

MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL HELD
IN THE VILLAGE HALL, SOUTH CERNEY ON WEDNESDAY 26TH JUNE 2013

Chairman: M. Stuart
Vice Chairman: P. Nicholas
Parish Councillors: Mrs E. Chubb
J. Harris
J. Kimberley
Mrs. D. Land
Mrs C. Tunbridge
R. Webb

The Chairman Cllr Stuart opened the meeting at 7.30 pm.

Apologies

Cllr Mrs F. Chapman had sent an apology for absence.

Cllr P. Jay apologised for his absence as he had a prior family commitment.

Local Plan Consultation Paper: Preferred Development Strategy

Cllr Nicholas accepted an invitation from the Cllr Stuart to explain the relevant details of the Local Plan Consultation Paper: Preferred Development Strategy.

Cllr Nicholas emphasised that the response to the consultation should be referred to as an initial response and not exhaustive. Commenting overall on the document he noted that there were inaccuracies and omissions which would have to be corrected. One glaring omission was the absence on the map of The Mallards.

He then proceeded to comment on The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which is a technical study that all local planning authorities are required to prepare. It forms part of the evidence base that will be used to inform the emerging Local Plan (formerly the Local Development Framework), in particular the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Documents (DPD). The new Local Plan, when adopted, will replace the Cotswold District Local Plan 2001-2011 (Adopted April 2006), and guide future development in, and provide a spatial planning framework for, the District to 2031.

The primary role of the SHLAA is to identify and assess as many sites as possible that have the potential to deliver housing in Cotswold District. The results of the Assessment will be used as evidence to support the delivery of sufficient land to meet the community's housing needs, through the Local Plan process.

It is worthy of note that whilst the SHLAA is an important evidence source to inform plan-making, it does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for housing development. That can only be done through the Local Plan, which will take into account all relevant evidence. The SHLAA assesses land and its potential and informs the development of future local planning policy. The SHLAA has no policy status.

In other words, a SHLAA site that has been referred to in the planning application process will not necessarily be granted planning permission. Planning applications are currently determined in accordance with the Cotswold District Local Plan (Adopted 2006), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Whilst some of the sites identified in the SHLAA are in general accordance with the development strategy of the Local Plan, it should be noted that the inclusion of a site in the SHLAA does not mean that planning permission for housing will necessarily be granted. The suitability of a site, and its capacity, will be tested through the development management (planning application) process.

The SHLAA is a technical document and as such is not subject to a formal consultation period. Anyone wishing to make representations about the suitability of sites for development will have the opportunity to do so through the Local Plan consultation process, in particular through the public engagement that will be carried out during the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.

The Cotswold SHLAA should be viewed as a ‘living’ document as the situation regarding sites is continually changing. The SHLAA will be continually reviewed in the future and will take account of new residential land availability data and assess additional sites that have come forward.

From the SHLAA document Cllr Nicholas described each of the notes referring to South Cerney in order:

- SC1 The Ferns in Clarks Hay had provision for one (1) dwelling although the adjoining plot to the north, alongside the Brambles could accommodate at least four (4) dwellings. There was also potential at Whitegates, Clarks Hay for further development.
- SC9 The Parish Council totally disagreed that land adjacent to All Hallows Church i.e. the allotments in Church Lane, should be included or ever considered regardless of the comment in the document that it would be difficult to “overcome restraints at present time”.
- SC11 Cllr Mrs Enid Chubb declared a prejudicial interest in this plot as owner. Land at Box Bush Farm. The document is incorrect as it states that this plot overlaps SC18. This is a fundamental error and must be corrected. The Parish Council did not disagree with the analysis that thirteen (13) dwellings could be built here.
- SC12 Land at Evergreen Industrial Park. The observation that the area was not currently suitable or immediately appropriate for residential housing was queried. The Parish Council would like to know which takes precedence: (a) the provision of industrial development or (b) homes and dwellings? The Parish Council would be interested in discussing the possibility of developing the frontage of the industrial estate in Broadway Lane which might provide a further twenty or twenty five (20/25) dwellings.
- SC13 John Ford’s field behind Ann Edwards Church of England School. The Parish Council would like clarification of the number of houses proposed on this site. Does the provision of the 107 houses proposed cover the entire site or that which does not fall within the flood plain? In recent memory, that is within the last 15 years, three quarters of this plot has been subjected to flooding and a significant proportion of the remainder has not flooded. Any planned development of this site must take account of the access as it will have severe consequences for the occupants of the nearby streets, that is Berkeley Close, The Leaze and Beverstone Road. Also the threat of future flooding must be taken into account for these areas as well.
- SC15 The Parish Council did not object to the allocation of one (1) dwelling at Ponderosa, The Langet
- SC18 The Parish Council was in agreement that the allocation of a dwelling at The Ridges should be withdrawn.
- SC19 The Vicarage. The Parish Council was in agreement that the eastern part of the plot including the two areas of woodland should be completely removed as development potential within the plan as it was utterly inappropriate. The Vicarage itself may be an appropriate site but that must be subject to its access.
- SC20 To the west of Cirencester Road, part of Claymeadow and either side of the old canal. The Parish Council consider this site as totally unsuitable for development and should

be removed from SHLAA. The Parish Council query why this area has been included at all and would like to know the reasoning.

SC21 Field to south of Trenchard Gardens. This site is totally unsuitable for development and should be removed from SHLAA. Any development on this site would fundamentally affect the rural setting.

The Parish Council then considered areas not included but which could be useful.

Coming into the village from a northerly direction, along Cirencester Road there were no sites before the 30 mph zone/Northmoor Lane.

There are two (2) dwellings to the west of Silver Street, behind Homestead which have planning permission and should be included in the totals.

SC19 The garden area north of Atkyns Manor, Ammonites and the Vicarage could be linked to provide a sizeable area for development.

The area to the rear of South Cerney House in Station Road and to the east thereof including the rear of Huxley Court to Kingfisher Place and south along the bank of Lake 16 could provide for many dwellings. Being lakeside it would encourage the provision of superior executive dwellings.

Land at the Mitie site in High Street would definitely be appropriate for the building of four (4) dwellings.

In Berkeley Close the Parish Council agreed that if the flats there were demolished they might be replaced with dwellings of a more appropriate nature to the area.

As mentioned at the start of this session the glaring omission of The Mallards in the report should be rectified.

Strategy 14

1. The Parish Council agreed that this idea was social engineering at its most ridiculous. Could the Forward Planning department please explain how it will be achieved?
2. The Evergreen Industrial Park or Lakeside (description of the site uncertain). The Parish Council does not consider that further industrial development is necessary.
3. Could the Forward Planning department please either explain and/or justify where the provision of 220 houses for the period 2013-2031 has come from? The Parish Council absolutely agrees that it is totally necessary to address the lack of affordable housing and affordable rentable properties in the parish.
4. The statement was considered totally irrelevant and idiotic.
5. Not contentious.
6. Any plan for further holiday homes was already over-provided with South Cerney having more than its fair share. Consensus opinion was that enough was enough.
7. If the list was hierarchical then this should be at the top. It is fundamental to the strategy.

New development proposals will be required to contribute to the provision of infrastructure (.e.g. new and improved cycle paths from South Cerney to Cirencester and the Cotswold Water Park). This would give people the opportunity to use a more sustainable mode of transport between home and work, and enhance tourism opportunities.

Strategy 20

The future of the Duke of Gloucester barracks.

Proposed Strategy for Cirencester

The proposal that 2,600 dwellings are installed to the west of Cirencester, in the vicinity of Chesterton poses the question of the disposal of the effluent which will be thereby created. Will the Shire Brook in South Cerney cope with the extra discharge? At present it is barely capable in times of rainfall. The consequences are unknown except that the potential risk of flooding will be increased for residents of South Cerney.

Cllr Stuart thanked everyone for their attendance at this extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council. There being no further business Cllr Stuart closed the meeting at 9.25pm.