



CHEL TENHAM

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Notice of a meeting of Council

Tuesday, 18 October 2016

6.00 pm

Council Chamber, Municipal Offices

Membership	
Councillors:	Chris Ryder (Chairman), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), Matt Babbage, Paul Baker, Garth Barnes, Ian Bickerton, Nigel Britter, Flo Clucas, Chris Coleman, Mike Collins, Bernard Fisher, Wendy Flynn, Tim Harman, Steve Harvey, Colin Hay, Rowena Hay, Karl Hobley, Sandra Holliday, Peter Jeffries, Steve Jordan, Adam Lillywhite, Chris Mason, Helena McCloskey, Paul McCloskey, Andrew McKinlay, Dan Murch, Chris Nelson, Tony Oliver, Dennis Parsons, John Payne, Louis Savage, Diggory Seacome, Malcolm Stennett, Pat Thornton, Jon Walklett, Simon Wheeler, Roger Whyborn, Max Wilkinson, Suzanne Williams and David Willingham

Agenda

5.	PUBLIC QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on Wednesday 12 October	(Pages 3 - 12)
6.	MEMBER QUESTIONS These must be received no later than 12 noon on Wednesday 12 October	(Pages 13 - 16)

Contact Officer: Rosalind Reeves, Democratic Services Manager, 01242 774937

Email: democratic.services@cheltenham.gov.uk

Pat Pratley
Head of Paid Service

**Council
JCS
18 October 2016**

Public Questions (13)

1.	Question from Adrian Kingsbury to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>Within the NPPF Section 83, there are clear criteria for the function of Greenbelt and it clearly states that Greenbelt may only be revised under 'exceptional circumstances'.</p> <p>Upon review of the HM Planning Inspectors Preliminary Report, it is stated within Sections 5 & 6 that such 'exceptional circumstances' have been demonstrated, yet the report does not define what such circumstances are. The Inspector's Interim Report made no further justification other than refer back to the previous report.</p> <p>However the Preliminary Report does state in Section 69, that "The AMEC GB Assessment of September 2011⁶⁵ considers all the Cheltenham and Gloucester GB land at a high level against the five purposes of including land in the GB⁶⁶. It does not consider sustainability or landscape issues, but is purely an assessment against the purposes and function of GBs. I am satisfied that the methodology used is appropriate and that the report is robust."</p> <p>It continues in Section 110 that "According to the AMEC report, this cluster is critical to preventing the sprawl of Cheltenham and, towards the south, the merger of Cheltenham and Gloucester¹¹⁷. The segments to the south are NE1 and NE2. NE4 is further north. Nonetheless, the report specifically says that this segment makes a significant contribution to the land separating Cheltenham and Innsworth¹¹⁸, thereby playing an important role in the separation of Cheltenham and Gloucester.</p> <p>With such clear expert guidance can you therefore please detail the criteria and the assessment of how the Inspector determines that there are now exceptional circumstances for release of the Greenbelt identified as West Cheltenham despite the contrary comment within the preliminary report?</p>
	Response from the Leader
	<p>During the examination detailed evidence was heard over a number of sessions on both the Green Belt sensitivity of the site and the potential for development which would meet both economic and housing needs at West Cheltenham. The agendas for these sessions, and the documents produced in relation to them are available on the JCS examination webpage, particularly JCS Green Belt papers EXAM 142 and EXAM 196.</p> <p>In determining whether exceptional circumstances exist, the value of the Green Belt must be balanced against the need to positively seek opportunities to meet development needs in our area. These opportunities should accord with the JCS spatial strategy and national policy. In assessing these needs it has been established that our need exceeds the urban capacity of Cheltenham to accommodate this growth without causing substantial harm to the character of the</p>

town. Further information on this can be found in the JCS Matter 7 statement on Green Belt on the JCS website.

The JCS authorities have considered strategic allocation options at West Cheltenham through the plan making process since the Broad Locations report in 2011, and allocation options were considered in 2013. Whilst the Pre Submission Plan identified the land for safeguarding for future development, the Hayden Sewage Treatment plant which forms part of the site and emits odour curtailed further development of the allocation at that time. Severn Trent is now working with the Council on measures to improve odour emissions, which when undertaken will release parts of the site for development. The latest statement of common ground outlining these measures and the emerging masterplan for the area is at EXAM 198 and a priority for this proposed allocation is ensuring effective master planning of phase 1 and a future phase 2.

The JCS inspector heard this evidence over the course of the examination. In December 2015 the inspector published EXAM 146 which contained the 'Inspector's Preliminary Findings on Green Belt Release, Spatial Strategy and Strategic Allocations' paragraph 113.

"Taking account of housing and employment needs overall, including GCHQ's requirements, and my reservations on certain other potential strategic allocations, it seems to me that the Cheltenham part of this proposed safeguarded area might be suitable for allocation. Views are sought from the JCS and other participants on the potential for allocating land in this area."

After hearing further evidence on the emerging allocation at paragraph 126 of EXAM232 the Inspector's interim findings she writes:

"An additional employment led site at West Cheltenham has been agreed for allocation by the JCS team, who suggest it is also suitable for about 500 dwellings, albeit the developers have put forward a figure of 750. This is in a sustainable location on the edge of Cheltenham and, for the reasons given in my Preliminary Findings, I recommend this site for allocation in the JCS. Allocating this site for 500 dwellings would reduce the remaining unmet requirement to 1,039 (1,539 – 500)."

After further hearings, in her most recent communication, the Inspector's "Note of Recommendations made at the hearing session on 21 July 2016" she writes:

"West Cheltenham Safeguarded Land Part of this area has already been recommended as a strategic allocation and I do not propose re-visiting those discussions. It is the remainder of the area proposed for safeguarding that I have re-considered. This proposed safeguarded land makes a significant contribution to the Green Belt according to the AMEC report. Consequently, there is a very high bar to overcome in demonstrating exceptional circumstances. However, in my judgement this bar has been reached for reasons which include the following: there would be a major benefit in Severn Trent Water removing the Hayden Sewage Works from the area, resulting in significantly improved living and working conditions; it would result in a co-ordinated development in two phases, preventing further piecemeal development in the area; it would

	<p>provide a strong Green Belt boundary; there would be significant contributions to infrastructure, including schools.</p> <p>Consequently, I find that exceptional circumstances exist for the release of this land from the Green Belt and, therefore, its safeguarding is sound. Furthermore, the JCS team might wish to consider exploring the possibilities of phase one being expanded and additional housing being provided in this area during the Plan period.”</p> <p>The JCS team have considered this in light of the statement of common ground, and work on the capacity of the site for employment and housing purposes, and maximising the sustainable utilisation of the area. Through this work, the main modifications plan has been prepared, identifying at least 45ha of employment land and 1,100 new homes for the area between the plan’s adoption and 2031.</p> <p>If the Main Modifications are approved by the three councils they will be subject to public consultation and then to Examination in Public.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Question from Carol Kingsbury to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>Can the Council confirm if any studies have been carried out during the creation of the JCS:-</p> <p>a. Pertaining to the wildlife in the area of Greenbelt identified as West Cheltenham, and if so where is the report lodged for public review?</p> <p>b. Pertaining to the toxicology of the soil due to the earlier practice by Severn Trent (and/or its predecessor) of the disposal of treated human waste within the area of Greenbelt identified as West Cheltenham?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p>
	<p>Exam 198, the Statement of Common Ground for land at Hayden, identifies the current evidence base which has been developed for the site so far. Biodiversity effects have been assessed through the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal in 2014 and updated in the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Report which is part of the associated documents with this report available on the JCS website. Detailed contaminated land work will need to be undertaken as part of any proposal regarding the strategic allocation, in accordance with JCS policy SD15.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Question from Peter and Margaret Holt (a resident of Springbank) to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>High Rise Buildings</p> <p>The constraints around this side of Cheltenham are daunting, particularly the traffic issues, housing and employment building distribution. What is proposed now will create more jobs and the consequent housing and roads trapped between the hills and the motorway. The planners are clearly very professional and pragmatic officers – one example and a very important one is that they advise tall commercial units to be on lower ground and closer to the main road arteries. They also advise open spaces. What has been proposed in the vision statement is the very opposite, namely:</p> <p>‘Proposing building high rise industrial units on the top of prominent greenbelt land, blocking out the western light, views and pastures for miles around. If we can see the Malverns and the Forest of Dean, they can see us. The industrial units on the high ground will stand out like solar panels in Dubai.’</p>

	<p>Why not build high rise next to the motorway – it can also act as a noise barrier and closer access?</p> <p>What makes you ignore your planner’s advice regarding building prominence?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p>
	<p>The vision statement contained within the statement of common ground identifies broad principles of placemaking, but is not equivalent to a detailed masterplan. Detailed master planning for the West Cheltenham area as a whole is an explicit requirement of JCS Policy SA1, and development of the site will not be approved without it.</p> <p>The placemaking principles in the statement of common ground include ensuring that development relates well to the topography of the land “The buildings on the higher ground to the north-east will be restricted to typical residential heights whilst taller commercial buildings would be located to the southeast on lower ground” but does not set out specifics of building heights and density, which will all need to be agreed as part of the master planning process of the site.</p> <p>The JCS detailed design policy (Policy SD5) identifies principles for architectural design in regard to layout and scale, and these will need to be integrated into any future proposal.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Question from Peter and Margaret Holt to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>Despite the hysteria concerning the development of Springbank, I have on my deeds that a ‘road of convenience’ may well traverse from south to north, west of my house. A natural, logical, forward planning requirement. So we have been expecting this since this house was built in 1968. I also cannot be such a hypocrite to object to houses being built in front of us as my house was built in front of somebody else. However over the passage of time, the authorities, politics, planners and circumstances have proved that they have missed the boat and boxed themselves into a corner. We are now (in my opinion) in the situation of where the JCS is forced to play pass the parcel with the additional pressures of governmental changed attitudes on the ‘greenbelt’ issue and the financing of housing and employment.</p> <p>To add to these pressures, are the changed attitudes to the environment and the need for increased security requirements. This is where I, as a 73 year old ex professional engineer, take a strong issue with the proposals. There are alternatives. The cyber security / science park does NOT have to be built on a Cheltenham greenbelt or even in the Cheltenham boundary. By building next to and from the M5 motorway towards Cheltenham, more people can share the remaining (I hope) greenbelt from either side, i.e. a greenbelt corridor! Tewkesbury seems to have all the greenbelts. What are you leaving as Cheltenham’s legacy – traffic jams, terrible traffic infrastructure, frustration, unrest and then just an ordinary industrial town.</p> <p>What happens when Cheltenham runs out of greenbelt space, when you finally develop the ONLY greenbelt around the west side of Cheltenham (or</p>

	even the whole of Cheltenham)?
	Response from the Leader
	<p>Please see also answer to question 1. The development proposed in the Main Modifications is sufficient to meet Cheltenham’s needs for the plan period, with areas safeguarded for development well beyond 2031 at West Cheltenham and North West Cheltenham. These locations have been chosen to reduce the potential for the coalescence of Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury, whilst preserving the openness and integrity of the remaining designation.</p> <p>Any release of additional Green Belt land will require exceptional circumstances, and can only be done through the review of the Plan. By identifying safeguarded areas in the plan, the JCS ensures that future growth well beyond the plan period can be sustainably accommodated to allow the town to grow whilst preserving its character and surroundings.</p> <p>If the Main Modifications are approved by the three councils they will be subject to public consultation and then to Examination in Public.</p>
5.	This question has been withdrawn
6.	Question from Mary Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan (plans to attend)
	<p>The following statement is made in the ‘Emerging JCS Transport Strategy’ which was only published on the JCS ‘New Evidence’ website 24 hours before the deadline for public questions.</p> <p><i>“When the 2013 Central Severn Vale SATURN model is available later in the year it will be used to refine the list of schemes outlined in the emerging strategy. Only once this work has been completed will the strategic and local highway authorities be able to fully consider the transport impacts of the JCS and its supporting Transport Strategy and to determine if their respective policy requirements are likely to be satisfied.”</i></p> <p>It is now clear that Councillors will be making their decision on the final JCS Strategic Allocations without adequate and credible up-to-date traffic modelling evidence. Likewise the public have been denied the opportunity to submit informed and relevant public questions regarding the key issue of transport infrastructure to this decision meeting.</p> <p>The 2013 CSV Saturn modelling was stated to the JCS Inspector to be available in April 2016 for the Transport hearing sessions. It failed to materialise in April, and was then stated to be available in October 2016. It is still missing.</p> <p>When is the 2013 traffic modelling going to be available and will you confirm that it will be published in time for the <u>start</u> of the public consultation on the Main Modifications?</p>
	Response from the Leader
	The updated 2013 CSV model is expected to be available later this year. However, additional work using this model will not be available prior to the Main

	<p>Modifications consultation.</p> <p>The latest round of modelling has tested all sites presented in the Main Modifications plan with a package of mitigation (the 'DS5' model run) on the existing 2008 model. Although the final package of mitigation needs to be refined using the 2013 model, the DS5 scenario provides us with enough information to confirm that the strategic allocations are deliverable and that there are transport measures that can be implemented to mitigate their impacts. This transport evidence is publicly available and will support the JCS consultation.</p> <p>In her Interim Report, the JCS inspector states: (para 195 – 197)</p> <p>"With respect to transport, there have been wide spread concerns that the transport modelling, based on the Central Severn Vale SATURN strategic highways 2008 base year model is outdated and not fit for purpose. Whilst I understand that the model has been refined to make it as robust and up to date as possible, Gloucestershire County Council and Highways England have commented that further refinement work needs to be done.</p> <p>Nonetheless, I note Atkin's evidence that the model was peer reviewed in 2012 and found to be generally fit for purpose. Whilst the 2008 model contains weaknesses, it is currently the best information available. There were no objections to its use at the March hearing session from Highways England or Gloucestershire County Council.</p> <p>Although Highways England and Gloucestershire County Council are working on a 2013 based update, it is not expected until later on in the year and, even then, model runs will have to be undertaken to make refinements to the mitigation packages and transport strategy. Waiting for this updated evidence would cause undue delay to the JCS, which in the public interest needs to progress. Therefore, I do not recommend delaying progress to await the 2013 based model."</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Question from Mary Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p> <p>In the same 'Emerging JCS Transport Strategy' document it states the following in Appendix A:</p> <p><i>“Lower High Street (Cheltenham) – bus only routes inbound, reallocation of existing highway space for inbound bus lane.”</i></p> <p>This means that all traffic, except buses, approaching the Lower High Street from the Tewkesbury Road (A4019) will either have to turn right into Gloucester Road, or left up Townsend Street or, (if able to proceed under the railway bridge) will be forced left onto the already congested Northern Relief Road.</p> <p>With a total of more than 5,300 new houses planned on land on either side of the Tewkesbury Road, plus major Employment sites included, can you explain why this planned entry closure into Cheltenham for all traffic except buses will not end up in gridlock around Cheltenham town centre, and be a major deterrent to people shopping and visiting the town, resulting in a severe adverse impact on Cheltenham's economy?</p>

	<p>Response from the Leader A number of measures have been tested throughout the extensive transport modelling work that has been undertaken over the last few years. It is an iterative process with different scenarios, containing different mitigation measures, being tested along the way. The DS5 scenario is the last culmination of this work. However, it is not the final package of mitigation measures and further refinement is required once the updated 2013 CSV model is available. Therefore, individual measures such as those described above will be re-assessed to confirm their impact to the wider transport network.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Question from Ken Pollock to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan (plans to attend)</p>
	<p>The summary diagram on page 5 of the 'Emerging JCS Transport Strategy - October 2016' document shows that Cheltenham is now to get both a Western Bypass AND a NorthWest Bypass (linking from the A4019 to the A435 at Bishops Cleeve), major routes which were obviously essential from the very first JCS stage, but which dysfunctional GCC Highways has hitherto declined to specify or acknowledge. Accordingly, the developer of the Cheltenham-NorthWest urban extension has never planned for any such link route through that whole area (of 4,000+ houses). Will Cheltenham Councillors urge that this road infrastructure (essential for the most massive JCS urban extension) be unambiguously required by/in the Main Mods text (Policy A5) prior to the forthcoming public consultation?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p>
	<p>The latest round of modelling has tested all sites presented in the Main Modifications plan with a package of mitigation (the 'DS5' model run) on the existing 2008 model. This has included some significant infrastructure improvements around the west Cheltenham area. However, while this latest modelling provides us with the information that the strategic allocations are deliverable, once the updated 2013 model is available then further testing is required to refine the mitigation package. Therefore, at this stage it is difficult to provide a policy requirement when we don't know the exact level of improvements that may be needed. Nevertheless, the JCS transport policy and the individual site policies put a requirement on sites that their traffic impact must be mitigated. This is high level modelling work, which demonstrates that there are no 'showstoppers' to delivery of the strategic allocations, but identifying the right scheme and the most efficient and cost effective layouts will be a more detailed process which will come as part of the master planning and applications work for these sites as they come forward.</p>
<p>9.</p>	<p>Question from Ken Pollock to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>The DS5 Modelling is grounded upon both the M5 Junction 10 'all movements' upgrade and the A417 Missing Link having been carried out. However it is quite possible that neither of these will be completed within the next 10 years, and the Junction 10 upgrade may not happen at all, if Highways England decides that it will impede motorway flow (due to the Cheltenham Western bypass not being built early enough).</p>

	<p>In a Matter 5 Statement provided to the JCS Examination in June last year GFirst LEP stated (page 3 para 1.4): <i>“At the present time the current evidence indicates that even if the A5 (North West Cheltenham) allocation were to progress from plan to implementation there would still be insufficient traffic demand to warrant an all ways junction at Junction 10.”</i></p> <p>The proposed net increase at West Cheltenham (of 600 houses, i.e. 1100 minus 500) may not change that J10 'demand' calculation, given that West Cheltenham comes with its own integral distributor road linking to the A40, Golden Valley Bypass and Junction 11.</p> <p>Therefore will Saturn CSV 2013 modelling be published to show the traffic implications <u>without</u> these two upgrades for the years 2026 and 2031?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p>
	<p>The specific scenarios that will be tested through the updated 2013 model have not yet been agreed.</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>Question from Dr D J Coppard to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>We live at the junction of Old Gloucester Rd and Hayden Lane, at the bottom of the hill proposed for development. Water levels are already high - near surface level all year round. In winter the defensive ditches are near full and the under road culverts are high. TODAY (OCTOBER) THE WATER LEVEL IN OUR WELL IS JUST 90CM BELOW GROUND LEVEL.</p> <p>How can you possibly build on this flood plain and who will be responsible when our properties flood and what will happen to the run off water from the roofs, hard surfaces, roads, and parking areas of the proposed business park and housing?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p>
	<p>Flooding is clearly an important issue, JCS Policy INF3 “Flood Risk Management” requires new development to where possible contribute to a reduction in existing flood risk and incorporate suitable sustainable drainage systems to manage surface water drainage, ensuring the flood risk is not increased either on site or elsewhere. This is detailed and exacting policy written in collaboration with the Environment Agency. New development will need to meet these requirements as well as national standards and guidance to gain approval.</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>Question from Dr D J Coppard to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>This is a huge plan with great impact and I am concerned it is being bulldozed through? This plan for West of Cheltenham abutting Old Gloucester Rd is being rushed through without due diligence. The area has gone from Green Belt to plans for a business park and 2,000 + homes in just two years. In the rush not to miss out on the New Homes Bonus this development will be a fragmented free for all for greedy developers with no responsibility for the supporting infrastructure and long term environmental impacts.</p> <p>This is a large life-changing development for the surrounding area.</p>

	Who will be accountable for the irreversible impact on place and people when the ambitious have moved on?
	Response from the Leader
	<p>Given the length of time it has taken to develop the JCS it is difficult to believe it is being rushed. However it is true that modifications have been introduced in order to achieve a sound plan. If these Main Modifications are approved by the three councils they will be subject to public consultation and then to Examination in Public.</p> <p>Please also see answer to question 4. Part of the value of the development of strategic allocations is the ability to gain substantial high quality 'hard', social and green infrastructure planned into the development and released alongside the build out of the schemes. Policy INF 4, 5 and 7 create requirements for delivery of each of these types of infrastructure, and there is currently ongoing work to study and develop the social and community cohesion and structures needed within these new urban extensions as they are built.</p>
12.	Question from Tess Beck to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>The North West Cheltenham development will create a significant amount of vehicular traffic, most of which is predicted to be seeking to access Cheltenham for work and recreation. The Tewkesbury Road (A4019) is heavily trafficked and congested with many drivers avoiding it by rat running through residential areas on Swindon Road and St Paul's Road. This already causes major problems for the communities living along these roads; noise; dirt; poor air quality; poor pedestrian environment. The junction of St Paul's Road and Swindon Road is already identified in the report as being congested at peak hours. However, in the evidence submitted, it seems no mitigation is planned for these roads.</p> <p>How will Cheltenham Borough Council ensure that the St Paul's and Elmfield communities are protected from the impact of the extra traffic generated by the NW Cheltenham development?</p>
	Response from the Leader
	<p>A number of measures have been tested throughout the extensive transport modelling work that has been undertaken over the last few years. It is an iterative process with different scenarios, containing different mitigation measures, being tested along the way. The DS5 scenario is the last culmination of this work and contains a number of measures that have been identified in response to the North West Cheltenham allocations. However, it is not the final package of mitigation measures and further refinement is required once the updated 2013 CSV model is available. Therefore, if evidence suggests that further mitigation is required then this can be assessed.</p>
13.	Question from Tess Beck to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>Swindon Road through Elmfield and St Paul's Road are not suitable for heavy vehicles due to the various weight limits and height limits on the bridges. But with a significant reduction in traffic, this could be a cycle route to the town centre and the Honeybourne Line.</p> <p>Will Gloucestershire Highways and Cheltenham Borough Council be considering modal filtering and other traffic reduction measures along this route to improve cycle access from Swindon Village/ NW Cheltenham to</p>

	Cheltenham town centre?
	Response from the Leader
	<p>These measures can be assessed to determine what the most sustainable and efficient solution will be. This will be done as part of the detailed assessment of transport needs which will come as part of the master planning of strategic allocations and with further work on the local transport network alongside the County Council through the local transport plan, We are currently at the high level modelling stage, while specific solutions such as this would need to be looked at in a more detailed context at the applications level, when considering the needs of the area as a whole in response to specific development proposals.</p>

Council – 18 October 2016

Member Questions (7)

1.	Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>The JCS Transport Strategy Evidence Base was only released on 10 Oct, just 2 days before the deadline for questions to Council. This is simply not good enough and makes it very difficult to have a proper debate on JCS transport matters next week. This late release of key transport strategy information has been a regular feature of the JCS throughout the last couple of years.</p> <p>We will also have the situation that when the JCS next goes out for public consultation in November, we will still be waiting for the release of the 2013 Central Severn Vale base year Saturn model and new 2031 forecast models (also due in "November" but it will not be until Jan/Feb 2017 that we will have a model based on the 2031 developments and the associated traffic mitigation). Without that critical transport information we will be unable to fully consider the transport impacts of the JCS and its supporting Transport Strategy and to determine if their respective policy requirements are likely to be satisfied.</p> <p>Why is it that the JCS Authorities seem incapable of managing the release of key transport planning information in sufficient time to inform the democratic process of review?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>Please see also answer to public questions 6 -9 on transport modelling. It was agreed at the hearings that we would utilise the 2008 model to determine the mitigations necessary and consequently a transport strategy for the JCS to review the new sites as proposed in the main modifications. This has been completed and is what will be consulted upon.</p> <p>With reference to timing of the transport evidence clearly this is not ideal although is not entirely within the control of the JCS Authorities. The work being done via the County Council is not a straight forward technical analysis as both they and Highways England need to review the outputs for accuracy before anything is issued.</p>
2.	Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>The JCS Transport Strategy Evidence Base when considering the North West Cheltenham development, stated that a long term solution would be to introduce a south bound access to J10 on the M5 to reduce the traffic impact on Prince Elizabeth Way. Up to now, I had always understood that increases to traffic from JCS development was thought to be insufficient to justify a south bound access to J10. Do the JCS Authorities now believe that situation has changed and that we may be able to generate a realistic business case to modify J10?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>Yes – the increased volume of traffic which has come about from the new proposed sites to meet both the recommended housing numbers as well as the employment sites does strengthen the case for the south bound access to the M5 J10. However it must be noted that this emerging strategy will be refined as and when the 2013 SATURN model is eventually available.</p>

3.	Question from Councillor to Cabinet Member, Councillor Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	The JCS Transport Strategy Evidence Base appears to indicate that the North West Cheltenham development of some 4,300 houses will need significant public transport investment on Tewkesbury Road, more than on any other JCS site. What is the latest view of transport operators on this demanding financial requirement of £19M?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	This is really a question for transport operators. It is important to note that the purpose of the DS5 scenario is to provide us with enough information to confirm that the strategic allocations are deliverable and that there are transport measures that can be implemented to mitigate their impacts. Whilst the work has achieved this, the exact schemes to be chosen will be a matter for master planning further down the line. This means that the current financial requirements are subject to change once specific layouts and schemes are decided, beyond this high level work.
4.	Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	The JCS Transport Strategy Evidence Base suggests that Do Something 5 may be the best mitigation solution to meet JCS traffic problems. However, it does not include any dwellings in Leckhampton. Yet the TBC planning permission for 377 houses on SD2 is still extant (although subject to a Judicial Review) and Inspector Ord has agreed "of the order of 200 houses" could be built on CBC land to the east of Farm Lane. So in the 'worst case' situation of 577 houses being built in Leckhampton, should not future modelling of the DS5 transport mitigation measures factor-in that worst case traffic pressure?
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>To be consistent the JCS transport modelling work has mirrored that as proposed in the Main Modifications in terms of strategic sites. Of note however, is that the 'smaller sites growth' within the JCS (for the local plans to further define) is also included but as a background traffic demand. Therefore in this case for Cheltenham this would include the development as proposed at Leckhampton, albeit not as a specific site.</p> <p>The Cheltenham local plan work however would then be the plan and the time to better review any specific local need.</p>
5.	Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	The JCS Transport Strategy Evidence Base at Fig 71 on page 88 lists the potential funding sources of the £750M + required for the preferred DS5 solution. How realistic is this provisional breakdown? Please explain what level of confidence you have in each of the potential funding sources.
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>This provisional breakdown is a 'first level' calculation and therefore is merely guidance only. The actual number can only be better refined when:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2013 SATURN model is available and 2. Detailed schemes are put forward for the final list of mitigations. <p>To answer the question of potential funding sources, there is growing confidence in these, and other, sources of funding to support the growth. Naturally substantial further work needs to be completed before funding could be confirmed, but at this stage, there is sufficient confidence to at least pursue these sources further.</p>

6.	Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>Para 2.6 on page 11 of the Main Modifications Report to Council, notes that the Farm Lane site of 377 dwellings can be accorded to Cheltenham's supply figures "should TBC and CBC agree." I thought they had agreed and that we were simply waiting for the legal paperwork to be signed? Also, why is this paperwork taking so long to conclude, given that Inspector Ord made her recommendations on apportionment of urban extensions/Duty to Cooperate in May/June, some 5 months ago? Does the 10,996 housing supply figures for Cheltenham on pg 43 of the Report include the 377 figure?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The statement of agreement between Tewkesbury and Cheltenham according the 377 dwellings to Cheltenham's supply is still being drawn up, but there is no known disagreement between the parties. Because these are technical and precise legal documents they can take some time to draw up. Yes the housing supply figure for Cheltenham shown includes this permission.</p>
7.	Question from Councillor Chris Nelson to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>I wish to be assured that CBC officers are not planning to include in the Cheltenham Plan significantly more than 200 dwellings on the Leckhampton site east of Farm Lane, nor intending to include more than 200 dwellings, in line with Inspector Ord's JCS recommendations for an indicative figure of 200?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>The Inspector's Interim Report states that: (para 123 and 124)</p> <p>"Overall, in my judgement, a limited amount of development could be supported towards the north of the site where public transport is more accessible, subject to the avoidance of land of high landscape and visual sensitivity. Therefore, for reasons of landscape/visual amenity and highway impacts, I recommend that the Cheltenham part of the site be allocated for a modest level of built development in the order of 200 dwellings.</p> <p>This remaining modest level of housing would not classify as an urban extension and, therefore, it would be more appropriate to allocate the site in the emerging Cheltenham Local Plan rather than in the JCS. It is, therefore, my recommendation that the Leckhampton urban extension be removed in its entirety from the JCS."</p> <p>In light of the interim report the Leckhampton strategic allocation has been removed from the JCS and is now being considered within the Cheltenham Plan, local allocation in that document (which is less than 450 dwellings). Because the work on capacity for the landscape areas identified as having potential for development has not yet been undertaken (and will be through the Cheltenham Plan) it would be wrong to pre-judge the specific number of dwellings that could be sustainability accommodated, other than to say it would not be a site of strategic scale in JCS terms. Further work on the capacity of the remaining parts of the Leckhampton site, as well as local green space will be undertaken through the Cheltenham Plan.</p>

