

Council

Thursday, 30th June, 2016
6.00 - 9.15 pm

Attendees	
Councillors:	Chris Ryder (Chairman), Klara Sudbury (Vice-Chair), 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

Minutes

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Babbage

2. **MOMENT OF REFLECTION**

Canon Rev Dr Tudor Griffiths invited Members to take a moment of reflection

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Coleman, Fisher, Harman, Colin Hay, Sudbury and Wheeler all declared interests as members of Gloucestershire County Council and indicated that they had been granted dispensations from the Standards Committee to participate and vote in the meeting.

Councillor Savage declared an interest as a member of CPRE. Councillor Wilkinson declared an interest as an employee of a company working on a non-contract basis with a landowner affected by the JCS.

Councillor Ryder declared a personal and prejudicial interest as an owner of some white land in Leckhampton. She would not participate in the debate and would leave the chamber before the debate of the item.

Councillor Bickerton declared an interest as Chair of Leckhampton and Warden Hill Parish Council, Chair of the Neighbourhood Planning group, Chair of LEGLAG and member of CPRE.

Councillor Nelson declared an interest as a member of LEGLAG and member of the Leckhampton and Warden Hill Parish Council and member of the Neighbourhood forum.

4. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor put on record her thanks to all those who had supported the launch of her charities, County and Community Projects and St Vincent's and St George's.

The Mayor advised Members that the 11th and 12th June saw much celebrations of the Queen's birthday. She thanked her Chaplain for the well thought through service held at the Minster to commemorate the occasion.

She had recently returned from a visit to Annecy to celebrate Cheltenham being twinned with the town for 60 years. The party from Cheltenham had been given a wonderful reception and she was looking forward to welcoming dignitaries and twinning friends from Annecy to Cheltenham in July. The Mayor thanked everyone who had attended the commemoration event for the Battle of Jutland at the Minster. The Mayor advised that on the following day she would be representing Cheltenham at the Centenary Commemorations of the first day of the Battle of the Somme and invited Councillors to join her at the Pittville Pump Rooms at 3.30 pm. She concluded that she would now be handing over the chair to the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Sudbury.

5. COMMUNICATIONS BY THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

The Leader took the opportunity to comment on the outcome of the recent EU referendum and expected that members would wish to debate the implications at the Council meeting scheduled in July. He informed Members that a summit of key local companies was being set up to better understand any issues they have and how the council can help. Whilst the future was extremely uncertain he undertook to do the best he could to represent the views and interests of the people of Cheltenham in whatever comes next.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

1.	Question from Gary Egger to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	Can you provide a summary of the process which you will go through to consider and approve or decline Elizabeth Ord's recommendations?"
	Response from the Leader
	<p>The JCS councils have made no decisions in regards to modifications to the plan and this will be informed by the stage 4 JCS examination hearings scheduled 6 July, informed by the debate arising from council meetings scheduled 28th and 30th June. All the findings in the interim report are without prejudice to the Inspectors ultimate conclusions and will be reviewed in context of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upcoming stage 4 hearings where the JCS authorities will set out the consequences of the recommendations as agreed at Council meetings, and • public consultation responses should the JCS authorities make main modifications to the plan in September <p>Further Council meetings are scheduled in September to agree any main modifications to the plan. Communities and other stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide comments on the modifications through the</p>

	<p>consultation process that follows. Responses will then be collated by the JCS Authorities and passed to the Inspector for her consideration. At that stage the Inspector will consider objections to the modifications and make a decision whether any further information, hearings or revisions are required before concluding her Examination and submitting her Final Report to the JCS Authorities.</p> <p>Finally, the JCS Authorities will have a further decision to take as to whether they are happy to proceed on the basis of the Inspector's Final Report and adopt the JCS as their plan. If they choose not to then the JCS would not be adopted and wouldn't represent planning policy.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Mr Egger, referred to statements from Brandon Lewis, the Minister of State for Housing and Planning for the Department for Communities and Local Government, where he had said that Green Belt boundaries should only be changed under exceptional circumstances and with local support. What consultation has taken place with local residents in this case?</p> <p>The Leader advised that this was the Inspector's view and not the council's plan. In his view there were limitations in the process the inspector was following and his personal aim would be to maximise the involvement of local residents in the process. He confirmed that the council would do all it could to involve the public in the JCS process going forward.</p>
2.	<p>Question from Alex Randall to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan (not present)</p>
	<p>First of all, I appreciate the effort that has gone into the Joint Core Strategy and the need to progress to a conclusion. I was though surprised to read in the Preliminary report that a number of Prestbury green belt areas have been proposed to lose their status in favour of development. In particular, the inspector commentary in paras 127 onwards suggests this was primarily based on a site visit, rather than based on balanced evidence or fair assessment. Will the council promise that a fair hearing, with supporting evidence, will take place over the Summer to review the green belt status of the proposed areas prior to any final decisions?</p> <p>Background to Question <i>Having looked at the government website, and having lived in Prestbury for the last few years, my personal assessment is that the greenbelt areas serve two of the five purposes outlined in the policy on the gov.uk website. These are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</i> - <i>To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</i> <p><i>In particular, I would like to focus on the Prestbury conservation area which includes many listed buildings. Development of these areas which are adjacent to the Prestbury conservation area will spoil the setting and the infrastructure within the conservation area will not cope. Evidence of this:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Listed buildings form part of or border the greenbelt areas;</i>

	<p>- A frequently used path links Prestbury church to Southam through the countryside as an extension to the conservation area;</p> <p>- The roads through the conservation area already carry restrictions on usage by cars;</p> <p>- The area struggles to cope with flooding - noting a major flood alleviation scheme goes through one of these greenbelt areas.</p> <p><i>Part of one of the greenbelt areas, along with the grade II listed "Hayes", form part of the setting underneath Cleeve Common (AONB). Together, they form a distinct beautiful gateway to Prestbury and Cheltenham via the Southam Road. The corner of Mill Street and Southam Road form the entrance to the conservation area.</i></p>
	<p>Response from the Leader Please see also the above answer to question one regarding the JCS' ongoing process.</p> <p>Inspector Ord has evaluated detailed Green Belt evidence submitted by the Councils and through independent studies, but has reached different conclusions from those of the JCS authorities regarding the sensitivity of the Green Belt in this location. It is within the Inspector's remit to suggest modifications to a plan which in her view would make it sound. Should the Councils choose to proceed with amendments to the Green Belt in accordance with the recommendations, then this would be through full statutory consultation as part of the Main Modifications consultation. Communities and other stakeholders will have an opportunity to make responses at that time, which would then be collated by the JCS Authorities and passed to the Inspector for her consideration. At that stage the Inspector will consider objections to the modifications and make a decision whether any further information, hearings or revisions are required before concluding her Examination and submitting her Final Report to the JCS Authorities.</p> <p>I understand the concerns about the Inspector's decision to propose new sites to be removed from the Green Belt late in the JCS process. So I will be proposing in the later debate that the Council assists in progressing a Local Green Space review for these areas.</p>
3.	Question from Harriet Ward to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>Can you please provide details of the expected population increase, including the percentage increase from the current position, that you anticipate will result from accepting Elizabeth Ord's recommendations to build an additional 450 to 500 houses on Green Belt land in Prestbury village.</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader The Inspector's report identifies an increased Objectively Assessed Need figure for the JCS authorities, based on population and household projections and economic uplift. The inspector finds that the housing requirement for Cheltenham Borough as a whole is therefore increased to 10,851 dwellings (which represent an increase of +1,751 from the 9,100 dwellings set out in the Pre Submission Joint Core Strategy). This proposed increase will be the subject of further challenge before the JCS</p>

	<p>in finalised.</p> <p>While this is a rise in the OAN for the Borough as a whole, the Inspector's report also recommends that housing numbers should be redistributed. In the Interim Report the Inspector has deemed that there is additional potential housing capacity in the north of Cheltenham. This includes areas around Prestbury. Whilst the Inspector recommends the removal of particular areas from the Green Belt to be undertaken through the JCS, any allocation would be for the Cheltenham Plan to consider.</p> <p>Because these areas are not to be allocated through the JCS, only a very rough estimate can be given regarding how much the population of the area would increase if development were to take place. Based on an average household size of 2.3 persons per dwelling, an increase of 500 houses would equate to around 1,150 people. However, these numbers do not take into account factors such as house type or the density, design or layout of any potential scheme, which would be likely to affect the number of residents.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Ms Ward asked if the Inspector's recommendations were accepted, had any detailed consideration being given to the additional school places that would be required in the village?</p> <p>In response the Leader advised that this detailed consideration had not been completed at this stage. If the recommendation for moving the Green Belt was accepted as part of the JCS, then it would be for the Local Plan to determine if those sites were appropriate for housing and if yes then infrastructure needs such as education would be considered at that point.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Terry Dicks to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>The Joint Core Strategy normally concerns itself only with development of 450 houses plus. All the sites recommended by Elizabeth Ord for release from Green Belt and subsequent development are owned by different people, making this a proposal for multi-site locations with none reaching the 450 criteria. Is it therefore within her remit to group together sites in this way to be included in the Joint Core Strategy?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p> <p>The JCS is a strategic plan which has determined strategic scale to be of 450/500 houses or greater. The Inspector's interim report agrees that the JCS should not allocate sites for less than 450 dwellings. However, the inspector has also reviewed the Green Belt in the JCS area and recommends alterations. Although the JCS authorities have presented evidence regarding the sensitivity of the Green Belt to the north of the Borough, the Inspector has examined this evidence and taken a contrary view.</p> <p>In her view, the exceptional circumstances test is met for releasing Green Belt in some of these areas, and by doing so would create capacity for development, especially that which could come forward early in the plan period. Whilst the Inspector recommends the removal of particular areas</p>

	<p>from the Green Belt to be undertaken through the JCS, any allocation would be for the Cheltenham Plan to consider. To help inform this process, I will be proposing in the later debate that the Council assists in progressing a Local Green Space review for these areas. See also the above answers to questions 2 and 3.</p> <p>In a supplementary question Mr Dicks said that in her report Elizabeth Ord made reference at paragraph 132 to "developer evidence" which suggests "some of the sites could be progressed immediately". The willingness or otherwise of a developer to proceed should be entirely irrelevant to a decision about Green Belt. Having clearly consulted with developers, but not local residents, how can you reassure me that Elizabeth Ord is not demonstrating predetermination in the recommendations she makes?</p> <p>In response the Leader advised that considering developer evidence is a relevant part of the process for the Inspector. The council had an obligation to provide a 5 year supply of land for housing and therefore there was ongoing discussion with developers about how quickly sites could be brought into development.</p>
5.	Question from Terry Dicks to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>The Governments National Planning Policy Framework says the Green Belt's number one purpose is 'to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas'. How does the recommendation support this?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework identifies the 'fundamental aim' of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.</p> <p>The NPPF cites that the Green Belt serves five purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; ● to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; ● to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; ● to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and ● to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>Through the Joint Core Strategy the authorities have sought to alter green belt boundaries at urban extensions to allow for the sustainable development of Cheltenham and Gloucester (Tewkesbury's strategic allocations around Tewkesbury town are not within the Green Belt). In doing so the Green Belt has to be comprehensively reviewed, and the authorities have presented two detailed studies on the Green Belt in the Cheltenham area.</p> <p>The NPPF requires that when reviewing the Green Belt:</p> <p>'...local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development</p>

	<p>towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.'</p> <p>The JCS Inspector has considered the studies and evidence presented to her over the course of the examination, but has come to an alternative interpretation of this evidence to that of the JCS authorities. She has examined whether exceptional circumstances are met to release each of the areas of the Green Belt in her report; based on the sensitivity of the Green Belt in that location, the ability to create a defensible green belt boundary and the value of releasing the site in relation to housing need.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Mr Dicks commented that many of the Inspector's conclusions appeared subjective. The answer to my question supports this by use of the phrase 'alternative interpretation'. If these proposals are accepted, there will be no green belt boundary left; defensible or otherwise. Can you therefore explain what is meant by defensible in this case, as I don't understand how a 'defensible green belt boundary' can be created if it is erased completely?</p> <p>In response the Leader advised that generally features such as a river or a road or some other similar firm reference could be defended as a future boundary for the Green Belt. He could not see how this applied to Prestbury at this stage.</p>
6.	<p>Question from Patrick Durkan to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>Elizabeth Ord's report makes reference to the proposed Green Belt sites in Prestbury to be released as being "sustainable", what does sustainable mean in this context?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p> <p>The Inspector's role is to examine whether the JCS is "sound", based on four tests. These tests set out that the plan should seek to meet requirements for delivery of housing and infrastructure in line with national policy. If the Inspector has identified that needs are not being met, then she has the power to examine and recommend alternative sites and locations where the need could be delivered; taking into account the evidence she has heard on the social, environmental and economic principles of sustainability. After having evaluated evidence on these principles and requirements the inspector writes:</p> <p>'The removal of Leckhampton as a strategic allocation and the reduction of housing numbers at North West Cheltenham leaves Cheltenham with a need to find alternative housing capacity. The newly proposed strategic allocation of West Cheltenham will go part way to doing this, although a deficit still remains. In my judgement there is additional potential capacity in non-strategic Green Belt sites, which could significantly increase Cheltenham's district capacity and which could be allocated in the emerging Cheltenham Local Plan. Releasing these areas of Green Belt now within the JCS would facilitate these sites coming forward and contributing to Cheltenham's five year housing land supply. Following this approach should also enable Cheltenham's housing requirements for the</p>

	<p>Plan period to be met in full'</p> <p>Beyond quoting the Inspector's report I am not in a position to further explain her thinking.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Mr Durkan commented that as part of the JCS process the main sites being considered for development in Cheltenham, Tewkesbury and Gloucester which formed part of the Examination in Public were subject to thorough review in relation to sustainability. Can you please share with me or let me know where I can find the detailed traffic studies which have been carried out to assess the impact on Prestbury's Village lanes which confirm that the infrastructure of the village is indeed sustainable and can cope with the addition of 500 dwellings?</p> <p>The Leader advised that the traffic impact of the original JCS submitted to the Inspector for examination was reviewed by the county council. The county council planned to review this in the autumn when new data would be available and this would now include an assessment of the traffic impact of any new areas now being proposed for the JCS.</p>
7.	<p>Question from Question from Robert Douglas to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>The entire JCS team has spent over 5 years developing the planning strategy for the region. How is it possible for the inspector to come forward with a very different allocation of sites in such a comparatively short time frame, involving sites that had not previously been scrutinised at all?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p> <p>Please see also the above response to questions 1, 4 and 6.</p> <p>The discussion on the Green Belt around Cheltenham within the examination have been detailed and over a number of months. The Inspector has heard evidence on the sensitivity of the Green Belt through the Councils' submissions as part of matters 7 and 9 (Green Belt and Omission Sites) and through detailed analysis in Exam documents 142 (the Councils' Green Belt Paper) and 196 (Green Belt Update Paper). The councils have also given evidence over a number of days of hearings on the topic, alongside legal counsel. Whilst this evidence has been presented to the Inspector and she has heard evidence from both the Council and objectors to the plan; her reading of this evidence has led her to her findings in her Interim Report, which differ from those reached by the JCS authorities during the development of the Plan and our view expressed in detail at examination. However, this is the Inspector's judgement to make through her consideration of the Plan, after having heard all the evidence presented to her on this matter. The interim findings set out in at this stage are not her Final Report, and therefore responses on the Main Modifications will be an important opportunity for further evidence and views to be presented by the community. I am keen to ensure there is a proper chance for views to be expressed although the JCS process is largely in the hands of the Inspector.</p>

	<p>In a supplementary question, Mr Douglas said that given the fact that the JCS team has spent around 5years developing its plans and given the recent policy statement on the Green Belt by the Secretary of State, how can the Inspector possibly justify removing white land from the plans and then proceed to introduce Green Belt land?</p> <p>The Leader commented that this was an entirely fair question but one for the Inspector.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Question from Robert Douglas to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan</p>
	<p>Green Belt land in Prestbury has suddenly appeared, without consultation, in the possible JCS sites due to recommendations from the inspector. However, the elected representative of Prestbury has been forbidden to speak at the JCS examination in public meetings on 6th and 7th July. How can this be justified?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader Please see also the answer given above to question 1.</p> <p>I share the concerns expressed and although the Councils have discussed this matter with the inspectorate, the exam hearings on the 6th and 7th of July cover specific matters with only a limited number of participants. Currently the modifications to the Green Belt around Prestbury are not part of the Plan, and will only become so if they are integrated into the Main Modifications Draft. Council meetings are scheduled in September to agree any main modifications to the plan. Communities and other stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide comments on the modifications through the consultation process that follows. Responses will then be collated by the JCS Authorities and passed to the Inspector for her consideration.</p> <p>At that stage the Inspector will consider objections to the modifications and make a decision whether any further information, hearings or revisions are required before concluding her Examination and submitting her Final Report to the JCS Authorities.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Mr Douglas commented that the answer to question 8, and also to my question 7, imply that the council has complete knowledge of the powers, authorities and scope of the Inspector. I have had correspondence with the DCLG and they have been strangely reluctant to provide me with information about the exact nature of the authority of Inspectors. It would be helpful if the council could provide details of the scope and authority of the Inspector, in order that we may fully understand why the council believes it has to roll over whenever it is threatened with any element of the JCS plan being found unsound.</p> <p>The Leader advised that if the council were to leave the JCS process, they would have to start from scratch on their own. The Council would be taking a view in September regarding whether the revised JCS proposals were acceptable. He was disappointed that Members could not communicate directly with the Inspector outside the open sessions of the enquiry or have the opportunity to question her views?</p>

9.	Question from Margaret Randall to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan (not present)
	<p>There is housing demand in excess of supply for over a decade and there will be for many years to come. I consider this to be the "norm" unless central government makes significant changes to policies. Therefore, I don't consider the current situation as exceptional circumstances. In addition, in the preliminary report, I cannot find any references to brownfield sites as well, such as Premiere Products which is up for sale. While I accept the JCS must proceed, could I please ask the council to challenge the preliminary report by questioning if circumstances are truly exceptional and why brownfield sites are not considered. Will the council and JCS do this?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader Please see also the answer given above to question 6 regarding exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>The JCS authorities have taken into account the 'urban capacity' of both Cheltenham and Gloucester when calculating the remaining need for development and before considering the need for urban extensions and strategic allocations. This includes all brownfield and greenfield land which is considered able to come forward within the Borough boundaries. The Inspector factors this into her calculations of need as part of her Report, and has offset this against the overall requirement.</p>
10.	Question from Peter Weir to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>As a local resident of Prestbury, I am seriously concerned about the recent news regarding the green belt areas in the village being recommended to change status and be used for building additional houses.</p> <p>Can you explain exactly what the exceptional circumstances are that Elizabeth Ord refers to in her report?</p>
	<p>Response from the Leader</p> <p>I understand the concerns and please see the answer given above to question 6.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Mr Weir suggested that the Minister for Housing and Planning, Brandon Lewis, has been clear to his MPs that housing shortage alone should not be used as a reason to redraw Green Belt boundaries. What justification is there for Prestbury to be treated in a way which contravenes his stated approach and the government's policy?</p> <p>The Leader reiterated that the JCS could not satisfy all the housing requirements without using some element of Green Belt so that does require potential sites to be looked at. The open question here is whether Green Belt sites in Prestbury should be added.</p>
11.	Question from County Councillor Iain Dobie to the Leader,

	Councillor Steve Jordan
	Does Cheltenham intend to approve the building of 200 new houses in Leckhampton within its Town Plan?
	<p>Response from the Leader</p> <p>The Inspector's interim report makes it clear that she does not find that an allocation of strategic scale (i.e. greater than 450/500 houses) is appropriate at Leckhampton in the JCS, but considers that a smaller allocation may be appropriate within the Cheltenham Plan. The Inspector finds the proposed Farm Lane development of 377 houses unsound which is in line with this Council's view however since the application has already been approved by Tewkesbury we do need to clarify the status of that site.</p> <p>The Inspector's view is that development at Leckhampton is a matter for the emerging Cheltenham Plan to consider and no decisions have been made as yet. The Preferred Option consultation for the Cheltenham Plan, which will further review the principle of allocation in this area, is scheduled for September this year. While I would broadly support the Inspector's view the Council decision on accepting corresponding modifications to the JCS will take place in September. There are also ongoing legal challenges regarding planning decisions on this site still to be decided.</p>
12	Question from County Councillor Iain Dobie to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	If the answer to the previous question is yes, what primary school provision would be made out of developers contributions for the children of those 200 houses (plus additional housing developments already in train) - will the plan for a new primary school in Leckhampton funded by new housing be revived?
	<p>Response from the Leader</p> <p>Please see also the response to question 11 above. Whilst school provision needs to be reviewed as part of the Cheltenham Plan, and that plan needs to review the most efficient and comprehensive use of the site; it is clear that a scheme of 200 houses alone would not fund a new primary school at Leckhampton. Conversations are progressing with the County Council on this issue.</p>

7. MEMBER QUESTIONS

1.	Question from Councillor John Payne to the Leader , Councillor Steve Jordan
	On the 7th of June this year Brandon Lewis, Minister of State for Housing and Planning wrote a letter to all Members of Parliament stressing and restating the Government's position on development in the Green Belt, that "development may only be allowed where exceptional circumstances exist". Could you please detail the specific circumstances that justify the destruction of most of the Green Belt in Prestbury?
	Response from Cabinet Member

Government policy and statements both reinforce that Green Belt boundaries should only be changed where exceptional circumstances exist.

The exceptional circumstances case for release of Green Belt can be made depending on the need for release, the sensitivity of the Green Belt in that location, and the potential for a suitable new green belt boundary to be created. These principles have been demonstrated through previous examinations and through case law.

The Inspector's role is to examine whether the JCS is "sound", based on four tests. These tests set out that the plan should seek to meet requirements for delivery of housing and infrastructure in line with national policy. If the Inspector has identified that needs are not being met, then she has the power to examine and recommend alternative sites and locations where the need could be delivered; taking into account the evidence she has heard on the social, environmental and economic principles of sustainability.

While the Inspector cannot compel the authorities to make the modifications she recommends to make the plan sound, the authorities cannot legally adopt or implement the plan if it has not been found to be sound through examination.

As Cllr Payne will be aware, after having evaluated evidence on these principles and requirements the inspector writes:

'The removal of Leckhampton as a strategic allocation and the reduction of housing numbers at North West Cheltenham leaves Cheltenham with a need to find alternative housing capacity. The newly proposed strategic allocation of West Cheltenham will go part way to doing this, although a deficit still remains. In my judgement there is additional potential capacity in non-strategic Green Belt sites, which could significantly increase Cheltenham's district capacity and which could be allocated in the emerging Cheltenham Local Plan. Releasing these areas of Green Belt now within the JCS would facilitate these sites coming forward and contributing to Cheltenham's five year housing land supply. Following this approach should also enable Cheltenham's housing requirements for the Plan period to be met in full'

On pages 28 – 30 of the Inspector's report she gives reasons why, in her view, the exceptional circumstances test is met for release of Green Belt land in each of the locations described to the North of Cheltenham – based on the principles above.

Through the Joint Core Strategy the authorities have sought to alter green belt boundaries at urban extensions to allow for the sustainable development of Cheltenham and Gloucester. Tewkesbury's strategic allocations around Tewkesbury town are not within the Green Belt. In doing so the Green Belt has to be comprehensively reviewed, and the authorities have presented two detailed studies on the Green Belt in the Cheltenham area.

	<p>National Planning Policy requires that when reviewing the Green Belt: ‘...local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.’</p> <p>The JCS Inspector has considered the studies and evidence presented to her over the course of the examination, but has come to an alternative interpretation of this evidence to that of the JCS authorities.</p> <p>The Inspector has reviewed the Green Belt across the whole JCS area and recommends alterations to those set out in the Submission JCS, not only in Cheltenham Borough. For example, recommending that significant areas of land be released from the Green Belt at Twigworth, and that land not be removed from the Green Belt for Safe Guarding at West Cheltenham (phase 2) in Tewkesbury Borough; where the JCS authorities argued it should be removed but Safeguarded.</p> <p>Although the JCS authorities have presented evidence regarding these sites also, the Inspector has examined this evidence and taken a contrary view.</p> <p>In regard to North Cheltenham and the Prestbury area, whilst the Inspector recommends the removal of particular areas from the Green Belt to be undertaken through the JCS, any allocation would be for the Cheltenham Plan to consider.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Councillor Payne suggested that the determination of small, non-strategic sites for development should be a responsibility of this council. Does the Leader agree that the authority of Cheltenham Borough Council has been usurped and the proposals have not been subject to the normal consultation?</p> <p>In response, the Leader advised that it would not be possible within the JCS to provide all the housing required without using some element of the Green Belt. The question here was whether Prestbury needed to be added in order to meet the targets.</p>
2.	Question from Councillor John Payne to the Leader , Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>All the proposed sites in the JCS have been subject to scrutiny to inform their suitability. What, if any detailed scrutiny have the sites in Prestbury been subjected to, specifically in relation to site accessibility, transport modelling, environmental impact and the ability of the infrastructure to support such extensive development?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>Please see also the answer given to Question 1.</p> <p>The areas at Prestbury have been evaluated through the strategic land</p>

	<p>availability assessment, which is a basic technical appraisal of sites across the Cheltenham Borough area. Since the area was not proposed for strategic allocation detailed work has not been undertaken on accessibility, transport modelling or environmental impact, or the infrastructure requirements of development in this area.</p> <p>Any proposal for development in this area would need to demonstrate that these needs could be met. While the Inspector recommends the removal of particular areas from the Green Belt to be undertaken through the JCS, any allocation would be for the Cheltenham Plan to consider, and would need to include an infrastructure delivery plan. I am keen that any sites now being proposed by the Inspector are properly considered before final decisions are taken although the JCS process is largely in her hands.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Councillor Payne asked whether the Leader believed the timescales set for the JCS were sufficient for a full assessment of the sites at Prestbury and appropriate consultation with local residents?</p> <p>The Leader acknowledged this was doubtful but was keen for this consultation to take place, admittedly though it would be in the very short timetable set by the Inspector.</p>
3.	Question from Councillor Adam Lillywhite to the Leader, Councillor Steve Jordan
	<p>The JCS's legal representative, Mr Jameson suggested to the inspector on the final day of the JCS hearing that as an independent outsider, rather than an officer, if she could be clear about what should happen and if she were to make a recommendation then the simpler the political process would become.</p> <p>He inferred that it would be politically difficult for officers to make these recommendations.</p> <p>It is clear that the inspector understood what she was being asked to and that she had enough information, and again she asked Mr Jameson if he was sure that the JCS authorities didn't want the flexibility to make those changes themselves.</p> <p>Mr Jameson's response was that it would make the political process easier if the inspector were to point us in the right direction.</p> <p>Do you think the JCS's legal representative was correct when he suggested it would be politically difficult for our officers to make these recommendations and was he correct in asking the inspector to make them?</p>
	Response from Cabinet Member
	<p>Mr Jameson was speaking from his professional experience of providing legal assistance to numerous local plan examinations. He was advising from the perspective that a clear direction of soundness would need to be given in relation to the Plan through the Inspector's Interim Report. Mr</p>

	<p>Jameson advised that uncertainty would lead to delay and sought certainty in her report on that basis.</p> <p>If the Inspector finds any aspect of the plan unsound in her Final Report it cannot progress so the sooner we know the better as proposals concerning strategic allocations across the JCS area are proceeding at pace. Therefore it was important that the Interim Findings when delivered were meaningful and showed a clear direction of travel that the Inspector would have the authorities take in order to achieve soundness, if she identified areas where, in her view, the plan was not sound.</p> <p>In a supplementary question, Councillor Lillywhite asked whether the Leader could assure Council and the public that the revised transport modelling will be completed for all the proposed sites in the JCS by October 2016?</p> <p>The Leader advised that the council relied on the county council to do this piece of work and therefore although he hoped they would meet the timetable he could not guarantee it.</p>
--	--

8. GLOUCESTER, CHELTENHAM AND TEWKESBURY JOINT CORE STRATEGY : INSPECTOR'S INTERIM REPORT

The Deputy Chair of Council, Councillor Klara Sudbury took the Chair for this agenda item.

The Leader introduced his report regarding the Inspector's interim report on the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy. The report explained that the JCS was the strategic planning document being prepared jointly by Gloucester City, Cheltenham Borough and Tewkesbury Borough Councils to provide a framework for meeting the development needs of the area over the plan period from 2011 to 2031.

The report summarised the Inspector's Interim Report, received on 31st May 2016, following the extensive examination of the JCS that had taken place since its submission to the Secretary of State in November 2014. The Interim Report made recommendations on main modifications to the JCS on issues that had not been resolved during the examination to date. In general it did not cover proposed main modifications that had already been discussed and proposed through the hearing sessions.

The report set out the proposed response to enable further discussion on the consequences of the Interim Report. The main body of this report was contained in Appendix A, with the recommended JCS response set out at section 4 of this appendix. This would allow JCS officers to set out the specific consequences and key points arising from the Inspector's recommendations. The report therefore sought Council approval to accept this proposed response and present these to the Inspector at further hearing sessions to take place on 6th and 7th July 2016.

He was confident that the joint working between Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury was still the right approach in the long term for this area. He thanked all the contributors to the Inspector's process which had taken a lot

longer than expected. He was concerned that the JCS was “morphing” into the Inspector’s plan rather than the three council’s own plan developed over a long period of time.

He referred to Appendix A which set out the three councils’ responses to the Inspector’s report and talked through each of the issues in detail.

Finally he referred to the additional bullet point in the recommendations which had been circulated in Members’ places. The additional point “welcomed the Inspector’s use of the Local Green Space review in Swindon Village and Leckhampton and requests a similar review be urgently undertaken in areas in West and North Cheltenham which she is now suggesting should be taken out of Green Belt.

The Deputy-Mayor invited Members to ask questions on the report and these were responded to by the Leader with support from the Director of Planning, Tracey Crews, where appropriate.

- Would the Leader agree that the people of Prestbury had been let down by the attack on the Green Belt?
 - The Leader responded that this was a fair point regarding any area which had now come into the equation.
- A Member referred to the Leckhampton SD2 development for 377 houses which had been found to be unsound on appeal. If the Judicial Review was won by Leglag and the decision referred back to Tewkesbury Borough Council Planning Committee, would this council write to TBC stating their view that it was unsound to build on the SD2 site given the Inspector’s views.
 - The council had raised their objections to the development in the first place and given the Inspector’s view that it was unsound, he would be happy to take that suggestion on board.
- How would the council ensure that Cheltenham gets the right mix of houses in new developments and not 4/5 bedroom houses in place of affordable housing. What powers does the council have as the planning authority to refuse sites with an appropriate mix?
 - The Strategic Housing Market Assessment assesses housing need and converts that to a housing mix that is required for Cheltenham. Once established any planning applications for developments would be assessed against it. The council would be aiming for a 35% target for affordable housing in urban extensions and a 40% target elsewhere. This flows from the viability work undertaken to support CIL and highlights the high infrastructure demands of large sites.
- The JCS has identified a number of sites to be taken out of the Green Belt in north-west Cheltenham. Proposals for those sites would not be known at this stage because that is part of the Local Plan but officers will have already made assumptions on the number of houses that could be built on these sites. Could the Leader clarify the process?
 - The exact process was still to be determined but the Member was correct in his assumption that sites defined as non-strategic would be an issue for the Local Plan and not the JCS. In September Council would have the final package for debate.

- If the Judicial Review (JR) for SD2 is not determined before September 2016, would that put the plans for the JCS in disarray?
 - The Leader referred this question to the Director of Planning, Tracey Crews. She advised that the outcome of the JR result in a further public inquiry and the Inspector could not wait for a result. She acknowledged it was an unknown and a risk for the JCS and Members would be fully informed of the current position when they came back in September to consider the JCS recommendations.
- A Member referred to the 'Florence convention' which required the council to carry out a full public consultation regarding any proposed developments which could change the nature of the local landscape. Would that be done in this case?
 - The Director of Planning advised that the council would consult on any proposed main modifications to the JCS. There was a specific requirement on local authorities to consult in these circumstances and indeed the Member had raised this point with the Inspector at the examination and it had been taken on board. The officer confirmed that SD15 was the relevant policy regarding health and environmental quality and would facilitate what the Member required.
- Could the Leader assure Members that the necessary consultation with neighbouring local authorities referred to in the Inspector's report would not cause delay in finalising the JCS and Local Plan which were critical tools in avoiding inappropriate development.
 - The Leader advised that discussions had already taken place with Stroud and Wychavon and would evolve over time so he was confident that these would not cause undue delay to the process.
- Can the Leader reassure members that the new boundaries proposed for the Green Belt in the northern parts of the town would be consistent with the DCLG guidance that the boundaries should follow physical features in the landscape?
 - The Leader acknowledged the importance of defensible boundaries for the Green Belt. He also pointed out that even if the Green Belt boundaries are moved as part of the JCS, those areas could still be protected within the scope of the proposed local Green Space reviews.
- How can the council ensure that the social housing needs for people in Cheltenham would be met and in particular a sufficient supply of houses would be available for rent for those who could not afford to buy?
 - The Leader acknowledged that the government's new definition of Affordable Housing did not necessarily resolve the problem nor did the Inspector's 5% uplift on housing numbers.
- Is the National Policy on affordable housing being considered and how could the views of residents in Springbank ward be taken into account if the local Ward Councillor had been refused permission by the Inspector to represent their views at the hearing on 6/7 July?
 - The Leader sympathised with this view. He would do everything he could to try and make sure people have their say as part of the Local Green Space review. The officer added that officers have been lobbying the Inspector regarding their concerns that the process was inadequate in terms of facilitating direct conversations with the Inspector. Officers shared the views expressed that the real needs for affordable Housing would not be met by the current proposals and she advised that a new

policy on affordable housing was currently being developed and will be available by September which would assist in the process.

- How would the infrastructure costs for the North West be funded? Would this be from county council funds or Community Infrastructure Levy?
 - The Leader could not answer this question at this point as it was an ongoing conversation. The officer added that Section 106 funding or CIL funding, once it was introduced, would be relevant.
- Does the 5 year plan for housing take into account planning permissions already granted?
 - The officer confirmed that the 5 year supply does take account of both committed and potential developments coming up in the Local Plan and revised figures will be available in September.
- Will a transport infrastructure plan be available in the autumn and can we ensure that local roads in residential areas will not be adversely affected by new developments?
 - The Leader advised that the county council was currently debating the revised Local Transport Plan and in the autumn the county council would be doing a revised traffic analysis for the JCS. He assured the Member that he would enable the maximum input from local residents in any consultation. In the meantime the Inspector would be working with the traffic analysis previously done but clearly it was important that the analysis was updated to reflect the potential new sites in the JCS.
- Is there a Plan B if the Council decides to reject the JCS in September?
 - The Leader confirmed that there was no plan B and the only alternative was for the council to start from scratch on its own.
- The assessment of housing needs was very much based on economic growth targets. If that growth is no longer relevant can housing numbers be reduced?
 - The Leader acknowledged the uncertainty following the referendum result and the difficulty of making economic predictions. The officer added that the Inspector had gone for the middle line in terms of economic growth but acknowledged that a recession could have a real impact on the figures.
- What could the council do to ensure that affordable type housing could not be abused by unscrupulous landlords who would buy up the property and then try and cram as many rooms as possible into the property resulting in unsuitable accommodation?
 - The Leader outlined the survey work that the council was planning to undertake on houses of multiple occupation (HMOs). The officer advised that this had come up at a recent Planning Committee and the committee had been advised that this particular issue would be dealt with as part of the Local Plan.
- A Member was concerned about local school provision following removal of the Leckhampton sites. Local communities needed some certainty on whether school places will be made available.
 - the Director of Planning advised that recommendations at Leckhampton have an impact on levels of infrastructure. A new primary school will not be delivered by a site of 200 new houses. Officers are working with GCC colleagues to consider the impact on primary and secondary school places.

In the debate that followed the following points were raised by Members:

A Member wished to put on record his thanks to the Council and officers for the consideration of Leckhampton in the preparation of this plan. There were three unanimous votes of support, important wording added into the JCS resolutions and the 31 July 2014 Planning Committee left all Members feeling inspired.

Members believed that a strong message should be sent to the Inspector with regard to the inclusion in the plan of the removal of green belt land in Prestbury. It was important to protect the remaining green belt at all costs. The responsibility of changing the green belt was not in the gift of the Inspector but lay with the local planning authority via the preparation of the local plan. The inclusion of the Prestbury green belt had never been in the original draft JCS and had never been consulted upon nor scrutinised in great detail. As such local residents had been disenfranchised and there were also clear inconsistencies in terms of consultation when compared with consultation undertaken with residents in Leckhampton and Up Hatherley. It was also noted that Prestbury Parish Council had been denied its opportunity to speak at the hearings. A public consultation mechanism was therefore vital. Some Members questioned whether the Inspector's impartiality in the assessment of the soundness of sites had now been compromised.

Some Members highlighted the irreparable damage the inclusion of green belt land could have on Prestbury's character which would impact negatively on future generations. In this respect there were inconsistencies between that of Leckhampton and Swindon Village and that of Prestbury particularly in respect of landscape and sensitive views and heritage. These impacts were detrimental to Prestbury but had not been addressed by the Inspector. Officers were advised to consider the objections the council had submitted to the Mill Lane application when presenting Members' views at the July hearings. Prestbury had a distinctive village character in a semi-rural setting and development would fundamentally change it.

Members also highlighted the inconsistencies in terms of the inclusion of green belt land in Prestbury and the impact on infrastructure. More detailed work should be undertaken with regard to impact on roads, access to school places and doctors surgeries.

One Member suggested that the inclusion of Prestbury could be phased to the second half of the JCS period, once the JCS had formally been reviewed at its first 5 year point.

Members believed it was important to review the Housing Need numbers in the light of the Brexit Referendum result. There was current insecurity in the market with the economic outlook uncertain. The Council however had a responsibility to plan for Cheltenham's future with a strategic plan for the next 20 years and plans for sustainable economic growth in the town. It was important to highlight that the town was 'open for business' and that companies attracted to the borough could be accommodated. Members fully supported proposals for a cyber hub and high tech growth in the west of the town.

The uplifts were in the views of some members resulting in the direct consequence of the removal of additional areas of the green belt. Officers were requested to take a robust approach at the July hearings to challenge the uplifts

which some members regarded as 'arbitrary figures'. They believed there was no justification for the high percentage uplift in affordable housing and they questioned how this would be achieved. A Member believed CBH was capable of producing a proactive plan to deliver such homes without building on the valuable green belt around Prestbury.

Members recognised the housing crisis in the town with the current waiting list standing at 2600 with many residents in unsuitable, unsustainable accommodation and facing an uncertain future. It was vital that the JCS was in place so that the Cheltenham Local Plan could be finalised and these issues tackled. Members questioned how affordable and social housing derived from this uplift could be achieved particularly in the light of changes in government legislation.

Members placed particular emphasis on the style and sustainability of future developments. Good quality estates which included green space creating that 'open feel' would preserve the character of the town and develop sustainable communities.

A Member believed that the 377 units earmarked at Farm Lane should, if delivered, be allocated to Cheltenham. Members argued that the level of development currently being delivered wasn't because permissions weren't granted but rather that the development industry had failed to implement consents granted as there was no compulsion to do so. The application of a 20 % NPPF buffer was viewed as unfair.

The inclusion of greenbelt land in Springbank in the Plan was not unexpected but a Member questioned why, just because of the lower quality of the land, it had to be developed. The area had its own unique issues, for example a reduction in the bus service but due to its late inclusion, residents had not been democratically involved in the plan and it was important to protect the quality of life of all residents.

Members highlighted the need for a plan demonstrated by the high degree of cross party consensus over recent times. It was important that the plan belonged to the town, rather than the Inspector. Decisions should be made in full knowledge of the facts and full public consultation. Members supported the proposal to undertake local green space reviews in the West and North of the town as the Inspector had used these reviews when considering sites in Leckhampton and Swindon Village and Members believed these would assist in designing sustainable developments.

The Director Planning advised that a strategic overview of comments from this meeting would be drafted to inform the July hearings of the Inspector. The comments would be categorised under the headings as set out in Appendix A of the Council report and would be supplemented by the minutes of the meeting.

She summarised the main points raised under the following headings:

A - Housing Numbers

- Housing need must now be assessed in light of the result of Brexit. The decision raises new uncertainties for the economy.

- The uplifts as described in the recommendations are undefined, but have a direct consequence on the removal of additional areas of the green belt. Officers are tasked to present a case at the July hearings to seek removal of the uplifts.
- There is no clear justification for the 5% affordable housing uplift. Whilst recognising the need to respond to housing needs, including homelessness and young people, there is no way to ensure that new homes derived from this uplift will be affordable.
- If uplifts remain, they should slip to the second half of the plan period. We can then take stock at a review point and reflect upon the Brexit outcomes.
- The JCS has come a long way, but the recommendations open up uncertainty. It is a very different plan than that agreed by the JCS Councils.
- It is important that Cheltenham grows, but that it grows in the right way. Key to this is the importance of open spaces and reflecting the character of Cheltenham.
- The level of development currently being delivered isn't because we haven't approved enough sites, we have, but the development industry has failed to implement consents granted. Application of a 20% NPPF buffer is unfair.

B - Employment Land

- Cheltenham is open for business and it is important that land is available. However there are huge uncertainties around the future of the economy. The plan needs to be flexible and respond to Brexit.
- Support for cyber hub and high tech growth.

C - Strategic Allocation / Green Belt Removal

- The JCS has been carefully drafted in respect of proposals in the green belt. Remaining green belt needs to be protected at all costs. The Inspector's recommendations are not transparent and at North Cheltenham fail to deliver a strategic site.
- The responsibility of identifying non strategic sites is that of the local planning authority through local plan preparation. By proposing further changes to the green belt the Inspector has compromised decisions that should be taken at a very local level.
- There has been selective use of evidence in regards defining exceptional circumstances. Officers are tasked with the reinstatement of these green belt areas through the July hearings.
- Consideration should be given to the phasing of the release of land within strategic allocations. Too much emphasis has been given to statements made by developers that sites will be delivered.
- Concerns regarding West Cheltenham. Just because it is defined as a lower quality green belt doesn't mean we have to build on it. We need a grown up discussion on the best way forward.

- There was much debate in respect of Prestbury including:
 - redrawing of green belt boundary would significantly change the character of the area.
 - There are inconsistencies in the report between that of Leckhampton and Swindon Village and that of Prestbury, particularly in respect of landscape and sensitive views and impact of development on heritage. These impacts are equally detrimental to Prestbury but not addressed by the Inspector's report. Officers are directed to present recent objections to the Mill Lane application made to Tewkesbury Borough Council to the July hearings.
 - Prestbury has a distinctive character, development would fundamentally change a semi rural village.

D - Reserve Sites Policy / Local Green Space / Safeguarded Land

- Account needs to be taken of additional work proposed by Cheltenham Borough Council to undertake assessment of Local Green Space in those areas previously not undertaken (North Cheltenham and West Cheltenham). See additional recommendation noted on opening page of this summary.
- Phase 2 West Cheltenham - we need a grown up debate about the future and best planning of this area. Deleting phase 2 is arbitrary, the strategic allocation needs to be properly master planned.
- Cheltenham Borough Council agreed the following motion; "That this Council, mindful of Inspector Ord's Interim Findings in relation to the JCS, welcomes the specific finding that the case for a Local Green Space in Swindon Village, which conserves the historic setting for the village, has been made. Council also welcomes the fact that the finding will be further recognised and developed through the Cheltenham Plan."

E - Infrastructure

- There are inconsistencies in the Inspectors recommendation report. at Leckhampton the Inspector has looked at the cumulative affect of transport, but this is not the case for development in the pipeline or new sites arising from the recommendation report.
- As well as high level infrastructure issues, officers are directed to inform the Inspector of local issues e.g. Prestbury will no longer have a doctors surgery and impact of issues around access to school places.
- Recommendations raise concerns regarding appropriate school places.

F - Trajectories

- 377 units at Farm Lane - If this site is delivered these figures should be allocated to Cheltenham. Officers are directed to seek clarity.
- Consideration should be given to the phasing of strategic sites.
- If the numbers remain, due to uncertainty these should be pushed to the back of the plan period.

General Comments

- The JCS should not determine policy that is more appropriately dealt with at the local plan level.
- Great care has been given to ensure that the JCS is evidence based strategic plan. New sites recommended for Cheltenham are neither strategic nor been subject to rigorous examination of evidence.
- Local communities should be given full opportunity to set out their views in the same depth as those within the submitted JCS. Communities related to new sites identified by the Inspector's report do not have the same opportunities to engage. There is a democratic deficit - communities have been dealt a raw deal.
- We need a plan, but a plan that works for Cheltenham. we need to own the JCS, but we might not be able to achieve this due to lack of engagement and depth of public airing as the previous proposals in the submitted plan.
- Decisions we make today should not make the situation worse for future generations.

In response to the debate the Leader believed it was right to protect the green belt. There was broad acceptance with the JCS that housing need would go some way to being met. It was however inevitable that some homes would have to be built in the Green Belt as it was not realistic to avoid it entirely. He acknowledged that there was a real issue as to whether Prestbury had been fairly treated.

In terms of the uplift in affordable housing he highlighted that a generation required housing. In terms of the economic uplift he acknowledged the difficult economic projection in the light of recent events but the aim should be for something that is likely rather than excessive. The authority had failed in previous years in terms of the penalty as sites had been approved which developers had not built out.

The JCS was indeed a planned process and it was important that there were green and open estates and all residents had the right to input into the process.

Upon a vote it was

RESOLVED (unanimously) THAT

- 1. the Interim Report of the Inspector be noted.**
- 2. it be agreed that the JCS officers attend the July hearings to discuss the Interim Report and the recommended way forward with the Inspector, identifying specific consequences and key points arising from the findings to the Inspector as detailed (within Appendix A-section 4) and expressed through the June 2016 Council meetings on this report;**

3. **it be agreed that a summary of comments made by Members at the Council meetings held by the JCS Authorities be passed to the JCS Inspector for consideration.**
4. **the Inspector's use of the Local Green Space review in Swindon Village and Leckhampton be welcomed and that it be requested that a similar review be urgently undertaken in areas in West and North Cheltenham which she is now suggesting should be taken out of green belt.**

9. NOTICES OF MOTION

Proposed by Councillor Clucas, seconded by Councillor Fisher

"That this Council, mindful of Inspector Ord's Interim Findings in relation to the JCS, welcomes the specific finding that the case for a Local Green Space in Swindon Village, which conserves the historic setting for the village, has been made. Council also welcomes the fact that the finding will be further recognised and developed through the Cheltenham Plan."

In proposing the motion Councillor Clucas thanked colleagues for their support in relation to the use of the Local Green Space Review in Swindon Village. She said that, as the JCS had not been approved, it was important to give a message to developers on the Inspector's finding which would be developed further through the Local Plan. She wished to place on record her thanks to all those residents who had contributed to the work undertaken.

In seconding the motion Councillor Fisher took the opportunity to thank Martin Horwood for his contributions on the National Planning Policy Framework.

RESOLVED THAT

"this Council, mindful of Inspector Ord's Interim Findings in relation to the JCS, welcomes the specific finding that the case for a Local Green Space in Swindon Village, which conserves the historic setting for the village, has been made. Council also welcomes the fact that the finding will be further recognised and developed through the Cheltenham Plan."

Chris Ryder
Chairman