

Fairford Neighbourhood Plan

Questions for the Neighbourhood Plan Hearing 14 September 2017

Context

The questions set out in this Note will be raised with the invited parties at the hearing on 14 September 2017. They provide further detail to the general headings set out in the earlier Hearing Note. The questions are based around the comments raised in either the statements provided for the hearing, or provided beforehand as part of the wider consultation processes. This Note identifies the questions and which of the various participants will be invited to answer them. Where appropriate follow-up questions may arise.

For the purpose of this Note the following abbreviations are used:

FTC	Fairford Town Council
CDC	Cotswold District Council
LTC	Lechlade Town Council
GD	Gladman Developments Limited
GSL	Gleeson Strategic Land Limited
CY	Cygnnet Investments
FNP	Fairford Neighbourhood Plan
RSA	Revised Sustainability Assessment Report (May 2017)
FLLG	Fairford Landscape and Local Green Space Study
PGSEA	A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2005)
HTC	Helix Transport Consultants Transport Assessment Report (January 2016)

Matter 1: The SA/SEA Process

Paragraph 1.2 of the RSA indicates that ‘the District Council has not issued a formal screening opinion requiring an SEA, but given the contents of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Town Council has determined that one will be required in order to meet the basic conditions of the 2012 Regulations.’ Please can this process be explained in further detail? (FTC/CDC). Does it correspond with paragraphs 2.12 and 2.15 of the PGSEA? (FTC/CDC)

To what extent has the RSA properly followed the five stages of SEA as set out in Section 5 of the PGSEA? (FTC/CDC/GD/GSL)

Please would LTC elaborate further on its specific concerns about the potential impact of the implementation of the FNP policies on infrastructure requirements in Lechlade? How would these impacts differ from the implementation of the strategic development proposed in the emerging Cotswold District Local Plan? (LTC)

Has the approach adopted to SA/SEA been iterative and inclusive? (FTC/CDC/GD/GSL/LTC)

Is the level of detail in the RSA appropriate to the circumstances of the Plan itself? In particular is its information on site-specific proposals, and of the reasonable alternatives to those proposals, appropriate? (FTC/CDC/GD/GSL/LTC)

Is the approach taken in paragraphs 8.3 to 8.5 of the RSA appropriate in respect of its consideration of cumulative and in-combination effects? (FTC/CDC/GD/GSL/LTC)

Is the assessment of reasonable alternatives appropriate to the circumstances of the Plan itself? (FTC/CDC/GD/GSL/LTC)

Should the RSA reasonably have considered the proposed emerging Local Plan housing site allocations as a package rather than as two free-standing sites? (FTC/CDC/GD/GSL)

Is the level of detail of the assessment of the preferred and the reasonable alternatives appropriate? Does it strike the correct balance between quantitative and qualitative predictions? (FTC/CDC/GD/GSL)

Is the information about the reasonable alternatives as extensive as that for the preferred approach? (FTC/CDC/GD/GSL)

Matter 2: The proposed allocation of land for residential use at Leafield Road (FNP16)

Please will FTC elaborate on the promotion of this site through the FNP as set out in its paragraphs 5.53 to 5.55? (FTC).

How did the emerging FNP take account of Section 8 of the HTC in general, and its recommendations (8.2) in particular? (FTC)

Can the site be sensitively incorporated into the wider landscape in this part of the town in general, and to its north and east in particular? (FTC/CDC/GSL/GD)

How did the site perform in the SHLAA process as part of the emerging Cotswold Local Plan? (CDC)

What has underpinned the decision to include the requirements in criterion 6 of the policy and in paragraph 5.58 of the supporting text? What is meant by 'at some point in the future'? (FTC)

Is it appropriate for the FNP to include a degree of commentary about a proposed use of land beyond the Plan period? (FTC/CDC/GSL/GD)

Matter 3: The proposed Fairford-Horcott Local Gap (FNP11)

The policy identifies a single purpose of the policy whereas Section 3.0 of the FLLG identifies its three aims. What is the ultimate function of the policy? (FTC)

Would the practical effect of the policy be to introduce a 'blanket restriction' on built development in this part of the Plan area? If not, what type of development would be acceptable? (FTC/CDC/GD)

Is a Local Gap of this scale appropriate for a neighbourhood plan? (FTC/CDC/GD)

Is the proposed Local Gap underpinned by appropriate information and evidence in the submitted FLLG? (FTC/CDC/GD)

Is its designation necessary to ensure that the policies in the FNP contribute towards sustainable development? (FTC/CDC/GD)

Matter 4: The proposed Area of Special Landscape Value (FNP12)

Does the policy have regard to national policy and is it in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan? In particular how does it conform with Policy UT1 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2001-2011? (FTC/CTC/CY)

Is the proposed ASLV underpinned by appropriate information and evidence in the submitted FLLG? Is there any evidence to suggest that it is a 'valued landscape' as identified in paragraph 109 of the NPPF? (FTC/CTC/CY)

Does Cygnet Investments take comfort from the assurances set out in the FTC hearing statement in its paragraphs 4.4 to 4.9? In that event are any modifications required to the submitted policy to ensure that it has the clarity required by the NPPF? (CY)

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
Fairford Neighbourhood Plan

11 September 2017