

Fairford Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031

Consultation Statement

February 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Introduction	3
2. Neighbourhood Plan Designation Area	4
3. Community Views on Planning Issues	5
4. Neighbourhood Plan	7
5. Dateline of Events	8
6. Early Public Consultation	13
7. Pre-submission Consultation	18
8. Statutory Consultees	19
9. Green Spaces Consultation	20
10. Summary of Changes made in the Plan as a result of the Pre-Submission Consultation	23
11. Appendices – separate document	

1. Introduction

This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Fairford Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2031

The legal basis of this statement is provided by Section 15 (2) of part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:-

- I. Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan,
- II. Explain how they were consulted,
- III. Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted, and
- IV. Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.

2. Neighbourhood Area Designation

The Neighbourhood Area was designated by Cotswold District Council on 20th November 2013 following the statutory publicity and covers the whole of the parish but does not intrude into any of the adjoining parishes.



3. Community Views on Planning Issues

3.1. The Town Council has striven for constructive engagement with residents over the development of the Town over many years, driven partly by pressures to develop holiday accommodation on nearby lakes created following previous mineral extraction in the Cotswold Water Park Area. Relevant activities commenced with the production of the Fairford Health Check over the period 2001-2005. These were followed, in response to the Government's Localism Bill, by the development of a community plan document "Fairford Horizon 2011-2016" in 2011-2012.

3.2. As a response to an increasing number of significant developments that were being proposed and permitted in Fairford, a public meeting was held in August 2013 and a sub-committee of councillors and residents was formed with a view to developing a Neighbourhood Plan, and a Neighbourhood Area Designation Request was submitted to Cotswold District Council. Following advice from a planning consultant, a decision was taken in September 2013 to update the Fairford Horizon document and its objectives as a Community Plan, taking account of the newly committed growth (some 30%) and achievement of some of the projects, as a preliminary step before developing a Neighbourhood Plan.

As part of this process, a questionnaire was delivered to every household in February 2014, and consultation sessions, in the form of workshops / small group discussions, were held in the Community Centre in April 2014. Responses (summarised in Appendix A) were taken into account in the preparation of the draft Community Plan, which was published for comment in June 2014. The final version of the Community Plan was adopted by Fairford Town Council on 22nd July 2014.

A key conclusion was that the Vision for Fairford remained the same as in 2011 – 2012:

"Fairford will continue to be a working community that recognizes the distinctiveness of the people who live, work in or visit the area. Fairford Community Plan aims to conserve Fairford's attractive environment and heritage while providing jobs, accessibility and facilities for all."

To facilitate the Vision the Council identified three key aims:

- 1. To maintain and manage the town in accordance with the wishes of residents and so ensure it remains an attractive place to live and work.*
- 2. To protect the town from any unwanted or unsustainable form and scale of development which may damage its heritage and historical significance and features, wildlife and green environment*
- 3. To take an active part in determining how the town should develop and ensure that there are appropriate community facilities and services*

The Community Plan 2014 set out the background under a number of policy headings, and identifies the direction that the Town Council and residents would like the town to take. In addition to the normal activities of the Town Council, which will include many of the actions set out within the text of the Community Plan, the Council identified a

number of more strategic projects which it would like to implement over the next few years but which were likely to require additional funding. It was expected that further projects would be identified over the life of the Community Plan, particularly as new residential development is occupied.

The Council recognised that the new growth would significantly change the dynamics of the town and the demands upon the infrastructure. It believed that more detailed studies should be completed and any impacts identified before further growth was considered sustainable. It stated that "Fairford is a town of considerable heritage with the centre being mainly populated by listed properties that have grown around the historic church and Market Place and a broader conservation area. The Council believes that these aspects of the town, and the entry to it, require a rural setting to preserve the character and historical importance."

Many residents described the town as having a "village feel" which is largely contributed to by the market square and the rural aspect when arriving from either the west or the east.

Overall the Town Council welcomed change but only if it would improve the environment and facilities for new and existing residents. Whilst recognising the need to grow, it stated that such development must be sustainable and not put undue strain on the services available to existing residents. The Community Plan set out these views in detail and also provided an indication of the medium to long term aspirations for the town.

It envisaged that the vision and aims from the Community Plan would in time be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan after full consultation with residents.

4. Neighbourhood Plan

- 4.1.** Following the adoption of the Fairford Community Plan a planning application (13/03793/OUT) for up to 120 dwellings, community facilities and associated works by Kensington & Edinburgh Estates on land at London Road (East of Cinder Lane) was approved by Cotswold District Council (CDC) on 24th July 2014, and on 22 Sep 2014 the Planning Inspectorate issued their decision allowing the appeal Gladman for a development of up to 120 homes on land South of Cirencester Road (13/03097/OUT), the latter largely on the basis that CDC did not have an up-to-date Local Plan and could not then demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply plus the required 20% margin.
- 4.2.** In January 2015 CDC issued a Local Plan Regulation 18 public consultation: development strategy and site allocations, which proposed no new site allocations in Fairford beyond the 442 homes already committed in the plan period (2011-31). The Council remained concerned about the need for improvements to the existing sewage and roads infrastructure in particular, in view of all the new development.
- 4.3.** Following the 2015 Parish/Town Council elections (uncontested in Fairford), the Fairford Town Council Planning Committee recommended (on 5th May) that the Council should proceed with work on the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.4.** Following a meeting of the Planning Committee with a representative of Gloucestershire Rural Community Council (GRCC) on 2nd June 2015, on 9th June 2015 the Town Council agreed to setting up of a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, with members drawn from both the Council and the local community and an action to agree its Terms of Reference. The Steering Group agreed these on 2nd July 2015.

5. Date line of Event

5.1. Original Steering Group Members:

Malcolm Cutler
 Cllr Barry Fenby (FTC) Joint Chairs
 Cllr Richard Harrison (FTC)
 Alison Hobson (Secretary)
 Margaret Bishop
 Suzanne Jones
 + Sue Hughes (joined 30 July 2015)
 + Sarah Basley, Rev. Caroline Symcox (joined Sept 2015)

Current Steering Group Members (from FNP website):

Malcolm Cutler (Chair)
 Cllr Jennie Sanford (Deputy-Chair)
 Alison Hobson (Secretary)
 Margaret Bishop
 Cllr Richard Harrison
 Sarah Basley
 Rev Caroline Symcox

Date	Event	Outcome/ comments
Nov 2011	Town Council carries out housing needs survey	
18 Jul 2013	Application on Land South of Cirencester Road submitted by Gladman	
22 Aug 2013	Public meeting in Fairford -	sub-committee of councillors and residents formed;
28 Aug 2013	Neighbourhood Area Designation Request submitted to CDC	
Sep 2013	Following recommendation from planning consultant, Town Council agreed to proceed with update of Fairford Horizon 2011-16 as Community Plan	
18 Nov 2013	Gladman application refused by CDC (appealed on 6 th Feb 2014)	
20 Nov 2013	Neighbourhood Area designated by CDC	
05 Dec 2013	Horizon Subcommittee recommended Town Council proceed with Community Plan with a view to developing a Neighbourhood Plan	
Feb 2014	Community Questionnaire sent out	Community Views clearly established and later used to inform the later Community Plan

Date	Event	Outcome/ comments
22 July 2014	Completion and adoption of Community Plan	Community plan published
24 July 2014	Kensington & Edinburgh application on land at London Road approved by CDC	
22 Sep 2014	Gladman appeal allowed	
5th May 2015	Fairford Town Council formally agrees to progress a Neighbourhood Development Plan.	
2 June 2015	Meeting with GRCC to discuss next steps in NDP progression	
09 June 2015	Town Council agreed to setting up of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	
15 June 2015	Initial Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Steering Group (SG) meeting	Establishing purpose and discussion of membership
2 July 2015	NDP SG Meeting	Agreed terms of reference
July 2015	Terms of Reference adopted	
July 2015	Community groups contacted	Consultation exercise to establish initial interest and concerns. (Appendix B)
30 July 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
10 Aug 2015	Meeting with Fairford Town Football Club Chairman	Fact-finding
13 Aug 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
20 Aug 2015	Meeting with GRCC	
27 Aug 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
15 Sept 2015	Meeting with Mr Clive Elliot, local businessman	Fact-finding
17 Sept 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
24 Sept 2015	SG meeting with Joseph Walker (CDC)	
1 Oct 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
1 Oct 2015	Business Questionnaires distributed	Fact-finding
15 Oct 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
21-22 Oct 2015	Meetings with Horcott Industrial Estate & London Road business	Fact-finding
26 Oct 2015	Meeting with Royal International Air Tattoo Management	Fact-finding

Date	Event	Outcome/ comments
28 Oct 2015	Meeting with Ridgeway Estate Agency	Fact-finding
29 Oct 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
3 Nov 2015	Meeting with Bharat Jashmanal – local businessman	Fact-finding
5 Nov 2015	Meeting with Fairford & Lechlade Business Club (FLBC)	
12 Nov 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
24 Nov 2015	Presentation at Bowling Club AGM	Discussions and outline FNP objectives
26 Nov 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
26 Nov 2015	Attendance at Quenington Parish Council meeting	Outline FNP objectives and discussions
1 Dec 2015	Article in Council Newsletter	Urging residents to respond to the questionnaire they would shortly receive. (See appendix C)
3 Dec 2015	NDP SG Meeting	
14 Dec 2015	Workshop – Town Centre Development Workshop, run by Place Studios	Attending by SG and local businesses to help frame FNP policies
7 Jan 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
28 Jan 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
11 Feb 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
25 Feb 2016	Presentation to FLBC members	Outline FNP objectives and discussions
03 Mar 2016	Infrastructure and Environment Group Meeting (sub-group of the FNP SG)	
10 Mar 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
11 Mar 2015	Meeting with GRCC	
15 Mar 2016	Meeting with Bharat Jashmanal – local businessman	Discussions on local business needs & objectives
15 Mar 2016	Housing and Development Working Group Meeting	
31 Mar 2016	Meeting with Arkell's Brewery	Outline FNP objectives and discussions
31 Mar 2016	Infrastructure and Environment Group Meeting (sub-group of the FNP SG)	

Date	Event	Outcome/ comments
1 April 2016	Article in Council Newsletter	Thanking residents for returning the questionnaire. (See appendix C)
4 April 2016	Letters and email sent to all town centre businesses inviting them to town business meeting on 14/04/16	
4 April 2016	Meeting with Ernest Cook Trust (ECT) – local landowner	Outline FNP objectives and discussions
7 Apr 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
14 April 2016	Meeting with local business owners	To discuss findings from the business questionnaire
18 April 2016	Meeting with James Hunter – Highways consultant	Discuss his study suggestions for the FNP
28 April 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
5 May 2016	Infrastructure and Environment Group Meeting (sub-group of the FNP SG)	
6 May 2016	NDP SG meeting with rCOH	
10 May 2016	Housing and Development Working Group Meeting	
12 May 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
19 May 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
26 May 2016	Meeting with Fairford Town Council	To update the Council on FNP progress
1 June 2016	Meeting with Ernest Cook Trust (ECT) – local landowner	Discuss development site allocations
6 June 2016	Site meeting at Horcott Lakes (Hansons, RAF, FTC. SG, CDC Ward Councillor)	Fact finding
15 June 2016	Meeting with James Bray, Joseph Walker (CDC)	Discuss site allocations and Local Plan implications
23 June 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
27 June 2016	Meeting with Ernest Cook Trust	Discuss site allocations
29 June 2016	Meeting with ECT & Gleasons	Discuss proposed development on Leaffield Rd
15 July 2016	NDP SG Meeting	Attended by representatives from CDC, GRCC, and rCOH

Date	Event	Outcome/ comments
21 July 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
28 July 2016	NDP SG Meeting with ECT	
1 August 2016	Neighbourhood Plan Article in the Council Newsletter	Keeping the community informed. (See appendix D)
04 Aug 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
09 Aug 2016	NDP SG meeting with Pegasus	
17 Aug 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
25 Aug 2016	SG visit to Fairford Leys with ECT	View development
31 Aug 2016	Infrastructure and Environment Group Meeting with GRCC & CDC Heritage	
01 Sept 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
6 Sept 2016	NDP SG Meeting with rCOH	
08 Sept 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
15 Sept 2016	NDP SG Meeting	
18 Sept 2016	Consultation open day	Appendix D
22 Sept 2016	Consultation open day	Appendix D
29 Sept 2016	NDP SG Meeting with ECT	
14 Oct 2016	NDP SG Meeting with rCOH	
Nov 2016	Start of Reg 14 consultation period	
1 Dec 2016	Article in Council Newsletter regarding reg. 14 consultation.	See appendix E
6 Dec 2016	SG meeting with Lechlade Town Council	Review LTC comments on draft FNP
19 Dec 2016	End of Reg 14 consultation period	
5 Jan 2017	NDP SG Meeting with rCOH	
9 Jan 2017	MC meeting with Local land owner (A Cutler.)	
26 Jan 2017	SG meeting with Gleesons	
27 Jan 2017	SG meeting	

6.0 Early Public Consultation

The FNP is based upon the results of wide consultation with the local community. This process has included leaflets, meetings, workshops, questionnaires, discussions and public consultation drop-in days, and there have been invitations throughout to participate and to make comments.

6.1 Three previous consultations resulting in the comprehensive Fairford Health Check (2005), Fairford Horizon 2011-16 (2011) and Fairford Community Plan (2014).

6.2 The early stage was to identify the issues – all known community organisations were consulted (see list at appendix B), and a letter was delivered to every household in Fairford raising awareness of the plan and its purpose and inviting their participation. A website was set up, (www.fairfordneighbourhoodplan.org.uk) along with a Facebook page, aiming to attract, inform and invoke response, and an email address and mobile phone number were provided for contact. Working groups were then set up, initially there were more but they were later rationalised into four groups - Housing, Infrastructure and Environment (including Heritage), Business and Employment, and Community Services and Facilities, and there was a general invitation for anyone interested to join any of the groups. An independent Transport Appraisal report and a Town Centre report and workshop were commissioned. Evidence gathering and research into existing conditions continued and there was a display about the aims and activities of the steering group at the Fairford Festival.

6.3 A six-page questionnaire (31 questions) was prepared with help from GRCC, and this was delivered to every household within the parish boundary. (Appendix C) It was also put on the website and people encouraged to reply on line. The response was very good -645 in total, including around 60 online (just over 40% of households). After discussions with business and tradespeople a separate business questionnaire was produced and businesses, tradespeople and retailers invited to participate. Thames Water held a drop-in day to get feedback on sewage flooding problems and at the event there was a display about the Neighbourhood plan with hand-out leaflets. GRCC also carried out community facility audits and assessment of future infrastructure needs.

6.4 The analysis of results was carried out by the Steering Group and GRCC. This gave key themes about what people want, and what are their concerns. Bearing these in mind, and after discussions with planning professionals, landowners, developers, local organisations, health professionals, schools, neighbouring town and parish councils, the District Council and the County Council, various sites were considered and plans and options drawn up. Subsequent to the Questionnaires, CDC announced in April 2016, without prior consultation of the local community, that they were going to allocate 2 additional sites in Fairford (that had previously been rejected and placed on a 'reserve' list) for an additional 77 houses in total. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group were therefore obliged to develop their proposals taking account of this additional housing requirement.

6.5 Wide publicity was given before the two Public Consultation Days, Sunday 18th and Thursday 22nd September, (see Appendix D) and people were invited to come and see the proposals and give us their opinion. Maps and plans were displayed and options presented. (see Appendix D). Members of the team were present to explain and answer questions. The attendance was good -total over the two days was 330 visitors and almost 90 comment sheets.

6.6 Findings of Early Public Consultation

Households Questionnaire

The questionnaire was made available online and distributed to local households on 8-9 January 2016, with a response deadline of 25 January (although some were received and accepted up to about a week after this). 645 responses were received in total – 581 paper and 64 online. This is about a 40% response on a household basis, which ranks well compared with the responses to other Neighbourhood Plan questionnaires. (appendix C)

Analysis of the postcodes and ages of people in the households, compared against 2011 census data (as well as comparison of response percentages on a sample of questions), shows that the response gave good and fairly even demographic coverage overall, although the over 65 age group was relatively over-represented by up to 60% and certain areas (e.g. The Quarry) were under-represented.

The top 6 most valued characteristics of Fairford (rated as Very Important) were:

Rural feel and access to countryside	83%
River and lakeside walks	82%
Character and heritage as a Cotswold market town	82%
Historic buildings housing and streetscape	78%
Good schools	77%
Community facilities	76%

The top 7 issues (significantly above the rest) that respondents were 'Very Concerned' about were:

Pressure on public services e.g. health	83%
Overloaded sewers	74%
Recent rapid expansion of housing	70%
Traffic speeds and/or congestion	66%
Keeping Fairford 'green'	65%
Loss of retail space (shops) in the town centre	60%
Flood risks	59%

9 environmental objectives were clearly rated above others as Very Important:

Preserving open green spaces within the town	87%
Protecting the River Coln and lakes	85%
Preserving green areas around the town	80%
Maintaining and improving local footpaths	78%
Conserving historic buildings and features of the town	78%
Preventing sewage pollution & improving river water quality	76%

Reducing traffic congestion and HGVs through the town	76%
Design of new developments to fit in with local surroundings	74%
Protecting the local wildlife and habitats	73%

These results are generally consistent with the findings of the Community Plan Questionnaire 2 years earlier (although the questions were different – See Appendix C).

86% of respondents supported the position in the draft Local Plan at that time that no further sites should be allocated for housing development in Fairford up to March 2031.

In response to the Question “Are there any particular public open/green spaces you especially value and, if so, why?” 154 people said they especially valued Walnut Tree field; 141 indicated rivers and lakes and a further 28 said Mill and/or Oxpens. 38 indicated ECT areas; 19 The Green and 43 valued green spaces generally or all of them. In all, 15 different green spaces were mentioned.

59% of respondents felt that improved vehicle access and parking at the Doctors' Surgery was Very Important.

60% of respondents supported the allocation of additional land for business developments to encourage local employment opportunities.

Much other useful information was gathered, including statistics on the frequency of use of shops and other facilities, factors inhibiting the use of these, commuting destinations and the intentions of current residents to move from and to different types/sizes of housing.

A more comprehensive summary of the results is given in Appendix C.

Key results from Business Questionnaire – referring to Appendix B for detail

[50] Business questionnaires were delivered and most of these were completed and returned.

The main issues mentioned were mobile phone signal and parking, particularly on the Horcott Industrial Estate. Other issues mentioned included:

- Access issues to some Town Centre shops, especially for disabled access
- Lack of room for expansion both in Town Centre and Horcott Business Park
- Lack of 'generic' marketing of the town, shops and facilities
- Lack of visitor attractions/marketing

Preparation of initial Plan proposals

These results, together with other information provided by GRCC, Thames Water and others and from discussions with land interests who had approached the Town Council, enabled the Steering Group to prepare a set of Plan proposals with a fair

degree of confidence in what would be likely to be supported by the local community. These were presented to the public in the Consultation Days, together with the supporting material providing the rationale.

Summary of comments from Public Consultation Days

These broadly confirmed questionnaire findings on issues/priorities, clarified views on CDC and developer proposals, and gave positive response on new site proposals (based on the requirement for the 77 new homes under the Local Plan). On the different aspects:

- **Views on CDC, Developer and Neighbourhood Plan proposals for Housing** - Most people recognised that Fairford was required to accept some additional new housing, although many commented that the town should be given time to assimilate the recent growth. With only one exception, those that commented on this agreed that the sites proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group were preferable to the additional sites proposed by CDC or other developers, particularly as they incorporated provisions to address existing problems such as parking and congestion at the schools and doctors' surgery and sought to minimise additional traffic impact in the town centre and on other constrained roads such as Horcott Road and Coronation Street. There was therefore support for the idea that access to the proposed housing on Leafield Road should be from Hatherop Road in the east, and that improvements to the sewage system should be made before this development. The need for the right mix of housing to cater for new families, young people (particularly local) and the elderly/retirees was also mentioned.
- **Views on Highways and Access**
Common reference was made to the "dangerous volumes" of traffic on A417, and support was given to the introduction of a weight limit through Fairford. The safety of the junction of A417 and the High Street was a concern as was the junction of Coronation Street/ A417/ Horcott Road. The need for better pedestrian crossings on A417 and better parking in the town centre was referenced by many of the respondents. There was support for improving walking and cycling routes around the town and to surrounding villages. The lack of public transport in Fairford was of concern to those that attending the open days.
- **Views on Business, Shopping and Employment**
Support was given to plans to encourage new employment and business opportunities along with supporting existing businesses in Fairford. Suggested changes in Market Square garnered support but there was concern over the need to maintain levels of parking in the town. This was echoed in the comments on transport and travel, above. People supported the idea to end the conversion of retail shops into residential use. There was support for the development of 'out of town' industrial estates, especially on Whelford Rd estate, and multiple comments regarding the closure of Lloyds Bank and need to maintain the building as a retail property (combined coffee/shopping). 'Managed' office space was a

requirement for small businesses (also for general industrial –B2, storage and industrial – B1, B2) and there was wide support for extending the Town Boundary.

Respondents commented on the need to encourage employment within the town so new residents do not have to commute.

- **Views on Green Spaces**

- **Protecting Local Green Spaces (FNP10)**

The response to the proposals was overwhelmingly positive with **no** adverse comments from local residents. Walnut Tree Field is the most valued open space in the town, particularly for the amenity it provides for local children and families as well as for community events but all sites were supported. The proposed local green spaces were all included in remarks about their value in retaining the open, rural character of the town, seen to be even more important considering the recent, sudden expansion of the town. One point, which was made repeatedly, was the importance of all the proposed Local Green Spaces in providing water storage.

- **Protecting The Fairford – Horcott Local Gap (FNP11)**

The role of the fields which would constitute a local gap between Fairford and Horcott was understood and fully supported in local residents' responses. The rural nature of the proposed Gap was seen to be important to the setting of the two settlements as was the role of the fields in providing a home and corridor for wildlife; this latter was supported with lists of wildlife seen in the area. The value of the fields to the community, with people of all ages playing sports, was apparent. Views (including views of the church) and the peace and tranquillity were mentioned and a couple had happy childhood memories of the area. Walkers of all kinds responded, as well as residents living nearby. The archaeological significance of a part of the Gap was also noted. This area was seen to be more vulnerable in light of the recent rapid developments in the town.

- **Protecting The Area of Special Landscape Value (FNP12)**

The feature of this area most frequently mentioned is the wildlife: birds, snakes, mammals, wildflowers (including orchids). Lake 104 was specifically referred to several times, as were the fields south of Fieldway but the policy as a whole was supported by all respondents. The views and open green space were much appreciated. The area and its PROWs are well used by walkers, birdwatchers and part-time naturalists and many others who backed the policy. Several people pointed out the importance of the area in helping to alleviate floods, as well as the detrimental impact of the recent large Bovis development.

- **Views on Community Services and Facilities**

During the two days, 92 comments were in response to Local Community, Services and Facilities issues. 46% people had grave concerns that Fairford surgery could not cope with additional population in Fairford and that it should expand and 16% people suggested that Fairford Hospital should play a larger part in the community. Several people complained that there was no NHS dentist in Fairford. 20% were very concerned that Fairford Primary school was at capacity and local children had to be relocated to other schools in nearby villages. 20% were concerned that there was insufficient parking facilities at the surgery and the primary school. The rest of the consultees had concerns regarding the shrinking bus service, something

for teenagers; protect Fairford hospital, the Library and the Post Office and Sports facilities.

Other Local Green Space evidence

Forms were made available for people to provide relevant details of why they wished certain areas to be designated as Local Green Spaces. Many of these were returned and taken into account in the preparation of the [Local Green Spaces] document.

Description of how consultation findings were taken into account in developing the Plan proposals

The comments received on the proposals put forward in the Public Consultation Days gave sufficient confidence to enable these to be taken forward as the basis of the Pre-Submission Plan. etc.



7.0 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

The six-week Statutory Consultation period commenced on Monday 7th November and ended at midnight on Monday 19th December 2016

7.1 During the six-week Statutory Consultation for Draft Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan, the consultation was advertised in the Town Council Newsletter which is delivered to every household, in Ripples (local magazine), the Town Council Website, Neighbourhood Plan website and the Town Council and FDP Facebook pages. Hard copies were available in the Post Office, the library, the doctors' surgery & the local coffee shop.

8.0 Statutory Consultees

8.1 Statutory Consultees responses to the Draft Pre-Submission Plan are largely benign but with a number of helpful comments. The Neighbourhood Plan Guidance requires that certain stakeholders, including the following, should be consulted:

Stakeholders to include:

- Residents
- Community organisations
- Elected representatives
- Businesses
- Landowners
- Developers
- Active players in voluntary sector
- Government Organisations e.g. Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage

A summary of consultation responses can be found at Appendix E.

The statutory consultee responses were analysed by rCOH Ltd & the Fairford Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, and all necessary changes made to the Plan Policies. These changes are contained in the rCOH Ltd Regulation 14 report in Appendix E.

Summary of responses received from the public.

66 responses were received from the public. These responses were analysed by the Steering Group, and then taken into consideration when reviewing the Plan Policies.

Below is a summary of the responses. Full details can be found at Appendix E.

	%	%	%
	yes	no	other
Support for the Objectives and Vision of the draft plan:	95.45	4.55	0.00
Support for the allocation of land at Leaffield Road for housing in preference to the land allocated in the CDC Local plan:	93.94	4.55	1.52
Support for the proposals to designate a number of areas as local green spaces, a Fairford-Horcott Gap and an Area of Special Landscape Value:	95.45	3.03	1.52
Support for the proposals to designate a number of Local Heritage Assets:	95.45	3.03	1.52
Support for the other proposals and policies:	95.45	3.03	1.52

9.0 Green Spaces Consultation responses

With results below:-

NB. Fuller explanations of responses and actions can be found in Section 5 of the 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study'.

Site	Owner	Response	Action
Proposed Local Green Spaces			
Walnut Tree Field	Ernest Cook Trust (Represented by Gleasons)	No objection to FNP Local Green Space proposals	No action
Upper Green	Ernest Cook Trust (Represented by Gleasons) and unknown (fenced area in the process of being sold)	No objection to FNP Local Green Space proposals	No action
The Short Piece	Representative Gladman Developments Ltd.	Objection	Additions / minor 'Landscape and Local Green Spaces Study' Section 2.3. Responses to points of objection provided at the end of the 'Landscape and Local Green Spaces' Study document.
Coln House Playing Field	Gloucestershire County Council	No response	No action
Proposed Fairford-Horcott Gap			
Carters Ground	Representative: Gladman Developments Ltd.	Objection	Additions / minor changes to 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study' Section 3.3. Responses to points of objection provided at the end of the 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study' document.
The Short Piece (see above)	Representative: Gladman	Objection	Additions / minor changes to 'Landscape and Local

	Developments Ltd.		Green Space Study' Section 2.3. Responses to points of objection provided at the end of the 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study' document.
Fairford and Lechlade Youth Football Club football pitches	Fairford and Lechlade Youth Football Club	No objection – new information provided.	Small change to 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study' document.
Fields of the River Coln Floodplain	Cole Family Trust (Represented by Moore, Allen and Innocent)	No comment	No action
Old Piggery Paddock and field (photograph 3.2.3 p.19 of 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study')	Mrs P Hay	No response	No action
Field (photograph 3.2.5 p.19 of 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study')	5 members of the Yells family		Additions to 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study' Section 3.2. Responses to points of objection provided at the end of the 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study' document.
Area of Special Landscape Value			
Fields between Fieldway and the Floodplain	Cole Family Trust (Representative: Moore, Allen and Innocent)	Objection	The objection did not specifically address any of the arguments in the 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study'; rather the emphasis was on features of any future proposed development. No changes to 'Landscape and Local Green Space Study'.

Lake 104	Mark Savage of Cygnat Investments (Representative: David Neame of Neame Sutton Ltd.	Objection	The LGS acknowledges the planning permission that has been granted on this land and the proposals do not conflict with this.
----------	---	-----------	--

10.0 Summary of Changes made in the Plan as a result of the Pre-Submission consultation.

Revisions are marked in red.

Revisions made in response to Grassroots developer comments as follows:

FNP3 BUILDING NEW RETIREMENT HOMES & A CAR PARK AT EAST END

The Neighbourhood Plan allocates land at East End, as shown on the Policies Map, for a mix of residential and car parking uses.

Proposals for a housing development will be supported, provided:

- i. the scheme delivers, prior to the occupation of more than three dwellings, a car park for surgery use with a minimum of 20 spaces and pedestrian access to the public footpath leading to the surgery;*
- ii. the housing scheme comprises up to 10 dwellings, with a mix of retirement flats and lifetime home compliant 1.5 storey dwellings; and*
- iii. a new vehicular access is made from East End with the demolition of the existing dwelling;*
- iv. any developments must deal satisfactorily with issues of surface and groundwater without increasing flooding risks elsewhere; and*
- v. design, scale and layout are appropriate to the location in the Conservation Area.*

5.14 This policy allocates land at East End for a development scheme to serve two purposes: to deliver a car park for surgery use, to help serve users of the nearby health centre and to deliver new retirement homes to meet local housing needs.

5.15 The health centre is increasingly popular, as it serves the growing population of the town and smaller villages around Fairford. Although this is within the town, which will encourage some to walk, the location of major new housing schemes on the edges of the town, will result in many residents having to drive to the centre. The present car parking facilities are 'woefully' inadequate to accommodate this level of demand and East End is not well designed for on-street car parking.

5.16 To resolve this situation, the Town Council has identified a plot of vacant land at the end of East End, from which direct access can be achieved by footpath to the health centre. Although currently outside the development boundary, this privately-owned site is bounded on three sides by existing development and is therefore capable of a small housing scheme that will facilitate the delivery of the car park, preferably for doctors and surgery staff. Given the demand for retirement homes in the town, it is considered this form of housing on a site close to the town centre and other services is more appropriate than other forms of open market and affordable housing.

5.17 The site lies within the Conservation Area, is adjacent to the grounds of Morgan Hall (grade II listed), although screened by established trees, and is in an area known to be at high risk of groundwater flooding. The policy therefore also requires that the scheme specifically addresses these matters in terms of its design. The policy makes it

a requirement that the car park must be delivered by the scheme before more than three dwellings on the site are occupied.

Revisions made in response to discussion with Thames Water. Thames Water have agreed the policy wording below.

FNP7 INVESTING IN UTILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS

Development proposals must demonstrate that they include provisions which ensure any additional capacity required of the local utilities infrastructure will be delivered in time to service the development.

Houses must not be occupied until it can be demonstrated that the sewage system has adequate capacity to accommodate the additional flow generated by the development.

5.29 Fairford Town Council has been concerned for several years that further development would lead to overloading of existing sewage infrastructure, since the population for the catchment has already exceeded the design horizon of the 2006 upgrade. Ground and surface water ingress into the foul sewers adds to the problem, leading to sewage overspill in storm conditions and flooding of properties following prolonged and heavy rainfall.

The provider, Thames Water, has acknowledged the problems of sewer and surface water flooding and is working on a drainage strategy for Fairford. Stage 1 of this Fairford Drainage Strategy called Initialise/Prepare, Published in 2016, states:

"In recent years, the foul sewerage system in Fairford has become overwhelmed in some locations following prolonged and heavy rainfall. This has resulted in properties suffering from sewer flooding and restricted toilet use. The foul sewerage system is recorded as a separate foul system rather than a combined network. We believe that the system has surcharged due to a combination of groundwater infiltration to public sewers and private drainage, significant volumes of surface water run-off from surrounding saturated fields, inundation from highways and public spaces, surface water misconnections (i.e. downpipes from roofs), and river water overflowing from the River Coln. The root causes of sewer surcharges are therefore numerous and the resolution of the issues complex, requiring all stakeholders responsible for drainage in the catchment to work together to resolve them."

The 2006 upgrade was expected to provide adequately until after 2021, since the then Local Plan allowed a maximum of 260 additional houses in that period. However, actual growth has been significantly greater than this – 320 houses by 2015 and 120 more consented since, so that the sewer, pumping and treatment systems are working at the limit of capacity. Fairford is not included in the Thames Water Capital works programme 2015-2020, hence the requirement for FNP7. Thames Water has suggested that the CDC Local Plan should include *"When there is a capacity constraint and improvements in off-site infrastructure are not programmed, the developer should set*

out how the infrastructure improvements will be completed prior to occupation of the development.

5.30 To avoid sewage flooding, the Fairford sewage treatment works operates a fully-compliant permanent storm overflow system which permits discharge of highly diluted sewage into local watercourses during storm events. To meet changing performance requirements and regulatory measures the works has undergone upgrades over the years. Thames Water has stated that "the capacity of the sewage treatment works is being reviewed due to the amount of new development now proposed within the catchment. Assessments will be undertaken to understand the phasing of the proposed future development and growth, and the operational implications for the existing sewage works."

The Water Integrated with Local Delivery (WILD) group, a partnership project in the Cotswold Water Park working to improve the water environment, has reported (WILD project Rivers Management Plan for Fairford Parish May 2016) that the water quality of the River Coln has deteriorated in recent years.

5.31 Therefore, further housing developments in Fairford must wait until sufficient sewage capacity has been provided to accommodate the additional flows they will produce, before they can connect to the system. Hence the requirement in Policy FNP16 that the future development proposed at Leafield Road awaits an upgrade to the foul water system before the development can take place.

Where capacity constraints are identified, Thames Water will work with the developer to ensure any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of occupation.

Revisions made in response to CDC comments as follows:

FNP8 MANAGING TRAFFIC IN THE TOWN

Proposals for the management of vehicular traffic within the Development Boundary to improve highway safety for road users and pedestrians and cyclists will be supported.

All development proposals must demonstrate that they are able to successfully meet the development plan car parking standards on site, taking account of any additional requirement considered appropriate to the poor level of public transport provision in Fairford and any specific provision made in respect of town centre facilities, and to mitigate any harmful effects of additional road traffic on the Town Centre and on heritage assets in the Parish.

Proposals to create new and upgrade existing, safe, off-road pedestrian and cycle routes within the Development Boundary to connect residential areas to the Town Centre will be supported.

5.33 This policy identifies three ways in which the effects of traffic on this historic town can be better managed in the future, especially in the light of the major new housing developments consented on the edges of the town in recent years.

5.34 The policy fits into a wider strategy for managing traffic beyond Fairford, notably in respect of the upgrading of the Eastern Spine Road (and the introduction of better signage and information to reinforce the need for HGVs to use the Eastern Spine Road). There should also be a programme to improve the A417/Market Place junction to reduce speeds, limit numbers of HGVs and improve safety for both pedestrians and road users.

5.35 There are opportunities for improved 'non car' access to the Town Centre through the upgrading of pavements, cycle paths and lighting, especially from the new developments. It is also possible to improve and promote (via signage) existing walking routes in and around Fairford, including for disabled access. Additional Parking may also be possible through the expansion of the existing car park (North of the High Street) and the redesign of parking on the High Street north of Market Place.

5.36 In respect of car parking provision of new development, the policy allows for the county standards to be adjusted to enable development proposals to take account of the lower public transport availability and the constrained nature of some roads in the town.

5.37 With the A417 running through Fairford, the town is subject to considerable congestion due to the weight of traffic, especially HGVs, and in particular because, in places, the road is effectively single track due to restrictions and parking. The A417/Market Place junction is of particular safety concern due to lack of visibility and poor definition of pedestrian and vehicle areas. Additional parking to meet the needs of the growing population and decreasing levels of public transport, is also required.

Revisions made in response to CDC comments as follows:

FNP11 PROTECTING THE FAIRFORD – HORCOTT LOCAL GAP

The Neighbourhood Plan defines the Fairford to Horcott Local Gap on the Policies Map, for the purpose of preventing the coalescence of the two settlements.

Development proposals within the Local Gap will only be supported if they do not harm, individually or cumulatively, **its open character and function as a gap.**

5.42 This policy identifies the open land between the main settlement of Fairford and its smaller neighbour, Horcott, as a local gap preventing the visual coalescence of the two settlements. The defined land is considered to be essential to the integrity of the gap and, although much of it also lies within Flood Zone 2, proposals that may otherwise be acceptable outside a Settlement Boundary defined in Policy FNP1 will not be supported if they do not maintain its open character. A fuller justification is provided in the Landscape & Local Green Space Study report in the Evidence Base.

5.43 The Fairford-Horcott Local Gap includes Old Piggery Paddock; two fields south of Old Piggery Paddock; the Mere fields of Carters Ground and The Short Piece (also proposed as a distinctive Local Green Space); Coln House School playing fields (also proposed as a distinctive Local Green Space; Fairford & Lechlade Youth Football Club ground; and other land on either side of the River Coln to the south and east of the town centre. Thereafter, the land to the east is defined as an Area of Special Landscape Value, as it lies beyond the gap between the two settlements.

FNP12 PROTECTING THE AREA OF SPECIAL LANDSCAPE VALUE

The Neighbourhood Plan designates an Area of Special Landscape Value between the River Coln and London Road, as shown on the Policies Map and in Appendix B.

Development proposals in the Area of Special Landscape Value, that may otherwise be suited to a countryside location, will only be supported if they will maintain the essential open character of the land.

5.44 This policy defines an Area of Special Landscape Value around the River Coln and eastern edges of Fairford to manage development proposals that are appropriate to the countryside but risk undermining the special character of the landscape. **(This is in addition to the Special Landscape Area as designated in the Local Plan).**

5.45 This is a local designation and complements the growth strategy provided for by other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan and other policy designations. A fuller description of the land, and the justification for its designation, is provided in the Landscape & Local Green Space Study report in the Evidence Base.

5.46 The designation complements the proposed Local Gap to its west and together they are intended to maintain the special landscape character and visual integrity of

the land to the south of the town. This constraint will not prevent the longer-term growth of the town, as explained in Policy FNP1.

Revised Policy re. Trees and Hedgerows FNP13 (was FNP15)

Revisions made in response to Gloucestershire County Council comments as follows:

'Policy FNP15 is supported but could be strengthened by a small change in wording perhaps. It is normal practice to replace each lost tree with at least two replacements particularly as these will generally be younger and at risk from not reaching full maturity. In terms of hedgerows replacement providing another of equal length is the minimum required and this should be of similar or greater diversity of usually native species. A hedgerow of similar height and form will take time to grow so again the requirement should be same length of a new hedgerow plus some additional hedgerow or other shrub or tree planting elsewhere. We therefore recommend the policy is tweaked with some commentary in paragraph 5.5X about valid replacement ratios.'

Natural England have said, 'A specific Neighbourhood Plan policy requiring green infrastructure creation and preservation for new developments, including the retention of existing hedgerows, trees, and priority habitat, biodiversity enhancements, such as the inclusion of bat and bird boxes and planting for pollinators, to supplement policy INF7 of the emerging Cotswold District Local Plan'.

FNP 13 VALUING OUR TREES AND HEDGEROWS

Development proposals that require the removal of a tree should make provision for its replacement with **two trees of native species of equivalent height and girth within the site boundary.**

Development proposals that require the removal of all or part of a hedgerow should make provision in the landscape scheme:

- ***either for its replacement within the site of hedgerow of a similar length, height and form, **and of similar or greater density of native species to match existing or nearby hedging;*****
- ***or to deliver biodiversity value of the equivalent to that lost with additional hedgerow or other shrub or tree planting elsewhere;***

Proposals for new planting should link existing landscape features such as patches of woodland to watercourses or ponds. Hedgerows should be integrated into the development boundary features or be part of the open space provision to ensure their long term management and retention.

Development proposals adjoining the Development Boundary should make provision in their landscape schemes for trees and/or hedge planting to the site boundaries.

5.51 This policy provides some detailed design guidance for managing the effects of development proposals on the trees and hedgerows of the Parish. It sets a valid replacement ratio for the unavoidable loss of these important features, as guided by the County Council.

5.52 Fairford is unusual in that most of the green planting throughout the town is within the curtilage of private properties, with Cotswold stone walls being the boundary of choice. The effort to plant trees in public places is longstanding and on-going but is limited by highways issues. Thus new planting and renovation of hedgerows wherever possible is particularly valuable but not only as a means of enhancing existing landscapes. Hedgerows can also prevent soil erosion, capture pollutants such as fertilisers and pesticides running off fields, store carbon to help combat climate change, and provide homes for predators of many pest species. They also provide vital links across the countryside for wildlife, helping it to move about freely and keeping populations healthy.

5.53 The character of a place is found in the distinctive qualities of its landscape, cultures and built environment. A key environment issue in the Fairford Healthcheck (April 2005 EN3p61) was to 'keep Fairford green.' The recent, rapid expansion along the A417 has meant that the remaining green spaces which are so characteristic of the town, have come under particularly severe pressure. Hedgerows have disappeared and not been replaced, or been replaced with minimal planting when fully established instant hedging can now be purchased by the metre; nor have PROWs been protected by screening.

**Revised policy list following comments from CDC on the Pre-Submission Document.
Note change of policy number, now 14 (was 16)**

FNP14 ACHIEVING HIGH STANDARDS OF DESIGN

Development proposals will be supported, provided their design has had regard to the following key principles, as relevant and appropriate:

1. Short runs of low-level buildings in groups (1, 1.5 or 2 storey) should be placed at the edges of any development with higher (max. 2.5 storey) buildings kept to the centre **for developments outside the town centre boundary.**
2. Rural views should come right into any development, not be closed off by a row of houses. **Existing important views should be retained in new developments, and the sense of openness, which is important to the character of the town, should be maintained.**
3. The Cotswold stone of Fairford is the light, white/cream-coloured stone (not the yellow stone of the northern Cotswolds) with a light-coloured pointing. This should be the colour selected whenever Cotswold stone is used.
4. There should be a balance between features (windows, dormers, porches etc.), roof height **and pitch to avoid over-dominance of wall surface area on the front elevations.**
5. Frontages/boundaries, where they are to be defined, should be demarcated with Cotswold stone walls, iron railings or mature instant hedge. Practical maintenance arrangements should be in place if a hedge is to be planted.
6. **Timber close-board fencing should be used sparingly; never on frontages but can be used to divide properties at the rear.**
7. **Materials appropriate for function should be used ie. non-functioning chimneys, fibreglass porch pilasters and faux dormer windows are not acceptable.**
8. **Bin storage should be considered at an early stage in the design process and should be incorporated in a sympathetic manner that does not detract from the overall design of the new housing.**
9. Where 1960s-style 'Bradstone', or similar imitation stone is to be replaced/covered, use natural **and/or heritage materials, including rough cast render,** rather than reproduction,.
10. Linking alleyways are a feature of Fairford and to be welcomed provided they are at least 2m wide. **This is supported in the Gloucestershire County Council Street Design Guidance.**
11. Roads should not all be standard width but there should be 'lanes' (both for cars and otherwise eg. Mill Lane, Cinder Lane) ie. narrower with passing bays, trees and hedgerows. NB. Closes and crescents are not typical of old Fairford; **some variety would make developments more interesting and legible.**
12. In new developments **of more than 2 or 3 houses or industrial units, full provision should be made for onsite parking with greater use of raised tables / shared surfaces. This may entail providing separate small car parks and garaging.**
13. A range of different footpath surfaces should be considered depending on the situation eg. tarmac, paving slabs, **block/brick paving,** gravel, granite dust. **Surfacing should reflect the character of the local area and the use of the route.**

14. All houses should be provided with a water butt to receive rainwater from the roof. This is particularly important in Fairford which suffers so badly from high groundwater levels and surface water flooding.
 15. It is not appropriate for existing ground levels to be raised to accommodate surface flooding designs or attenuation systems in new developments, as this would increase flood risk to others.
 16. **Other than in exceptional circumstances**, existing land contours should be maintained and the final scheme should reflect those original contours. **Justified hydrological reasons are not, on their own, sufficient; of greater importance is the visual impact of increased land levels, an impact which must be positive and not detract from the quality of the adjacent landscape / townscape.**
 17. Where existing overhead services are within or adjacent to a scheme, they should be resited underground as part of that scheme.
 18. **Contemporary/modern design and materials can be acceptable subject to design being appropriate to the defining characteristics of the location.**
- 5.54 This policy complements the design policies of the CDLP (EN1 and D1) and the application of the Cotswold Design Code by identifying specific characteristics and features of Fairford and Horcott, to which development proposals should have regard.

FNP15 CONSERVING NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS (was FNP17)

Revised following pre-submission consultation. CDC created column 'Planning notes' - retained except where instructions have been carried out as part of the revision process eg. 'Suggest that these are put on the list separately with an analysis of each' or 'Need to be clear which properties in the terrace to be included.' Name change from Local Heritage Assets, to Non-Designated Heritage Assets as requested by Cotswold District Council.

Photographs and plans showing the location and boundary of each asset have been provided using the Parish Online maps as advised.

Fairford Park (33), Coln House Playing Field (34), The Short Piece and Carters Ground (35) have all been added to the original proposal in response to the Cotswold District Council's (Heritage and Design) comment at the Pre-Submission stage, 'The list produced only covers buildings and structures and could be expanded to include archaeological and other historic environment features, such as Fairford Park.' The Gloucestershire County Council response was also considered: 'In common with many Neighbourhood Development Plans the Fairford NP does not have a specific policy covering undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest ... Fairford parish is particularly rich in undesignated heritage assets of archaeological interest, some of which are of equivalent significance to designated assets (NPPF 139) which are not considered.' Nos. 34 and 35 have both been added on grounds of archaeological interest. The two bus shelters have been removed as they appear to be within the curtilage of listed buildings and therefore share in the listed buildings designations.

Criteria for selection as non-designated heritage assets (buildings and structures) in CDC draft Local Plan. The criteria under which each asset is put forward, has been added, as a letter, in the column, 'Site + description + criteria for selection (see above)'.

The Neighbourhood Plan identifies buildings and structures as Non-Designated Heritage Assets by way of their local architectural or historic and local interest. This list is not exhaustive, and should not preclude other properties being added at a later date or being considered as NDHAs within the planning process.

Proposals for a change of use or alteration that will result in harm to the local social, historical and/or architectural significance of a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, or for its demolition, will be resisted.

1. Palmer Hall
2. The Swedish Houses in The Plies
3. The Oxpens
4. Mill Lane
5. Park Farm House
6. Waiten Hill Farm House
7. Milton Farm House
- 8a. Stone Gate Pillar – Hatherop Lane (SGP HL)
- 8b. Stone Gate Pillar – Lovers Walk (SGP LW)
- 8c. Stone Gate Pillars – Leafield Road (SGP LR)
9. Iron Railings on Mill Bridge
10. Iron Gates to Waterloo Cottage
11. Terrace of Houses between Mr Ernest in the Market Place and The Plough, London Street: 7A, Tynedale, The Plough Inn (Terrace)
12. Terrace of Cottages on Milton Street backing onto Lower and Upper Green: (Milton Street Terrace)
13. Gable Cottages
14. Hyperion House
15. Fayre Court
16. Cotswold Stone Field Shelter
17. Cattle Trough in Carters Ground
- 18a. Fairford Gate South Stile (FGS Stile)
- 18b. The Short Piece Stile (SP Stile)
- 18c. Virgills Stile
- 18d. Milton Street Stile (MS Stile)
- 18e. Upper Green Stile (UG Stile)
- 18f. Oxpens Stile (Ox Stile)
- 18g. Gassons Field Stile (GF Stile)
- 18h. Garretts Stile
19. Fairford Cottage Hospital
20. Gassons Field Water Tower
21. Dynevor Terrace
22. Eastbourne Terrace
23. Vines Row
24. Bridge over disused railway
25. Red Pillar Box, Market Place (RPB)
- 26b. Telephone Box: Queensfield (TB Q)

- 26c. Telephone Box: The Green, Coronation Street (TB G)
- 27. The Old Piggery
- 28. Yells' Yard
- 29. Library/Old School
- 30. Entrance arch and Ernest Cook Estate Yard (ECT Yard)
- 31. The Boathouse
- 32. The Cascades
- 33. Fairford Park
- 34. Coln House Playing Field
- 35. The Short Piece and Carters Ground

5.50 This policy identifies a number of buildings and structures that have local social, historical and/or architectural interest in order that their significance is understood and taken into account in development proposals. They are therefore specifically regarded as 'non-designated heritage assets' in respect of §135 of the NPPF.

5.51 Each building or structure is listed and described in Appendix 'FNP15 Conserving Non-Designated Heritage Assets' which can be found at the end of this document.

This policy has been totally reviewed in light of discussions with the landowner.

FNP16 DELIVERING NEW HOMES AT LEAFIELD ROAD

The Neighbourhood Plan allocates land off Leafield Road, as shown on the Policies Map, for residential development and educational uses.

Proposals for housing development of up to 80 homes will be supported, provided they are accompanied by a masterplan for the whole site, which has regard to the following key principles:

- 1. The scheme is not commenced until the necessary upgrade and improvements to the local utilities infrastructure are completed, as provided for by Policy FNP7;***
- 2. Land within the site on the Leafield Road frontage is made available on request to provide for education uses comprising buildings, car parking/school bus drop off-on/turnaround facilities and ancillary structures to meet the long term needs of the adjoining schools;***
- 3. The layout and landscape scheme incorporate appropriate measures to mitigate the visual effects of development on the countryside on its western, northern and eastern site boundaries;***
- 4. The layout retains and improves the existing hedgerows and divides the land into at least three distinct development parcels;***
- 5. The scheme provides one or more areas of publicly accessible open space, including a children's play area and a community garden/allotments;***
- 6. The layout safeguards the potential for vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access connecting Leafield Road to Hatherop Road;***
- 7. Provision is made for the delivery of self-build plots in line with development plan policy; and***

8. The scheme incorporates measures to contain and attenuate surface water either within the site boundary or on other land within the control of the applicant as deemed necessary by the flood risk management strategy.

5.52 This policy allocates developable land at Leafield Road for a housing scheme to meet the District's housing needs once essential utilities works have been completed in the local area.

5.53 The local community is very concerned that the schools and nurseries will not be able to absorb the significant additional demand from new pupils of the 450 homes built/consented in the town since 2012. Beyond the planned works on the existing campus on the opposite side of Leafield Road, the proposed scheme will enable the release of sufficient land within the site on its frontage to plan for the long term expansion of school facilities

5.54 However, in the interest of community cohesion and convenience for families, plus environmental considerations such as reducing car journeys, even if the additional houses are outside the immediate catchment area it would be beneficial for the children to attend their local school. Failure to achieve this could isolate people living in new development. The land is the only sensible means by which the schools facilities can grow, without finding a completely different site for their relocation, which is not seen as desirable or financially viable.

5.55 The land is in private ownership but has been made available for these purposes. Indeed, the social benefit is an essential part of the justification for supporting the allocation of land for housing development. The policy therefore requires that this land is made available for education purposes on the request of the relevant bodies, if necessary prior to the commencement of the housing scheme.

5.56 The utilities works are not currently committed but Thames Water has confirmed that provision will be made for them in its business plan. Although this will mean that the scheme is unlikely to be able to contribute to meeting the District's five year supply of housing at 2017, it is expected to come forward during the plan period as the land is developable in all other respects. As it is, given the town is in the middle of a significant new building programme of around 450 homes, the scheme is not necessary to meet local needs within the next five years.

5.57 Although the land comprises green fields on the edge of the town, the land does not have any special sensitivity to development and it is considered a more sustainable way for the town to grow to locate new homes closer to the schools and away from the most sensitive historic buildings and landscapes to the west and south of the town.

5.58 Finally, the policy acknowledges that there may be the potential to continue to grow the town further in this direction beyond the plan period. It therefore requires that the layout of the housing and education schemes allows for reserved access through the site to enable a connection to be achieved between Leafield Road and Hatherop Road at some point in the future.

5.59 Discussions have been undertaken with the site owners regarding the implementation of this policy and a letter of agreement is to be drafted.

This policy has been reviewed in light of the recent announcement of the closure of Coln House School.

FNP18 CREATING NEW JOBS FOR THE TOWN

The Neighbourhood Plan allocates land off the A417, as shown on the Policies Map, for business uses. Proposals for business development will be supported, provided:

- i. The land forms an extension of the adjoining industrial estate and uses the existing vehicular access onto the A417 through the industrial estate;***
- ii. The buildings are no higher than the tallest buildings on the adjoining industrial estate; and***
- iii. The layout and landscape scheme provides a landscape buffer on the northern and western site boundaries to attenuate noise, fumes and light pollution in respect of the adjoining housing uses.***

Proposals to intensify the existing business uses on the Whelford Lane Industrial Estate, as shown on the Policies Map, will be supported, provided they use the existing access to the A417.

Proposals for a change of use of Coln House School, as shown on the Policies Map, from its established C2 (residential institutions) use will only be supported if they comprise the reuse and/or redevelopment of the site to include B1 business uses.

5.67 This policy complements policies EC2 and EC3 of the CDLP by allocating land to extend the existing employment area at the former station site off the A417 and to intensify the use of land at the Whelford Lane Industrial Estate. It also plans for the reuse of the Coln House School, if that use ends during the plan period.

5.68 With the town seeing around 450 new homes built in recent years, the local community is keen to see the number of quality local jobs increase to provide local employment opportunities as an alternative to commuting to nearby towns. The two existing industrial estates are already successful locations and are capable of delivering new jobs by extending their site areas or intensifying their use without any significant environmental or amenity harm.

5.69 The London Road site is close to recent housing development and would use existing vehicular access through the trading estate and therefore would not overload the existing access to Keble Fields.

5.70 Now that the closure of Coln House School has been announced, this policy requires that full consideration is given to it being reused for business purposes, in order to maintain and enhance employment opportunities in the town. The site is considered well-located in the town and especially suited to delivering smaller managed workspace units and office/conference/meeting room facilities to support those working from home.

This policy has been totally reviewed in light of discussions with the landowner.

FNP22 HORCOTT LAKES

The Neighbourhood Plan identifies Horcott Lakes, as shown on the Policies Map, as an area for improvements to recreation, leisure, tourism, biodiversity and renewable energy generation and for an enabling housing scheme.

Development proposals within the area should be made as part of a masterplan covering the whole allocation. The masterplan and its specific proposals will be supported, provided it adheres to the following principles:

- i. The masterplan has full regard to the implementation of measures put forward as part of the approved restoration and aftercare schemes associated with former mineral extraction operations;***
- ii. The delivery of a new community area, visitor facility and associated car parking on land adjoining the Development Boundary at Horcott, to be transferred to the Town Council or other appropriate body on completion and including a financial endowment to assist in funding the ongoing management of the facility;***
- iii. The delivery of footpath improvements and new footpath links around the perimeter of the lakes;***
- iv. The creation and securing of areas for biodiversity improvements;***
- v. The retention of existing landscaping with additional landscaping as appropriate;***
- vi. The installation of a solar panel scheme, provided the arrangement, orientation and height of the panels, together with any necessary mitigation measures, minimise its visual prominence in the landscape and its effects on the biodiversity of the lakes; and***
- vii. The delivery of a low density housing scheme of up to 20 dwellings that is of a high environmental standard, that includes implementation of an appropriate foul drainage strategy and fully respects the environmental constraints. The vehicular access shall be from Rhymes Lane with including additional pedestrian and cycle links.***

The masterplan should set out the appropriate provisions to manage the levels and flows through the Horcott lakes and adjacent watercourses to reduce flood risks there and downstream to acceptable levels. It should also demonstrate how the design, scale and layout of the development, together with associated screening by trees/hedges, will minimise the visual prominence of each development proposal in the landscape.

5.77 This policy establishes the key principles to guide the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan for Horcott Lakes to deliver a package of social, economic and environmental benefits for the town. The land was formerly a gravel extraction site and has since been successfully restored.

5.78 Key to the viability, and therefore delivery, of this package of improvements is a small enabling housing scheme off Rhymes Lane. The location lies beyond the Development Boundary of Horcott in Policy FNP1, and this housing scheme is proposed

as a justified exception to that policy, given its special purpose. It is also why the policy does not require the provision of affordable housing. It is considered that a low density scheme of no more than 20 dwellings, arranged around the edge of one of the lakes and adopting high environmental standards of performance, will be sufficient to finance the improvement package and will be environmentally acceptable. It is likely that the housing scheme may require a 'stand-alone' sewage treatment facility independent of the main Fairford sewer system but this will be for the applicant to address with the local waste authority, as this may be defined as 'excluded development', and therefore not a provision that it is possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to make.

5.79 A concept plan has been prepared by the land owner (see below) to show how the various masterplan elements may be delivered within the area, reflecting the importance of existing landscape, water and biodiversity features. The policy requires the preparation of a masterplan in order to secure the full range of benefits and their means of financing and delivery. The policy requires that all subsequent planning applications for specific elements must be in accordance with that masterplan. The precise nature of the community area and visitor facility will be agreed by the owner, the Town Council and any relevant facility operator during the preparation of the masterplan. The policy requires the facility to adjoin the Horcott Development Boundary to minimise the effects of its appearance on the site. The lakes form part of the wider Cotswold Water Park area, and the facility may form part of the visitor management infrastructure for the Park, and/or provide a bespoke attraction for the tourism benefit of the town. In any event, the facility will be accessible to all members of the local community and visitors.

5.80 Critical to the policy is the financing and delivery of these benefits (and transfer of the land to the Town Council or other appropriate body to manage) within the masterplan. The policy therefore requires the scheme to deliver the facilities (via a Section 106 agreement) to be operated by either the Fairford Town Council, local wildlife trust or specific management trust.

5.81 This policy also supports proposals promoting renewable energy. The land owner wishes to make part of the area available for a solar array to generate renewable energy. The precise nature of the scheme will be defined in the masterplan.

5.82 More generally, the management of the levels and flows through the lakes is desirable for downstream flood risk mitigation purposes, and the close proximity to the Air Base means that uses which minimise the attractiveness of the lake to bird species e.g. through the installation of floating solar panels will help to minimise the risk of bird strikes which would otherwise be a serious issue (as defined and discussed with the AirBase).

5.83 Discussions have been held with the site owners regarding the implementation of this policy and the delivery of the range of associated community benefits.



100% of the site is within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) boundary. The FRA boundary is shown in red. The site is located within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) boundary. The FRA boundary is shown in red.

KEY

- | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| EXTENT OF SITE (FRA) | POTENTIAL AMENITY LANDSCAPE / WILDLIFE ENHANCEMENTS | EXISTING AMENITY LANDSCAPE AREA | EXISTING FOOTPATH |
| KEY ACCESS ROUTE | POTENTIAL AMENITY LAKE | EXISTING AMENITY LAKE | POTENTIAL PEDESTRIAN ROUTE |
| VEHICLE ACCESS | POTENTIAL COMMUNITY USE | POTENTIAL FLOATING SOLAR | |
| POTENTIAL HIGH QUALITY BIOPOND (CENTRAL UNITS IN LANDSCAPE SETTING) | MOOBY PIT | | |
| LAKE/ICE FROM SLOAN & KITTENS | MOOBY AMENITY | | |

HORCOTT PITS, FAIRFORD - CONCEPT PLAN



PLANNING | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS | WATER RESOURCES | TRANSPORT | COMMUNITY | APPROPRIATE PM 10 | DATE: 10/01/17 | SCALE: 1:5000 |
 DRAWING NUMBER: 2017-01-001 | CLIENT: FAIRFORD UDC