Development Boundaries of Principal Settlements.</u> <p><u>6.5.5: Policy DS5 is only a fall-back position in the unlikely event of a looming housing land shortfall, i.e. if the Council’s monitoring indicates there is a supply of less than 5.5 years.</u></p> <p><u>6.5.6: The delivery of housing across the District is assessed through the production of annual residential monitoring reports, which includes an annual five year housing supply position statement and a housing trajectory. These are normally published around May each year.</u></p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>6.5.7: Section 6.1 of this Plan 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, when a healthy 8.0 years' worth of supply was demonstrated 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 is therefore not considered to persistently under-deliver housing; hence, a 5% (rather than 20%) buffer applies to the District's land supply calculations.</u></p> <p><u>6.5.8: NPPF 14 would normally be engaged if the annual housing monitoring reports demonstrated a supply of less than 5 years plus a 5% buffer. 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 Development Strategy is based.</u></p> <p><u>6.5.9: For this reason, Policy DS5 would be applied when monitoring demonstrates that the housing land supply had dipped below 5.5 years, which is considered a reasonable point at which to trigger DS5.</u></p> <p><u>6.5.10: It is anticipated that the flexibility afforded by Policy DS5 will to help restore housing supply to a healthy position by the time the next annual monitoring report is published. At that point, Policy DS5 need no longer be triggered. In the most unlikely event that a healthy supply is not restored, the policy would continue to be applied.</u></p> <p><u>6.5.11: 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>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>6.5.12: 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>6.5.13: Without prejudice to the consideration of any sites under Policy DS5, land adjoining 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>6.5.14: In this context, it is important to appreciate that even if a site adjoins 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>	
	6.3.5	<p>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 ...</p>	<p>Responds to Matter 2 Action 2.2 – The deleted text was included in error. Its deletion removes doubt and ensures the plan is clear and therefore effective.</p>
7. DELIVERING THE STRATEGY			
	7.0.1 and a	7.0.1: A total of at least 8,400 houses is planned to be delivered in the	Responds to Matter 6 Action

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	new paragraph	<p>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>New paragraph (7.0.2): <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>	<p>6.4 – rather than providing detailed information in the Local Plan for each allocation, this modification directs users of the Local Plan to where further information can be accessed on site constraints and the appropriate scale and nature of development. This modification will also help to inform Local Plan users of which assets should be retained on sites. The modification also avoids repetition of DS1. Furthermore, the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) is updated annually and the change ensures that the plan reflects the most recent SHELAA – the modification collectively ensures that the plan is flexible, clear and effective.</p>
	7.0.12 and a new paragraph	<p>REASONED JUSTIFICATION ADDITION FOR NON-STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <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</p>	<p>To clarify the delivery mechanism for infrastructure items identified in settlement policies.</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>designations are shown on the inset map for each settlement.</p> <p>New paragraph (7.0.13): <u>The non-strategic infrastructure items referred to above were identified during engagement and consultation with local communities. These items are not critical or essential to delivery of the Local Plan, but some may be regarded as contributing to local place-making. Whilst 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, an appropriate funding source for delivery may be the Community Infrastructure Levy.</u></p>	
	<p>SA1 – South Cotswold – Principal Settlements</p>	<p>Delete existing Policy SA1 text and replace with the following:</p> <p><u>Policy SA1</u></p> <p><u>STRATEGY DELIVERY - SOUTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA</u></p> <p><u>Within the context of policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the South Cotswolds Sub-Area are:</u></p> <p><u>Healthcare</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Romney House surgery, Tetbury - expansion or relocation; and</u> • <u>New doctors' surgery in Cirencester.</u> <p><u>Flood management</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>SUDS and soft measure interventions to manage flood risk.</u> <p><u>Highways</u></p> <p><u>Junction improvements at:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>A429 / Cherrytree Lane, Cirencester;</u> • <u>A417 (High Street) / A361 (Thames Street), Lechlade;</u> • <u>A417 / Whelford Road, between Fairford and Lechlade;</u> • <u>A429 / A433, between Cirencester and Kemble; and</u> • <u>A433 (London Road) / A433 (Long Street) / Hampton Street / New Church Street, Tetbury.</u> <p><u>Sport & Recreation</u></p>	<p>Responds to Matter 6 Actions 6.1 and the Council's responses to the MIQs on SA1 (ED017) – The modification simplifies the policy and clarifies the delivery mechanism for the infrastructure proposals in the Sub-Area.</p> <p>Having regard to the updated Highways Capacity Assessment (ED028), there is no longer a requirement for the junction in Tetbury between the A433 (Long Street) / A433 (Bath Road) / B4014 (Fox Hill) / Chipping Street. This modification ensures that the plan is justified and based on proportionate evidence.</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Re-use of the former Cirencester to Kemble and Tetbury to Kemble railway lines for cycling; and</u> • <u>Cycling infrastructure in Cirencester, including improvements to Tetbury Road and London Road corridors.</u> 	
	7.1.1.1.6	<p>CIRENCESTER HERITAGE ASSET AMENDMENTS</p> <p>7.1.1.1.6: As a Town Centre SPD. The <u>existing</u> Cirencester Archaeology Review <u>Archaeological Assessment</u> (January 2014) and any further assessment required 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</u> be used as a key driver and focus for inward investment, regeneration and redevelopment.</p>	To ensure clarity in the text. Change as proposed by Historic England
	S1; S5; S7; S9; S11; S12; S13; S15; S16; and S18.	<p>ALLOCATION AMENDMENTS IN LIGHT OF UPDATED SHELAA (SEPTEMBER 2017)</p> <p>S1 – Cirencester Town: C_39 – delete allocation</p> <p>S1 – Cirencester Town: C_97 – reduce capacity from 11 to 9 dwellings</p> <p>S5 – Fairford: F_44 – reduce capacity from 28 to 12 dwellings</p> <p>S7 – Lechlade: L_19 – reduce capacity from 9 to 6 dwellings</p> <p>S9 – Tetbury: T_24B – delete allocation</p> <p>S9 – Tetbury: TET_E2A – delete allocation</p> <p>S11 – Bourton-on-the-Water: B_32 – delete allocation</p> <p>S12 – Northleach: N_13B – delete allocation</p> <p>S13 – Stow-on-the-Wold: S_8A – delete allocation</p> <p>S15 – Blockley: BK_14A – reduce capacity from 16 to 9 dwellings</p>	Partly responds to Matter 8 Action 8.2. The modifications also update the plan to reflect the Council responses to the MIQs on Matters 6a, 6b, 7 and 8. These were discussed at the respective hearing sessions and update the plan to reflect the SHELAA Review (September 2017) [EB012]. The modifications ensure the plan is justified and is based on proportionate evidence.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>S16 – Chipping Campden: CC_23B and CC_23C – amend boundary and reduce capacity from 114 to 36 dwellings</p> <p>S18 – Moreton-in-Marsh: M_12A – reduce capacity from 68 to 63 dwellings</p> <p>S18 – Moreton-in-Marsh: MOR_E11 – delete allocation</p>	
	<p>S1; S5; S8; S9; S10; S11; S12; S14; S15; S16; S17; S18, S19 and EC2 9.1.5, 9.2.1.2, 9.2.1.4, 9.2.1.7 and Table 8 (Minimum Disabled Parking Provision)</p>	<p>STANDARDISED USE OF THE TERM 'ESTABLISHED EMPLOYMENT SITES'</p> <p>Amend policies S1; S5; S8; S9; S10; S11; S12; S14; S15; S16; S17; S18 and S19 as follows: Protected-existing <u>Established</u> employment sites:</p> <p>Policy EC2: Existing Established and allocated employment sites will be retained for B Class employment uses</p> <p>NB – consequential changes to the reasoned justification will result from the standardised use of the phrase '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>	<p>Responds to Q13 of the Inspector's Further Preliminary Questions (ED006). The submitted Plan uses several different terms to describe the same thing, including: established employment site, existing employment sites and protected existing employment sites. The different terms will be standardised to ensure that the Plan is clear and effective.</p>
	7.1.1.2.9	<p>7.1.1.2.9: 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 ensures 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>Inspector's MIQ 182 highlighted to the Council that more clarity is needed in paragraph 7.1.1.2.9. A modification has been made to provide clarity on meaning of 'small-scale' shopping and service units and further explanation on the role of the neighbourhood centre. This ensures that the plan is effective.</p>
	<u>Sub-section 7.1.1.3 -</u>	Delete entire sub-section 7.1.1.3 and replace with the following:	Responds to Matter 6 Action 6.3 – The Modification will:

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	<p><u>Cirencester Town Centre</u></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>7.1.1.3.2: The rural nature of the surrounding areas, along with relatively poor public transport coverage, inevitably means that the majority of people from outside 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>7.1.1.3.3: 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 quality³.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.4: 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>7.1.1.3.5: Certain issues, however, require specific policy guidance, including future retail provision (see Policy EC7, clause 3), mixes of uses</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify the proposed approach to off-street car parking provision, including the net gain in spaces being pursued. 2. Clarify how redevelopment of existing surface level car parks and other elements of the town centre strategy are expected to be implemented following the delivery of decked parking. 3. Distinguish between matters of policy and strategy. 4. Bring the contents of this section up-to-date. 5. Generally better explain the strategy for the town centre. 6. 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).

³ NS026 Cirencester Town Centre Conservations Area Appraisals

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>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><u>Retailing and other main town centre uses⁴</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <u>Class A1 uses should be concentrated in the Primary Frontage, defined on 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> 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> 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</u> 	

⁴ 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>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> <hr/> <p><u>The Strategy</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.6: 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>7.1.1.3.7: 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 development opportunities in the town centre.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.8: A major study of the town centre and resulting policy guidance⁵ 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>7.1.1.3.9: Cirencester currently has several surface-level car parks, and</u></p>	

⁵ Including Cirencester Town Centre SPD (November 2008) [EB071]; Cirencester Traffic and Movement Study (June 2007, Hyder Consulting) [NS021]

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>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)⁶.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.10: 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>7.1.1.3.11: 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>7.1.1.3.12: 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 -</u></p>	

⁶ Cirencester Town Centre Off-Street Parking Study (Atkins, 3 February 2017):

<http://www.cmis.cotswold.gov.uk/CMIS5/Document.ashx?czJKcaeAi5tUFL1DTL2UE4zNRBcoShgo=Gzrb2ku8AbRAy50DjakIh0awggJqwQwyMYwPo91QoZcn%2bYv7Ym3%2fIQ%3d%3d&rUzwrPp%2bZ3zd4E7Ikn8Lyw%3d%3d=pwRE6AGJFLDNIh225F5QMaQWctPHwdhUfCZ%2fLUQzqA2uL5jNRG4jdQ%3d%3d&mCTIbCubSFfXsDGW9IXnlq%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%3d&kCx1AnS9%2fpWZQ40DXFvdEw%3d%3d=hFfIUdN3100%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>Forum area, redevelopment options could be considered to create this much-needed facility.</u></p> <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> <p><u>a. The rationalisation and intensification of off-street parking, including decking at least one existing car park (ideally The Waterloo) to meet</u></p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>identified parking needs, including for retailing and long-stay commuting⁷;</u></p> <p>b. <u>Where justified, and subject to sufficient off-street parking being provided, considering the removal of on-street car parking where appropriate;</u></p> <p>c. <u>Creating an improved public transport interchange in the Southway - Forum area;</u></p> <p>d. <u>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 standard⁸.</u></p> <p>5. <u>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>6. <u>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>7. <u>The Brewery and Forum car parks have been identified as potentially favourable locations for retailing.</u></p> <p>8. <u>Any comprehensive redevelopment of key sites⁹ should be guided by a master plan prepared by Cotswold District Council as a</u></p>	

⁷ Cirencester Parking Survey (Gloucestershire County Council, August 2015)

⁸ Cotswold Cycling Strategy SPG - aims and objectives

⁹ 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>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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. Enhanced streetscape, urban environment, amenity, safety and the improvement of the ‘active’ street frontage;</u> <u>b. Improving the public realm with clear signposting and routing to key town centre destinations utilising distinctive local materials;</u> <u>c. Securing public art proposals and high quality and distinctive street furniture.</u> <u>d. 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</u> 	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>landscape features.</u></p> <p><u>7.1.1.3.13: 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>7.1.1.3.14: 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>7.1.1.3.15: 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>7.1.1.3.16: The District Council, through the auspices of the Cirencester Car Parking Project Board, is actively reviewing parking provision in Cirencester and developing remedial options¹⁰. 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>7.1.1.3.17: 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>7.1.1.3.18: 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>7.1.1.3.19: The Cotswold Retail Study¹¹ 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>7.1.1.3.20: 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</u></p>	

¹⁰ <http://www.cotswold.gov.uk/residents/environment/parking-and-public-toilets/cirencester-parking-project/>

¹¹ Bilfinger GVA, June 2017

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>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>7.1.1.3.21: 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 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>7.1.1.3.22: 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>7.1.1.3.23: 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>7.1.1.3.24: 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,</u></p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>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>	
	<p>S4 to S16 (except S12 and S14)</p>	<p><u>Non-Strategic (Local) Infrastructure</u> 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 <u>The following projects are proposed:</u></p>	<p>Responds to Matter 6 Action 6.2 – The modification enables the delivery of locally-identified non-strategic infrastructure. This ensures that the plan is consistent with national policy.</p>
	<p>S6 – Kemble</p>	<p>K_2 – reduce capacity from 12 to 8 dwellings</p>	<p>Reflects the Council’s response to Matter 6 Action 6.7. This reflects the further community engagement on the K_2 allocation in November/ December 2017. The modification ensures that the Plan is justified and based on proportionate evidence.</p>
	<p>7.1.4.7</p>	<p><u>7.1.4.7: ...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</u></p>	<p>To provide clarity of what will be expected of development proposals, which makes the policy effective.</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<u>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>	
	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...	Responds to Action AP6.1 – The modification corrects an error. The two sites are not within Source Protection Zone 1. The modification therefore ensures that the plan is based on proportionate evidence and is justified.
	SA2 – Mid Cotswold – Principal Settlements	Delete Policy SA2 text and replace with the following: <u>Policy SA2</u> <u>STRATEGY DELIVERY – MID-COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA</u> <u>Within the context of policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the Mid-Cotswolds Sub-Area are:</u> <u>Highways</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Improvement of Unicorn junction (A436/B4068), Stow-on-the-Wold.</u> 	Responds to Matter 6 Actions 6.1 and the Council’s responses to the MIQs on SA2 (ED017) – The modification simplifies the policy and clarifies the delivery mechanism for the infrastructure proposals in the sub-area. It also has regard to the updated Highways Capacity Assessment (ED028). This modification ensures that the plan is justified and based on proportionate evidence.
	New paragraph after 7.2.2.4	<u>New paragraph (7.2.2.5): 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</u>	Responds to Matter 7 Action 7.1 – this site is already in retail use and does not require a new policy to support the site’s redevelopment for retail use. However, the modification reflects the findings of SHELAA

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<u>assessment of their impact on the health of, and investment within the Bourton-on-the-Water Key Centre Boundary.</u>	Review (September 2017) [EB012] and provides clarity on the Council's position regarding this site. The modification therefore ensures that the plan is effective and justified.
	SA3 – North Cotswold – Principal Settlements	Delete Policy SA3 text and replace with the following: STRATEGY DELIVERY – NORTH COTSWOLDS SUB-AREA <u>Within the context of policy INF1, the strategic infrastructure requirements for the North Cotswolds Sub-Area are:</u> <u>Healthcare</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Expansion or replacement of doctors' surgery in Chipping Campden.</u> <u>Flood management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Flood alleviation bund and channel to the north-west and south of Moreton-in-Marsh.</u> <u>Highways</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Improvements to A429 (Fosse Way), Moreton-in-Marsh;</u> • <u>Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Oxford Street), Moreton-in-Marsh; and</u> • <u>Junction improvements at A429 (High Street)/A44 (Bourton Road), Moreton-in-Marsh.</u> <u>Education</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Expansion of Chipping Campden Secondary School.</u> 	Responds to Matter 6 Actions 6.1 and the Council's responses to the MIQs on SA3 (ED017) – The modification simplifies the policy and clarifies the delivery mechanism for the infrastructure proposals in the Sub-Area. It also has regard to the updated Highways Capacity Assessment (ED028). This modification ensures that the plan is justified and is based on proportionate evidence.
8. HOUSING TO MEET LOCAL NEEDS			
	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,	Responds to Matter 9 Action AP9.2 – the modification provides further clarity that

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>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>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]</p>	<p>the nationally described space standard will come into effect 12 months from the date of the Plan being adopted (in order to provide an appropriate transition period). This ensures that the plan accords with national policy.</p>
	<p>H1 (3) – Housing Mix and Tenure to Meet Local Needs</p>	<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>	<p>Responds to Matter 9 Action AP9.4 – the modification clarifies that the number of self build plots required on sites of more than 20 dwellings could be more or less than 5% depending on identified demand. This ensures that the plan is effective.</p>
	<p>H2 (2) – Affordable Housing</p>	<p>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></p>	<p>Responds to Matter 10 Action AP10.1 – The modification clarifies that the thresholds in criterion H1 (1) apply. It also clarifies that financial contributions by way of a commuted sum towards meeting affordable housing need would be made on completion of development. In so doing, the plan will be effective.</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	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:	Responds to Matter 9 Action AP9.3 – The modification clarifies that self and custom build housing is encouraged on all allocations and on windfall sites that are in accordance with other policies in the Plan. In so doing, the plan will be effective.
	8.1.7 (Bullet Point 2)	<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 	Responds to Matter 9 Action AP9.5 – The modification clarifies the cascade mechanism including with regard to the 12 month marketing period being from the start of development or earlier if appropriate, and that any plot offered to the Council or Registered Provider would be at market value. In so doing, the plan will be effective.
	8.1.5	8.1.5: Developers will be expected to demonstrate <u>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
	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	To clarify the District’s need for net additional affordable homes. As per the Councils response to Inspector’s week

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>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.</u> The Council will continue to maximise the delivery of affordable homes <u>through the delivery of the 8,400 dwelling housing requirement to meet the District's affordable housing need, subject to development viability.</u></p>	<p>one actions (ED041).</p>
	<p>H3 (1) – Rural Exception Sites</p>	<p>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 <u>villages and towns</u>, taking into account Parish Housing Surveys and Parish Plans or other local evidence, and provided that:</p>	<p>To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP10.2</p>
	<p>8.4.1 and the monitoring indicator for Policy H4</p>	<p>8.4.1: The SHMA Update (April 2016) has identified <u>identifies that, given the there will be a dramatic growth in the older population in Cotswold District with and the higher levels of disability and health problems amongst older people. There is likely to be an increased a requirement for 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 Specialist accommodation for older people should be one of include</u> a range of tenures and should not contribute to unbalanced communities.</p> <p>MONITORING INDICATOR FOR POLICY H4</p> <p>Net additional dwellings designed for the elderly – by type (sheltered housing, care homes and other types of residential care</p>	<p>Response to Matter 3 Actions 3.1 and Matter 9 Action AP9.6 – The modification quantifies the need for Specialist Accommodation for Older People. This ensures that the Plan is effective in that it is flexible and able to be monitored.</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>accommodation)-</p> <p><u>Net additional sheltered and extracare accommodation units (dwellings).</u></p> <p><u>Net additional nursing and residential care units (bedspaces).</u></p> <p><u>Vacant nursing and residential care units in Gloucestershire (bedspaces).</u></p> <p><u>This will identify spare capacity to meet nursing and residential care need.</u></p>	
	H4 – Specialist Accommodation for Older People	Proposals for specialist accommodation for older people, including sheltered <u>and extracare</u> housing, care homes and other appropriate models of accommodation for the elderly and those with particular needs, will be permitted provided that the development:	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.7
	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 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.</p>	To provide further clarity in response to actions required following Hearing Sessions for Matters 9 to 13 (Week Three) – Action AP9.8
	8.4.3	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

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	8.4.5 and new paragraphs before 8.4.5	<p>New paragraph: <u>There is sometimes confusion as to whether specialist accommodation for older people falls into the use class defined as a residential institution (C2) or a dwelling house (C3). Be that as it may, development which creates living spaces that retain the essential characteristics of a self-contained dwelling, even if some care is provided, will be expected to provide affordable housing in accordance with policy H2.</u></p> <p>New paragraph: <u>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.</u></p> <p>8.4.5: 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.</p>	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 8.7.3 to 8.7.8	<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 travellers¹²: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorncote, 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 	<p>To ensure that Policy H7 is consistent with national policy, specifically the updated PPTS (August 2015).</p> <p>To ensure that Policy H7 is justified in terms of being consistent with the latest evidence, including the GTAA (March 2017). [N.B. The position could change further in the light of the forthcoming</p>

¹² Those households meeting the definition set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (DCLG, August 2015)

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>3. If any shortfall is identified in the supply of Gypsy and traveller accommodation, the following reserve site, will be brought forward¹³:</p> <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 development¹⁴:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) First preference will be sites specifically allocated in this Plan for gypsies and travellers. (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. (c) Third preference will be to extend existing suitable gypsy and traveller sites adjacent to existing boundaries. (d) Only where a sufficient supply of pitches or plots cannot be achieved at the above locations will new sites be considered. <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 published in 2013 <u>published in March 2017</u> (GTTSAA GTAA)¹⁵. Essentially, the GTAA established three categories of <u>gypsies and travellers</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Households that meet the new planning definition</u>¹⁶; • <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>review of G&T sites].</p> <p>To provide further clarity in response to Actions AP11.2 and AP11.3.</p>

¹³ As above

¹⁴ As above

¹⁵ The Gloucestershire County Gypsy, and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (Peter Brett Associates, October 2013 Opinion Research Services, March 2017)

¹⁶ Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (DCLG, August 2015)

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION												
		<p>The GTTSAA GTAA, which was prepared in the context of the first PPTS (March 2012), concludes that there is a need to provide an additional 3 26 pitches for Gypsies and 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"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Identified future pitch requirements</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Period</th> <th>Pitches required</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <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> </tbody> </table> <p>Regarding 'unknowns', the GTAA concludes 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 indicates 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.</p> <p>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,</p>	Identified future pitch requirements		Period	Pitches required	2013-17	5	2018-22	6	2023-27	8	2028-31	7	
Identified future pitch requirements															
Period	Pitches required														
2013-17	5														
2018-22	6														
2023-27	8														
2028-31	7														

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>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>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>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 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 Gypsy and Travellers sites is currently being undertaken will be undertaken as soon as the latest GTTSAA has been completed.</p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<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 <u>the</u> future need <u>for pitches</u> arises from the growth of existing families that are resident within the District. Therefore, the proposed approach is to <u>Council will seek to meet the needs of those who meet the 2015 definition where they arise. The Council will require a sequential approach towards future provision is proposed, which provides for prioritises</u> the intensification, and then extension of existing suitable Gypsy and Traveller 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>	
9. ECONOMY, INCLUDING RETAIL AND TOURISM			
	EC4 (1) – Special Policy Areas	<p>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 following locations:</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</u> 	A modification is proposed to policy EC4, clause 1, to clarify the types of uses that would be appropriate at the three special policy area locations. Resulting from the Inspector's Week Two Actions Question/Issue 6.5.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>infrastructure to facilitate the use of the site as a food testing and research establishment, will be permitted.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <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> 	
9.2.4.1		<p>9.2.4.1: 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>
EC5 – Rural Diversification		<p>a) the proposal would not prejudice the continued viable operation of the existing use <u>will not cause conflict with the existing farming operation including severance or disruption to the agricultural holding that would prejudice its continued viable operation;</u></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. <u>the scale and design of the development contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area;</u></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>
9.2.4.5 and new paragraphs		<p>9.2.4.5: 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. <u>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:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>the history of the farm and its locality</u> • <u>existing buildings and their uses;</u> 	<p>Response Matter 12 Action AP12.3 – To provide further clarity</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>features of biodiversity or landscape interest;</u> • <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> <p>New paragraph (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></p> <p>New paragraph (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></p>	
	EC6 – Conversion of Rural Buildings	Subject to Policy EN9 (Conversion of Non Domestic Historic Buildings (designated and Non designated Heritage Assets)), <u>The conversion of rural buildings to alternative uses will be permitted provided:</u>	Response Matter 12 Action AP12.4 –To provide further clarity
	9.2.5.3	9.2.5.3: This policy applies to the conversion of all rural buildings, whether of modern or traditional construction. <u>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	9.3.1.3: ...Provision will be made through the site allocations in Cirencester (See Policies S1, S2 and S3A and S3F <u>S3</u>)	Consequential change

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	EC7 (3) – Retail	...Cirencester over the plan period (in accordance with Policies S1, S2 and S3A and S3F <u>S3</u>).	Consequential change
	EC8 (5) – Main Town Centre Uses	Subject to Policy S3A Clause 3 and 4 <u>S3</u> for Cirencester...	Duplication
	EC8 (7) – Main Town Centre Uses	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 Inspector's MIQ 185, and SQ 185A and 185C.
	EC8 (8) – Main Town Centre Uses	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	9.3.2.1: In Cirencester, the Primary <u>and Secondary</u> Shopping Areas <u>is are</u> specifically defined and lies within the wider Town Centre Boundary (<u>see Policy S3 clauses 2-4</u>).	Cross reference to a settlement-specific policy, which has been deleted from EC8 (5)
	New paragraph after 9.3.2.1	New paragraph: <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 paragraph after 9.3.2.3	New paragraph: <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	9.3.3.2: The impact test applies to retail, office and leisure proposals (<u>for the latter two uses, the default national threshold will apply</u>). The scope and level of detail required will vary according to local	Clarity is needed to explain when an impact assessment applies to B class

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>circumstance. For clarity, <u>the impact assessment test applies 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></p>	<p>development, resulting from the Inspector's MIQ 185, and SQ 185A and 185C.</p>
	<p>EC11 (1)(3) – Tourist Accommodation</p>	<p>1. ...will be permitted <u>only</u> where the proposal... 3. ...will <u>only</u> be permitted where it:</p>	<p>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</p>
	<p>EC11 (5)(6) – Tourist Accommodation</p>	<p><u>Removal of occupancy conditions – holiday lets</u> 5. <u>Applications for the removal of occupancy conditions on holiday accommodation that has been built or converted for that purpose outside Development Boundaries will not be permitted.</u> 6. <u>Applications will be permitted where the original building was used as a dwelling or the building is located within Development Boundaries.</u></p>	<p>To provide a specific clause(s) and clarity for consideration of holiday let / occupancy 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>
<p>10. BUILT, NATURAL AND HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</p>			
	<p>10.2.2.3</p>	<p>10.2.2.3: ...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, which is not consistent with national policy. A modification is proposed to split the site to define the</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
			extent of the Local Green Space and the housing allocation. This part of the paragraph can therefore be deleted, as it is no longer relevant.
	New paragraph after 10.2.2.4	10.2.2.5 (new paragraph): <u>LGS3: Manor Fields, Bourton-on-the-Water has planning permission, in conjunction with permitted development rights, as a car park for up to 42 days per calendar year (13/03379/FUL). It is appropriate to designate this site as a Local Green Space alongside its car park use.</u>	To identify that Manor Fields has planning permission for a car park for a maximum of 42 days per calendar year.
	10.3.1.1 and a new paragraph after 10.3.1.1	<p>10.3.1.1: Policy EN4 applies to the whole District <u>including the Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) and the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The distinctive importance of these areas is such that they are supported by their own policies EN5 and EN6 setting out additional criteria to be taken into account in relation to development proposals.</u> Many of the special qualities of the Cotswolds are shared by the rest of the District, including the setting of the AONB. The Cotswolds National Character Area, as delineated by Natural England, covers a wider area than that formally designated as AONB. The other two National Character Areas within the District – the Upper Thames Clay Vale and the Severn and Avon Vales - also exhibit many of these “Cotswold” characteristics. Detailed landscape and historic landscape characterisation has been carried out for the entire District. The resulting assessments emphasise the high landscape and historic quality of the whole area and the need to ensure its protection and enhancement. 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>New paragraph (10.3.1.2): <u>For the avoidance of doubt, the term “significant” in the context of policy EN4 and EN6 is used in the general sense of an impact that matters or is important, rather than any specific</u></p>	Amendment made in association with Matter 14 Action AP14.2 – this removes ambiguity from policies EN4 and EN6.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<u>definition related to the preparation of Environmental Impact Assessments or similar. The assessment of "significant detrimental impact" includes a judgement on whether any adverse impact of a proposal would outweigh its benefits.</u>	
	EN4 (2) – The Wider Natural and Historic Landscape	2. Proposals will take account of landscape and historic landscape character, visual quality and local distinctiveness. They will be expected to enhance, restore and better manage the natural and historic landscape, and any significant landscape features and elements, including key views, <u>the setting of settlements</u> , settlement patterns and heritage assets.	Matter 14 Action AP14.1
	10.3.2.1	10.3.2.1: <u>Whilst the general landscape policy EN4 also encompasses it</u> , the importance of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty has long been recognised in national planning policy <u>and this is reflected in policy EN5</u> . As some of the most sensitive landscapes in the country these areas are particularly vulnerable to the effects of development and change. Many of the key issues for the Cotswolds AONB are outlined in the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan (2013-2018), produced by the Cotswolds Conservation Board in consultation with its partners including Cotswold District Council. As a material consideration in preparation of this part of the Local Plan, relevant policies within the Management Plan are reflected in Local Plan policies.	Matter 14 Action AP14.2 – to clarify that, whilst policy EN4 applies to the AONB, policy EN5 includes additional criteria that will also need to be taken into account.
	10.3.2.2	10.3.2.2: The NPPF accords great weight in planning decisions to the conservation of landscape and scenic beauty in these areas together with their wildlife and cultural heritage. It stipulates that planning permission should be refused for major developments in the AONB except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. <u>For the avoidance of doubt it should be noted that clause 1 of EN5 applies to all development proposals, including allocations in the Local Plan. Clause 2 does not apply to development sites allocated by the Local Plan because they were assessed against the stipulated criteria during plan preparation.</u>	Matter 14 Action AP14.3 – clarification has been provided to show that clause 1 applies to all developments in the AONB, including on allocated sites, whereas clause 2 does not apply to allocated sites.
	EN6 – SPECIAL	Development within Special Landscape Areas that demonstrably meets	Matter 14 Action AP14.4 – the

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	LANDSCAPE AREAS	<p>the economic and social needs of communities (as shown on the Policies Map) will be permitted provided it does not have a <u>significant</u> detrimental impact upon:</p> <p>a. the quality of the natural or historic environment; and</p> <p>b. the <u>special landscape character, appearance or tranquillity</u> of the area and key landscape qualities of the area including its tranquillity.</p>	<p>modifications ensure that policy EN6 sets out the additional requirements that apply to the SLAs based on their special character and key landscape qualities and does not repeat the requirements of policy EN4.</p>
	10.3.3.1 and new paragraphs	<p>10.3.3.1: The purpose of SLA designation is to protect locally significant landscapes that, although not nationally designated, are of comparable quality to, and abut, the AONB. Their designation is based on a formal assessment of the landscape qualities of the area. SLAs were introduced in Gloucestershire in 1982. They are attractive landscapes in their own right, but may also provide important foreground settings and effective buffers for the AONB. There are nine SLAs in Gloucestershire, six of which lie wholly or partly in the District. Their boundaries are illustrated on the Policies Map. <u>Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) were introduced in Gloucestershire in 1982. There are six SLAs in Cotswold District. The purpose of SLA designation is to protect locally significant and valued landscapes that have particular intrinsic qualities or character. Although not nationally designated, in some cases they provide important settings and effective buffers for the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</u></p> <p><u>New paragraph (10.3.3.2): SLA designation is based on a formal assessment of each area. The Cotswold District designations were reviewed in February 2001 and again in May 2017. The 2017 review validates the work carried out in 2001 while updating the context, any physical changes and adding qualities. Both reports, or any successors produced by the Council, should be considered together. In assessing the impacts of development proposals on the areas' character and qualities the whole of the Council's evidence base regarding SLAs including description, key landscape qualities and justification for recommendation should be taken into account. Regard must also be had to the general requirements of policy EN4. For the avoidance of doubt,</u></p>	<p>Matter 14 Action AP14.5, AP14.6 and AP14.7 - reference to the SLAs being of comparable quality to the AONB has been deleted. Explanation has been provided to explain why the SLAs have been designated. Clarification has been provided that all development in the SLAs, including on allocated sites, applies to Policy EN6.</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>policy EN6 applies to all development in SLAs including the development of sites allocated in this Local Plan.</u></p> <p>New paragraph (10.3.3.3): <u>The Special Landscape Areas in Cotswold District are shown on the Policies Map and are:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Barrington Downs;</u> • <u>Coln Valley (north of Fairford);</u> • <u>Kemble/Ewen;</u> • <u>Moreton in Marsh surrounds;</u> • <u>North Cirencester; and</u> • <u>Norton Hall.</u> 	
	EN10 (1) – Designated Heritage Assets	<p>1. 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>	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 types of designated heritage asset such as World Heritage Sites.
	EN11 (c) – Designated Heritage Assets – Conservation Areas	<p>Development proposals, including demolition, that would affect Conservation Areas and their settings, will be permitted provided they:</p> <p>c. will not result in the loss of open spaces, including garden areas and village greens, which, because of their openness, make a valuable contribution to the character and/or appearance, and/or allow important views into or out of the Conservation Area;</p>	Matter 14 Action AP14.8

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
11. INFRASTRUCTURE			
	INF1 – Infrastructure Delivery	<p>Delete existing policy text and replace with the following:</p> <p><u>Policy INF1</u></p> <p><u>INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY</u></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 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.

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
	INF2 – Social and Community Infrastructure 11.2.2, 11.2.9	<p>Policy INF2: Social and Community Infrastructure</p> <p>1. Proposals for community facilities, <u>including open spaces</u>, either in their own right or...</p> <p>2. Planning permission for development which results in the loss of <u>a local facility</u> ies or <u>service-s</u>, <u>including an open space</u>, will be permitted provided:</p> <p>11.2.2: ...community and well-being. Facilities and services <u>can be buildings or open spaces</u> and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • parks, gardens, <u>allotments</u> and amenity open space together with natural or semi-natural green spaces <u>including such as</u> disused canals or railway lines. <p>11.2.9: With regard to the loss of sporting/community facilities, <u>including open spaces</u>, it should be demonstrated that they are surplus to requirements through the Emerging/adopted Play and Pitch Strategy. <u>Further details on the requirements for sporting/community facilities are provided in the Playing Pitch Strategy & Action Plan (April 2017), the Strategic Assessment of Need for Halls Provision in Cotswold District (April 2016), the Strategic Assessment of Need for Pools Provision in Cotswold District (August 2016), the Green Infrastructure, Open Space and Play Space Strategy (September 2017), or any subsequent updates of these documents.</u></p>	Matter 14 Action AP14.9 – To ensure INF2 refer to the updated evidence concerning the range of social and community infrastructure, including open space.
	11.4.9	11.4.9: An update to the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study, which covers GI, is being prepared. The Study's findings may result in refinements to this policy. The Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Play Space Strategy (September 2017), the Playing Pitch Playing Pitch Strategy Assessment Report (March 2017), and the Playing Pitch Strategy & Action Plan (April 2017) are relevant to the implementation of this policy.	To provide clarity on where further information that is relevant to INF7 can be accessed, which ensures this policy will be effective.
	11.7.17 and new paragraphs	11.7.17 As types of technologies can change, so the impacts of wind turbines and other renewable energy development can vary. <u>The requirements of Policy INF10 seek to ensure that</u> energy proposals will	Consequential changes as a result of Matter 15 Action AP15.2

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>therefore only be encouraged supported only where the different impacts of such development, <u>including cumulative impact</u>, have all been considered and where they are likely to be, or can be, made, acceptable in <u>planning terms</u>.</p> <p>In the case of wind energy development, the planning impacts identified by affected local communities should be fully addressed to ensure that the proposal has their backing. (60). Information will be required on the justification for and likely impact of proposals, including:—</p> <p>the appropriateness of the location for the specific technology involved and what reasonable alternatives have been considered;</p> <p>the nature and extent of early engagement with local communities and how this engagement has informed the evolution of the proposal;</p> <p>local amenity implications and how an acceptable living environment will be maintained;</p> <p>information on noise and emissions generation; a visual impact assessment incorporating an analysis of landscape character and the relationship to any significant heritage or architectural asset; and</p> <p>appropriate ecological surveys, following the most recent national guidance and best practice;</p> <p>in the case of hydropower schemes, a Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment and evidence of discussions with the Environment Agency on requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations.</p> <p>11.7.18 In respect of wind energy development, the Council has given <u>consideration to</u> potential locations identified in the <u>2011 Gloucestershire Renewable Energy Study</u>. <u>That study pre-dates the NPPF and whilst it had regard to general constraints it did not take account of emerging planning policy.</u> <u>and, g</u>Given the acute landscape sensitivity of the <u>Cotswolds District</u> in terms of its interrelated built, natural and historic environment, the Council wishes to secure its policy position regarding</p>	

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p>landscape protection and related matters before taking the step of considering sites suitable for wind energy development within the district. Site identification may be considered when the Local Plan is reviewed. In the meantime considers that in this context a criteria-based policy is a more appropriate approach to proposals for and flexible planning approach. In determining planning applications the Council will also have regard to national policy and guidance together with the Ministerial Written Statement of 18th June 2015 (or any national policy superseding it) in considering relevant planning applications.</p> <p><u>New paragraph (11.7.19): Where hydropower schemes are proposed, a Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment and evidence of discussions with the Environment Agency on requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations may be required.</u></p>	
12. OTHER – SPATIAL ISSUES			
	SP1 – Cheltenham and Gloucester Green Belt	<u>In</u> appropriate 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.
	SP2 – Cotswold Airport 12.2.5 and 12.2.8	<p>1.——The change of use of existing buildings <u>and any new development</u> within the <u>areas at Cotswold Airport</u>, shown on the proposals <u>Policies Map</u>, will be permitted provided it is <u>they are for employment-related uses that are</u> compatible with the use of the land as an <u>airport aerodrome</u>.</p> <p>2.—— Outside of the area shown on <u>Proposals Map</u>, re-use of existing hangars for employment purposes within use classes B1, B2 and B8 will be permitted.</p> <p>12.2.5: ...and the consequent potential loss of the aerodrome. <u>The Department for Transport published the General Aviation Strategy, which reiterated the importance of general aviation, in March 2015.</u></p> <p>12.2.8: ...dependence on the car. <u>This policy will allow for the growth</u></p>	<p>Response to ACTIONS 6.6 and AP12.1</p> <p>The Modification will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
		<p><u>and diversification of the airport that is in accordance with other policies of the Plan. 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>erection of new buildings.</p> <p>2. Avoid encouraging uses that might result in more HGV movements along inappropriate routes (see amendment to paragraph 12.2.8).</p> <p>3. Delete superfluous second clause, which duplicates Policy EC3.</p> <p>4. Draw attention to this important national strategy for aviation.</p> <p>5. Provide clarification on the deletion of the second clause of Policy SP2.</p>
APPENDIX K – GLOSSARY			
	Appendix K: Glossary	<p>Community and Cultural Facilities – services available to residents in the immediate area that provide for the day-to-day health, welfare, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community. Includes village halls, post offices, doctors and dentists’ surgeries, recycling facilities, libraries and places of worship. <u>Also includes 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.</u></p>	<p>To ensure the Local Plan’s Glossary lists a range of local community facilities and services and not just built development examples of these.</p>
	Appendix K: Glossary	<p>Employment Land – land <u>primarily used</u>, with planning permission, or allocated in a development plan, for <u>B1, B2 or B8 Class</u> employment uses.</p>	<p>The modification responds to Q13 of the Inspector's Further Preliminary Questions (ED006). This provides clarity on the definition of</p>

REF.	POLICY / PARAGRAPH	PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATION	REASON FOR MAIN MODIFICATION
			employment land to ensure the plan is clear and therefore effective.
	Appendix K: Glossary New definition for Employment Uses	<u>Employment Uses – B1, B2 or B8 Class uses</u>	The modification responds to Q13 of the Inspector's Further Preliminary Questions (ED006). This provides clarity on the definition of employment uses to ensure the plan is clear and therefore effective.
	Appendix K: Glossary	Enabling Development – is development that conflicts with planning policies which but enables the Council to secure a planning benefit which would outweighs the disbenefits of departing from those policies not otherwise be immediately forthcoming.	To ensure the definition aligns with national policy and guidance
	Appendix K: Glossary New definition of <u>Social and Community Infrastructure</u>	<u>Social and Community Infrastructure: Local facilities and services for the community including buildings as well as open spaces.</u>	Matter 14 Action AP14.9

Amended Key Diagram, which follows paragraph 2.0.6 in the Portrait section



Contains Ordnance Survey data © Crown copyright and database rights 2015