

SWINDON PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS

1 DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Planning Reference:	20/00759/FUL	Application Date:	14 th May 2020
Application Title:	Demolition of a dwelling and the erection of 260 dwellings (Use Class C3), new vehicular and pedestrian access off Manor Road, attenuation basin and ancillary infrastructure		

2 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Swindon Parish Council object to this application and wish to have our comments and concerns fully reviewed and taken into account when the determination of this application is made.

We also wish to be notified of any additional documentation and revisions to currently submitted documentation and to be given the opportunity to comment on such documents and their impact, prior to them being approved.

2.1 ALIGNMENT WITH OUTLINE APPLICATION & PHASING

- 2.1.1 Many of the documents submitted with this application contain reliance on commitments made in the Elms Park outline application (16/02000/OUT). We do not accept this full application for Phase 1 should be reliant on the parameters of an outline application which has yet to be determined. There is considerable risk that the outline application will never be consented.
- 2.1.2 A design brief for the entirety of Elms Park needs to be provided that details the requirements, in terms of supporting infrastructure, sustainability and other commitments, for different phases of the complete development.
- 2.1.3 We underline the importance of this Phase 1 application setting a precedent for future application's impact on our community.

2.2 DESIGN & VISUAL IMPACT & HERITAGE

- 2.2.1 The application's drawings do not reflect the topography of the site.
- 2.2.2 The appearance of the buildings does not reflect the character of the conservation area.

2.3 TRAFFIC & ACCESS

- 2.3.1 The site access deviates from commitments made in the outline planning application (16/02000/OUT).
- 2.3.2 The traffic assessment fails to validate (through lack of appropriate and realistic modelling) that the existing road network (including Manor Road) will not be adversely impacted by the development.
- 2.3.3 The traffic assessment fails to include local, committed developments which we expect to have a significant impact on traffic and congestion.
- 2.3.4 There is a lack of design information and justification for the proposed emergency vehicle access.

2.4 FLOODING & GROUND CONDITIONS

- 2.4.1 The flooding assessment fails to acknowledge the local experience of flooding within the area.
- 2.4.2 The flooding assessment fails to substantiate the proposed design through best practice fluvial and pluvial modelling.
- 2.4.3 The correspondence received from Severn Trent (April 2020), on which the flooding assessment is based, provides no indication whether it applies to the proposed application of 260 houses or the entirety of the Elms Park development.

2.5 SUSTAINABILITY

- 2.5.1 The application does not meet the minimum requirements as it does not include an energy policy.
- 2.5.2 We expect the planning application to fully reflect the sustainability that was proposed within the outline planning application, and aligned with the planning inspectorate process in the joint core Strategy and the Cheltenham Plan.
- 2.5.3 We encourage the developer to work collaboratively to establish a community that is sustainable in every respect and meets sustainability definitions (economic, environmental and social) agreed through legal, The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Joint Core Strategy (JCS) resolutions through the planning inspectorate's process.

3 ALIGNMENT WITH PLANNING POLICY, ELMS PARK OUTLINE APPLICATION & PHASING

- 3.1.1 Section 4.4.6 of the Planning Statement states:

“For CBC, the latest Five-Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement (December 2019) provides a figure of only 3.7 years. In this assessment, the Elms Park proposal was not considered to be able to deliver the trajectory produced in the JCS.”

The Parish Council notes that Permissions Homes Ltd confirms in this statement that it will not be delivering the whole site development of Elms Park within five years. This underlines that it would be unacceptable to allow Phase 1 to proceed without a commitment regarding how and when the offered cycle paths, transport initiatives, travel plans, bus services, schools and other required services will be delivered.

- 3.1.2 Section 5.1.1 of the Planning Statement states:

“This section includes a review of the following material considerations which are considered relevant in the determination of this planning application, as well as demonstrating how the proposed development conforms with them:

- ***The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)***
- ***The emerging Cheltenham Plan 2011-2031***
- ***Compliance with Controlling Parameters”***

The Parish Council recognises that it is important that the consideration of this application requires that each of the documents is considered in full and applied to the application site.

It is not acceptable to submit an application for full planning consent based on the Outline Application for the whole Elms Park, when the outline application has not yet been determined and contains parameters but not details and therefore has limited relevance to the application under consideration. From a number of the proposals contained in the documents submitted with this application it is clear that Persimmon Homes Ltd is proposing that a number of the requirements of the NPPF and requirements of the emerging Cheltenham Plan do not need to be satisfied for this Phase.

Whilst Persimmon Homes Ltd have made a reference to the parameters of the Outline Application, they have not provided any details or timescale for when these parameters will come into effect. Nor have they provided any indication of how many properties or how many square metres of floor area will be constructed before these promised parameters are provided.

The Parish Council understands from the descriptions and the phrasing of the statements and documents that have been submitted for Phase 1 that the promised parameters will only be provided with the development of the whole of the Elms Park Site.

The Parish Council object most strongly to this development of 260 houses proceeding without having its own:

- Sustainable Transport Plan,
- Detailed Travel Plan,
- Green Transport Plan, etc.

And without including:

- Cycle Way Provision
- Safe Pedestrian Routes
- Provision for Buses.

It appears that Persimmon Homes Ltd do not believe that it is necessary for the inclusion of many of the requirements / parameters for this first phase of the development of Elms Park, despite this application seeking consent for 260 dwellings and a link to a consented light industrial development adjoining the site.

3.1.3 Section 5.2.1 of the planning application states:

“Paragraph 2 of the NPPF (Update 2019) states that the Framework ‘is a material consideration in planning decisions.’”

The Parish Council agrees with the statement and wishes to underline that “is a material consideration in planning decisions” is a reference to ALL planning applications regardless of whether they are for a whole site or a single phase.

As previously stated the whole Elms Park proposal is an outline application which has not yet been determined. Therefore, this Phase must be considered independently, particularly as Persimmon Homes Ltd has chosen not to link the proposed phase through to the wider site area. Constructing a road to boundary within a larger development is not an uncommon occurrence as many ransom strips are produced by this method.

3.1.4 The Parish Council highlights that as the outline application for Elms Park has not yet been permitted this application cannot claim to benefit from the proposed mitigation described within the outline application. If the outline application, and the accompanying mitigations, are never permitted, there would be a long term, adverse impact on the Parish.

The Parish Council acknowledge the NPPF’s presumption in favour of sustainable development. Section 9 – Paragraph 102 of the NPPF’s lists a number of requirements which include:

- c) Opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued;***
- d) the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure can be identified, assessed and taken into account – including appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects, and for net environmental gains;***

Additionally, Section 9 – Paragraph 108 states:

“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) Appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;***
- b) Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users; and,***
- c) Any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.”***

As far as the Parish Council is aware these should be considered for all developments or parts of a development.

3.1.5 Section 5.2.4 of the Planning Statement states:

“In addition, paragraph 11d, footnote 7, states that in applications involving the provision of housing, situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

The Parish Council acknowledges the contents of this paragraph, but would underline that this footnote does not suggest that developments should therefore be permitted without taking into account all relevant requirements of the NPPF. Also, it does not suggest that an application should be consented on the basis that an adjoining development will meet the relevant standards. It does not appear to differentiate between a site phase or a whole site development.

- 3.1.6 The Parish Council objects to the promise of the parameters for the Elms Park Development being used as a reason for not considering a number of issues that are important for a development of 260 houses.

It is not clear from the Site Layout Proposals whether this applicant will construct the adjoining phases, or when the remainder of the development will take place. It is very likely that it could take a number of years to develop the Elms Park site. This will prevent compliance with, and implementation of, some or all of the controlling parameters for considerable time. This is not acceptable as the same arguments may be put forward in future applications for other phases.

Phase 1 in its current format is clearly self-contained and therefore could be constructed whilst the applicant decides on when they are in a position to develop the remainder of the site.

For reasons described in responses to other documents and sections the Parish Council do not accept the proposal to rely on Car Share, to be managed by the County Council, as an acceptable solution. The Parish Council notes the failure of the GCHQ car share strategy to provide a solution.

- 3.1.7 Section 6.1.6 of the Planning Statement states:

“The proposal accords with the relevant policies of the development plan and are in general conformity with the Strategic Allocation Policy A4. For these reasons it is requested that planning permission is granted for the proposed development.”

The Parish Council do not agree with this statement. The Parish Council considers that this application requires greater clarification, through the provision of more detail, before it can be determined.

4 DESIGN, LAYOUT, & CHARACTER

4.1 DESIGN & CHARACTER

- 4.1.1 The Parish Council wishes to highlight that various observations and reconditions within the Heritage statement have not been fully addressed and incorporated in the balance of the application.
- 4.1.2 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 40):

“A key design principle will be for Swindon Farm to create a character of its own but integrated into the wider Elms Park development when it is developed. Swindon Farm will have its own identity driven by appearance, public open space design, urban structure and land uses.”

We wish to draw attention to the fact that this application is for Phase 1 of the Elms Park development which, through the Heritage Statement, suggests that areas of Phase 1 should take into account the proximity of the new buildings to the existing conservation area and should be designed to limit the negative compact that the proposed Phase 1 development and buildings will have on the character and rural nature of the existing conservation area.

This requirement should be reflected in the Phase 1 proposals and not the parameters proposed in the ‘yet to be determined’ outline planning application for the full Elms Park development.

- 4.1.3 The summary (pg. 3) of the Heritage statement states:

“A full setting assessment has concluded that the Site is an element of the wider setting of the Swindon Village Conservation Area that currently makes a positive contribution to its significance. As such, development within the Site would likely result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area through alteration of its setting.”

The style and character of the proposed structures and buildings that will see and be seen from the conservation area should be designed and use materials that do not unnecessarily emphasise their presence. They should not become an unsuitable focal point which detracts from the existing rural character of the conservation area.

4.1.4 The buff brick is certainly not reflective of the area and should not be included in this phase of the development. It may become acceptable in future phases.

4.1.5 Slate is used locally, but so are tiles. Therefore a greater variation in roofing materials should be provided. The street scene illustrations show a mixture of slate on the roofs with roof-lights and dormers and tiles on the other pitched roofs. This variation would be a lot more acceptable.

4.1.6 Section 5.22 of the Heritage statement states:

“The proposed development will cause a change in use and in character to a part of this wider setting, from agricultural fields to a residential estate, whose presence can be mitigated through landscaping and the inclusion of green spaces. Nevertheless, the proposed development will result in a small negative contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area through those changes, including further erosion of its legible separation from Cheltenham and dilution of its rural character.”

It is important to minimise the negative impact. We hope that Persimmon Homes Ltd will be willing to discuss their proposals with the Parish Council to adjust their proposals wherever possible to reduce the impact that phase 1 and all future phases will have on the conservation area.

4.1.7 There is a trend to use ‘timber’ cladding which can be overused on some developments resulting in a Cape Cod or Nordic appearance which has its place but would not create a harmonious link between this phase of the development in this location and the existing architecture. We are therefore pleased to note from the street scenes that it is only being used for detailing. This is a material that, when new, can have a crisp and pleasant appearance, but it does fade and look tatty and uncared for quite quickly. If cladding is to be used it should be through colour composite cladding and not stained, painted or coloured natural timber / wood. Natural timber has a limited life span and requires regular recoating and maintenance and, unless this is attended to, there is a chance that the appearance of the properties could become shabby within 10 years.

4.1.8 The three storey units on Street Scenes 1 and 3 have the appearance of the houses built on the site adjoining GCHQ and do not reflect the character of the other buildings within the development, the buildings within the conservation area, or the wider Parish.

4.1.9 Section 4.4.4 of the Planning Statement states:

“Policy SP2 also directs the focus of new development to Gloucester and Cheltenham, “including urban extensions to these areas”

We note that Permission Homes Ltd is referring to this extension into the Greenbelt as an ‘urban extension’. The Parish Council wish to point out that it is their proposed development of Elms Park that will be completely changing the character of the area from Rural to Urban.

4.2 LAYOUT

4.2.1 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 40):

“The proposals at Swindon Farm will create a place that is easy to get to and move through utilising public rights of way and connections from.”

The above statement relates to the whole site development of Elms Park but it is not duplicated in the submitted proposals for the Phase 1 development.

4.2.2 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 44):

“Retention of existing hedgerows, particularly along the western edge”.

The western edge of Phase 1 is a proposed Spine Road which presumably will eventually have other properties facing on to it. We seek a commitment that this will not be altered by future applications.

The Phase 1 proposal contains a secondary emergency vehicle access which will necessitate the removal of more existing hedgerow, which is contrary to the above statement.

4.2.3 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 46):

“The affordable units are located in different areas and in small clusters including within the centre of the site and around the edges facing open spaces.”

And:

“The layout has aimed to focus the affordable units close to the central green space, in particular, to make it easily accessible and overlooked.”

Affordable housing should not be constructed in such a way as to create a segregated community. Affordable housing should be distributed throughout the development and not just in the least desirable inward looking and overlooked areas.

4.2.4 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 48):

“The Scheme Layout has a variety of different tenures and house sizes to meet local demand, provide interest within the street scene and add to good place making.”

The design access statement fails to define “local” when used in the above context. There is a significant difference in local demand across the parish, let alone NW Cheltenham. The application should clarify this.

4.3 ELEVATIONS

4.3.1 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 50):

“The Scheme Layout has a variety of building heights to add interest to the street and aid legibility through the new development. Building heights range from 1 storey up to 3 storey.”

Figure 1: View looking towards Furzen Hill from the Amenity Area within the Conservation



Area (photo taken by Swindon Parish Council).

The Parish Council do not believe that the levels of Furzen Hill within the development area are reflected in the heights of the elevations and street scenes of the submitted drawings.

The submitted scheme drawings should reflect the final levels of the proposed floors and ridges which are likely to rise above each other as the properties move back into the site towards the Gallagher Retail Park and up the gradients of Furzen Hill.

Unless the final levels are reflected in the street scenes and site sections it will not be possible to obtain an overview that accurately reflects the appearance and heights of the Phase 1 properties or to gauge the impact of the proposed buildings and their the overall appearance on each other or their relationship with the surrounding and neighbouring areas and the conservation area. It has been noted in the Heritage Statement that Furzen Hill will raise up the proposed buildings which will increase their potential to have a negative impact on the Conservation Area.

4.3.2 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 50):

“The development is mostly comprised of 2 storey houses which are located along main streets and being part of key frontages onto public open spaces and green areas, 2.5 storey houses are located on important corners, along key frontages and adding variety to the street scene through changes in roofline and 3 storey around important corners and key spaces particularly overlooking the Play Area.”

2.5 storey units with dormers (as featured in new developments throughout the Parish) would be more reflective of the rural character of the area, particularly in the area of Furzen Hill of the Phase 1 site as they will be raised above adjoining buildings and become dominant.



Figure 2: Extract from Page 47 of the Design & Access statement identify the number of stories for each building.

1.1.1 Section 5.25 of the Heritage statement states:

“Although the Conservation Area includes important views (Fig. 11, CBC 2007) looking towards its exterior it is considered that with an appropriate landscaping scheme no views of the development should be available from the Conservation Area’s boundary (Photo 7).”

The view (Photo 7) of the conservation area from the site that has been included on page 37 of the report is misleading because it has very obviously been taken at almost ground level and the angle of the view is not towards the buildings in the conservation area.

The downward gradient of Manor Road from Sainsbury’s to the Runnings Road junction is very noticeable and for most of its length it is possible to see the tower of St Lawrence’s Church. It is still possible to see it between the Spirax Sarco buildings when walking along Runnings Road.

The development area for the 260 houses is in a location known and recorded on the Tithe Plan as Furzen’s Hill, which, as the name suggests, will result in the development being higher than the surrounding area because the ground rises quite steeply. This rise in levels is very obvious from the amenity area (see Figure 1). As a result of the hill the houses on the new development will be very visible from the conservation area and therefore it is suggested that any 3 storey or 2.5 storey houses along the south and east boundaries of the development are replaced by 2 storey houses. As the Heritage Statement points out in a number of paragraphs, this development will have a negative impact on the Village and on the Conservation Area. It is therefore important to minimise the impact as much as possible. The Parish Council therefore believes that, prior to any decision being made, the proposed levels on the site should be reflected on the drawings, the street scenes, elevations and site sections. Site sections and views into the development should be provided in order to properly assess the visual impact that this development may have on the Conservation Area and the Village. Only then would it be possible to review and minimise the negative impact discussed in the Heritage Statement.

4.4 HERITAGE

4.4.1 The summary (pg. 3) of the Heritage statement states:

Considering the archaeological resource for the Site and surrounding area this assessment has identified that the Site has potential for prehistoric, Romano-British, medieval and post-medieval deposits... the heritage impacts of their truncation and / or removal could be mitigated by a programme of appropriate and proportionate archaeological works to be agreed with the Gloucestershire County Council in line with local policy SD8.”

We would like to be kept informed of the programme and progress of the archaeological works that will be agreed with Gloucestershire County Council and would like to receive a copy of the reports on completion of the works.

5 TRAFFIC, ACCESS, FOOTPATHS AND TRAVEL PLAN

5.1 SITE ACCESS

5.1.1 In the 2013 Design and Access Statement for the Elms Park Outline planning application (16/02000/OUT) the following statement was made regarding the Elms Park second access point from Manor Road:

“This access was specifically requested by the local authority to increase local access to the central green space within the site. However, vehicular access has been removed and restricted to pedestrian and cycle access only.”

This application reverses this agreement by including a roundabout junction with Manor Road that serves the 260 houses directly via a single spine road. The original 2013 statement should be adhered to. The main access for this part of the Elms Park development during and after construction should be from Tewkesbury Road.

5.1.2 The site proposed in this application will be connected to the rest of the wider Elms Park development via extensions to the proposed internal site roads. Upon completion of the other phases of development, the exit onto Manor Road is potentially accessible to over 4100 homes and businesses. The number of new houses served by the new junction with Manor Road should not be permitted to exceed the number that is proposed for this application.

5.1.3 Section 7.4.4 of the Transport Assessment states:

“A solution has been designed which would provide access to the consented light industrial site from the estate roads within the residential site.”

The proposed access to the adjoining, consented land (19/01260/OUT) is indicated in this application. However, no details have been submitted by the owners of this consented land or by Persimmon Homes Ltd for the new roundabout shown on this application's drawings that falls outside the scope of either application.

It is our opinion that the proposed road cannot be considered as a 'solution' until the totality of this proposal has been submitted for comment and approval by the relevant land owners.

Despite being included as a part of the underlay of the 4 sheets for the swept path analysis, none of the swept paths submitted are for the road contained on the adjoining development land. We acknowledge that there is a depiction on many of the submitted site layout plans and on the Proposed Site Access drawing showing the link from the Persimmon access road into the adjoining site. However, no details have been supplied regarding this link road and roundabout which fall outside of the scope of the application by Persimmon Homes Ltd.

We therefore suggest that until an application for this road has been submitted, the reference to it is omitted from this application's documentation to avoid it being considered by Persimmon Homes Ltd as having received consent.

As the road would be a change to the originally submitted scheme for that site, the Parish Council would expect to be consulted of any submission, particularly as many of our concerns regarding the application for the development of that land were related to vehicular access and the proposal by that applicant to link through land that they did not own to Manor Road.

5.1.4 The developer has sought to conceal their intent to construct a second access to the north of the existing gas house in Manor Road.

5.1.5 Section 3.1.9 of the Planning Statement states:

“A further pedestrian and cycle access (and emergency access) will be provided onto Manor Road at the north-eastern boundary of the site.”

And Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Access: In addition, an emergency vehicular access route is proposed to the northeast of the site off Manor Road. This will provide cycle and pedestrian access in compliance with Parameter Plan 01.”

We object to this additional access for emergency vehicles. It would be difficult to prevent its use by other vehicles. This was not included in the Revised Parameter Plan 01 and it is a surprise that the emergency vehicles will not have access via the new access formed with Manor Road.

The access is only described roughly in text and has not been indicated on any of the drawings. It is unacceptable that no details or drawings have been included with this application for this junction.

There is a narrow path illustrated, but not labelled, to the north of the existing gas house. If this is the proposed emergency access it is unlikely to be deemed acceptable for emergency vehicle access.

The 'S' shape bends along the North East boundary of the site make this an unsafe location for any form of vehicular egress or access. The gas housing will mean that there will be reduced visibility for any driver travelling north along Manor Road of any cyclist, pedestrian or vehicle exiting the site.

Such a junction will require adequate visibility and crossing points to be provided for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled/semi-ambulant people.

There is an existing route along Dogbark Lane that can be used by pedestrians, cyclists and disabled/semi-ambulant people. This can be connected to the various turning heads in the site without having to construct an additional access. Therefore, the only reason for creating the emergency access would be to provide an additional vehicular connection onto Manor Road. This would become the route favoured by the new residents because it would be perceived as a means of by-passing the other new junction. At peak times the new junction would be an undesirable transit location as traffic can be very heavy.

The description (planning statement) lists it as an access point for pedestrians and cyclists. To accommodate this use it would be necessary to include crossing points and methods of reducing the speed of traffic to make it safe. Localised narrowing of the road and the provision of tegular paving, lowered kerbing together with signage would be the minimum requirements.

5.2 TRAFFIC MODELLING

5.2.1 Section 7.1.7 of the Transport Assessment, states:

“Due to the application timescales, the Paramics modelling will not be completed prior to submission. It is intended the model results would follow-on shortly after submission as a separate addendum.”

The submission of an incomplete and unsubstantiated proposal due to commercial time constraints is unacceptable. Due to the lack of modelling the Transport Assessment is unable to demonstrate there will not be a significant degradation of local car journey duration and reliability. It is likely that any future modelling will require a revised road access scheme further delaying the development of this scheme. The application provides no commitments on timescales for the model or any subsequent design revisions based on its results.

5.2.2 Section 8.1.4 of the Transport Assessment states:

“Previous analysis using strategic modelling has demonstrated that the local highway network can accommodate travel demand associated with the proposed development.”

However, sections 7.1.4 of the Traffic Assessment states:

“The previous modelling was based upon provision of four access points rather than the single Manor Road access proposed. Saturn modelling, which is a strategic tool, is less detailed at a local level.”

The conclusion stated in Section 8.1.4 has not been substantiated. The previous modelling relied on four access points along Tewksbury Road. The proposed scheme in this application utilises an access via Manor Road. The Central Severn Vale Saturn model results cannot be used to demonstrate the impact of this scheme. As such, Persimmon Home Ltd has failed to undertake any relevant traffic modelling as part of this application. It is also noted that the Central Severn Vale Saturn modelling will not have considered more recent significant applications (see section 5.3.3)

5.2.3 Section 7.1.6 of the Transport Assessment states:

“Where necessary, additional standalone junction models will be prepared to understand the impact of the development.”

This modelling and impact assessment must form part of this planning application. The local road network frequently experiences heavy traffic and congestion. Specific roads that experience heavy traffic and congestion include:

- Manor Road, Runnings Road and Swindon Road during peak times.
- Swindon Road, specifically, the narrow railway bridge at Road during peak times.

- The entire local road network suffers delays when there is a traffic incident or roadworks on Princess Elizabeth Way or the M5. This is a regular occurrence.

5.2.4 The Transport Assessment provides a summary of the Draft Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan Review key points in section 2.3. However, it fails to set out that detailed traffic investigations and modelling covering Manor Road and the proposed site access location form part of the draft plan. This modelling is still being finalised and we await the conclusions from Highways England. The application must take account of these results.

5.2.5 There is already considerable congestion in Manor Road at peak traffic times due to the increase in usage of the local retail parks, including Gallagher Retail Park, and the increased traffic activity at Kingsditch Industrial Park, particularly related to the industrial units along Runnings Road. With the addition of 260 homes and a new junction, we expect any traffic modelling to demonstrate that the existing road network cannot support the proposed scheme as the current network cannot support the existing demand during peak times.

5.2.6 Section 4.4.12 of the Planning Statement states:

“The traffic distribution analysed in the Transport Assessment shows that it is unlikely that the development would exacerbate existing queuing at the southbound off-slip of J10 of the M5 which Highways England considers to be a safety issue.”

Further, section 7.4.4 of the Transport Assessment states:

“Based upon review of the traffic distribution in Table 6-6, only a small proportion of these arrivals would be via M5 J10. It is therefore unlikely that the development would exacerbate queuing at the junction, although this will be confirmed by the outputs of the Paramics model.”

This conclusion is flawed. The unsafe queuing on the southbound hard holder of the M5 at J10 is due to the congestion experienced along the Tewkesbury Road corridor into Cheltenham, including the junction with Manor Road. Due to the lack of adequate modelling, the Transport Assessment fails to take into account the impact of all journeys to and from this site on this corridor, and the junction with Manor Road (off which the entrance to this site is located).

Swindon Parish Council have clearly stated during the consultations on the Cheltenham Plan that additional traffic alleviation is required in the wider area including 4-way access on the M5 Motorway, Princess Elizabeth Way, Village Road, the level crossing at Swindon Lane and the railway bridge at Swindon Road. The specific details of these must be committed to before this planning application can be approved.

5.3 TRAFFIC AND CUMULATIVE IMPACT

5.3.1 The length of Manor Road between Runnings Road and Tewkesbury Road is one of the primary access routes between Bishops Cleeve and Tewkesbury Road (and M5 junction 10). Traffic near the sites access point is already often heavily congested along Manor Road and Runnings Road. It is impeded by long delivery vehicles / transporters delivering to the Industrial units on Manor Road and Runnings Road. These vehicles block one carriage way which results in delays of up to 15 minutes at peak times. This is further exacerbated by traffic queuing on the existing roundabout to access Sainsbury's, Lidl and the shops on Gallagher Retail Park.

5.3.2 Residents have already requested that measures be implemented to control the speed of traffic through the Village and deter it being used as a 'rat run'. Traffic travelling from the M5 Motorway and Tewkesbury Road utilises Church Road, running through the centre of Swindon Village as a way to avoid congestion. The additional junction and conflicting movements is likely to increase the flow of traffic through the village. There have also been requests to improve pedestrian safety at the crossing point to Dog Bark Lane.

5.3.3 Section 7.3.3 of the Transport Assessment states:

“There may be other committed developments within the Paramics model area. However, the traffic impact of the proposals will be relatively localised, and it is not therefore considered that it is necessary to explicitly include any other sites.”

This conclusion is flawed. Significant additional traffic movements are expected from a number of local developments that have been consented. These include:

- Redevelopment of the former Vibixa site (19/02009/FUL)
- Development of the adjoining land to provide light industrial units adjacent to this proposed site (19/01260/OUT)

While the impact of these developments may be localised, they are local to the proposed development, with 19/01260/OUT sharing the same access. These industrial units are expected to house shops open to the public. They will therefore generate significant traffic movements. This planning application should assess the cumulative impact of these developments.

5.4 ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

5.4.1 Reducing the speed limit to 30mph along Manor Road should be a condition of approval to take into account the close proximity of the roundabout to the existing junction. This is a 2 lane narrow road, with a very narrow footpath on the west side used by pedestrians and cyclists. The new roundabout junction is in close proximity to the junction of Manor Road and Runnings Road. The portion of the road running through the village should be limited to 20mph.

5.4.2 Section 5.3.3 of the Transport Assessment states:

This report provides an assessment to determine whether any of the measures proposed by the wider Elms Park site are required to mitigate the effects of the proposed development.

Further, section 4.2.3 to section 4.2.5 of the Travel Plan states:

“The planning application for the Elms Park site proposed a substantial package of highway improvements to mitigate the effects of the development and to enable the sustainable transport strategy”

The Transport Assessment and Travel Plan fail to provide any reasoned assessment as to whether any of the proposed highways, walking or cycling infrastructure is required to support the application. The application fails to commit to providing any of the proposed mitigations. Given the likely impact of the proposal, this is unacceptable.

5.4.3 Section 5.3.1 of the Transport Assessment states:

“Replacement of the Manor Road / Runnings Road junction with traffic signals.”

This is welcomed and should be made a condition of acceptance. This traffic light controlled junction should include a traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing as this is a particularly dangerous crossing point.

5.4.4 Section 5.3.1 of the Transport Assessment states:

“Replacement of the Runnings Road / Kingsditch Lane / Wymans Lane double mini-roundabout with traffic signals”

This is welcomed since this is a very difficult place for pedestrians and cyclists to cross and may impede people from walking to town.

5.5 FOOTPATHS & RIGHTS OF WAY

5.5.1 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 44):

“Retention of the public right of way running along a new street from south west to north east.”

We note that the public rights of way have been altered to minimise their impact on the proposed layout as opposed to providing the optimum reinstatement of the current alignments.

5.5.2 Section 4.4.10 of the Planning Statement states:

“New footpaths and cycle routes are proposed within the site which will provide linkages to Cheltenham in accordance with Policies CP4 and INF6.”

There do not appear to be any identified cycle routes or footpath links that accord with the referenced policies. The only provision is the footpaths that edge the roads in the residential development.

5.5.3 Ownership of the maintenance of the footpaths in the application site during the period of development must be clarified.

5.6 PARKING

5.6.1 The amenity area should also include a layby such that cars that park locally to use it do not cause congestion by parking in the road.

5.6.2 We welcome the proposed parking scheme of two spaces per house and one space per flat.

5.6.3 Additional visitor or delivery parking to ensure no parking on the road / pavements blocking the highways on the site must be provided.

5.6.4 Electric vehicle charging ports should be part of the parking provision.

5.7 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

5.7.1 Section 2.6 of the Travel Plan states:

“The proposed development will support the sustainable objectives set out in the NPPF and details of this will be provided in this Travel Plan.”

We disagree with the statement because the proposals for Phase 1 do not, in the opinion of the Parish Council, meet the required standards set out by the NPPF and listed in section 2.1.1 to 2.1.5 of the Travel Plan.

5.7.2 The Travel Plan relies heavily on mitigation proposed for the “wider site”, meaning the full Elms Park development. However, the NPPF Section 9, Paragraphs 102 to 111 promote sustainable transport for all developments regardless of its size. A separate Sustainable Transport Plan should be provided for this application that supplies further details and commitments for the proposed mitigations.

5.7.3 The number of parking spaces on the proposed site and the lack of any provision for buses indicates that this application does not consider that this phase will benefit in any way from changes in transport technology or that there will be any beneficial opportunities from existing or proposed transport infrastructure in the Manor Road area.

5.7.4 There is no evidence that Persimmon Homes Ltd has made efforts to engage the local community to develop attractive opportunities to promote walking, cycling and the use of public transport.

5.7.5 NPPF Section 9, Paragraphs 109 states:

“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if the residual cumulative impacts on the road network or road safety would be severe.”

Whilst the term ‘severe’ is open to interpretation, the impact of traffic from further developments of the Elms Park site on the site spine road and junction with Manor Road cannot be ignored and would have severe consequences on the existing road network and on road safety.

5.7.6 Section 3.4.6 of the Travel Plan states:

“Manor Road benefits from footways with dropped kerbs at crossing points along the western side, within the vicinity of the development site. The footway continues north on the eastern side of Manor Road, after the junction with Runnings Road, providing a connection to Swindon Village.”

The misleading way in which this paragraph has been written suggest that the footpath provision is more than adequate. At the point where the poor quality dropped-kerb crossing point crosses to the North East side of Manor Road the width of the footpath reduces to approximately 1.0m. This is the only pedestrian link into the Village and it, together with Manor Road, is often flooded when there is heavy rain because of inadequate drainage.

There is only one poorly maintained narrow footpath on the south west side of Manor Road between the proposed access and Gallagher Retail Park. This is the only pedestrian link between the Village and the Retail Park and there are times when it is blocked by car transporters while their cargos are off-loaded into the car sales showrooms.

5.7.7 Section 3.4.7 of the Travel Plan states:

“South of the site, Manor Road benefits from footways on either side, providing a connection to Gallagher Retail Park and the employment area of the Kingsditch Trading Estate.”

This is incorrect. There is only one poorly maintained narrow footpath that runs along Manor Road between the south west end of the site and Gallagher Retail Park. Similarly, there is only one footpath on the opposite side of the road to the eastern edge of the development site at the junction of Manor Road and Runnings Road. It is some distance before there is a second footpath on Runnings Road. The existing footpath does not meet accessibility requirements for the disabled; an issue which has directly affected parish residents.

Section 3.4.8 of the Travel Plan states:

“Controlled crossing facilities are provided across the signalised junction of Manor Road/A4019 Tewkesbury Road/Hayden Road to provide a safe crossing point for facilities located south of the Tewkesbury Road.”

This statement is correct, but this controlled crossing facility is too far from the site to be of any benefit to phase 1 until they link to Tewkesbury Road. Due to the heavy volume of traffic on the new junction, it is very likely that when Persimmon Homes Ltd has constructed a junction onto Tewkesbury Road the phase 1 vehicles will use the Elms Park junction to connect to Tewkesbury Road. This will avoid the traffic congestion on the Phase 1 roundabout in Manor Road.

5.7.8 Section 3.4.9 of the Travel Plan states:

“The proposed development site is located within close proximity to a range of local services and facilities. These include local food stores, cafes, restaurants, primary school and leisure facilities. The site is also adjacent to the Kingsditch Trading Estate which is a key local employment area. The main local facilities located in the vicinity of the development site are listed in Table 3-2 and highlighted within Figure 3-2.”

The above statement is correct but there are no links being provided to these facilities from Phase 1. The only link that will be available for the proposed 260 houses will be via Manor Road and its single footpath.

5.7.9 With reference to section 3.4.12, 3.4.13 and 3.4.14 of the Travel Plan which discuss accessibility by cycle, the application does not include any links to the cycle paths listed. It is therefore wrong to claim any benefit from these cycle paths. Direct links to these cycle paths should be provided.

5.7.10 Section 3.5.4 of the Travel Plan states:

“The walking distance to the bus stops on Tewkesbury Road is beyond the ‘typical’ 400m threshold for access to bus services. However, the routes that can be accessed from these stops are frequent and direct services into Cheltenham Town Centre, providing an alternative to the ‘H’ service.”

A development of 260 houses, the size of Phase 1, should include bus stops on the site’s constituent roads. This should be suitable for use by a publicly accessible bus service and for school bus

services as pupils travel to schools in Gloucester, Tewkesbury, Winchcombe and Stroud as well as the local schools in Cheltenham.

Considering that this is the first phase of a substantial development of 4,100 houses, Persimmon Homes Ltd should honour its commitment to sustainable alternative means of transport by including onsite bus services which expand through each phase.

The threshold distances of travel are set not just for able-bodied people but also for elderly and infirm people, children and parents with children who do not welcome struggling along busy and dangerous roads. Not only is this issue related to sustainable transport it also relates to safety and health and wellbeing.

- 5.7.11 In anticipation of development of the wider Elms Park site and the introduction of new bus services, the site's central road should include a layby that in future can be used as a bus stop.
- 5.7.12 With regard to bus links to other services, the Elms Park 4,100 house development together with the proposed employment land development should be large enough to enable expanded bus services to be negotiated. Services linking the development to Cheltenham, Tewkesbury, the railway station, and Gloucester should be implemented. Initially for phase 1 it would be understandable that bus services would be limited but commencing negotiations for a link to the railway station and to the centre of Cheltenham should be part of the conditions.
- 5.7.13 Section 3.5.5 of the Travel Plan states:

“Cheltenham Spa railway station is 3.5km south-west of the site, and offers regular regional and national services to destinations including Bristol, Cardiff and Birmingham. The station provides 178 car parking spaces and 134 cycle parking spaces.”

This statement is correct; however, it is unrealistic to expect residents of the site to cycle or to use public transport with direct links from the development to the railway station. This will only contribute to the inevitable congestion along Manor Road (the route to the railway station).

- 5.7.14 Section 4.2.1 of the Travel Plan states:

“The wider Elms Park site will deliver local facilities, new off-site highway infrastructure and public transport services.”

This is not acceptable. As the outline planning application for the full Elms Park development has not yet been consented, it is unacceptable to rely on “promised” facilities that do not form part of this application. The above sentences imply that there will only be any public transport services after the 4,100 houses have been constructed.

- 5.7.15 Sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 of the Travel Plan states:

“This Residential Travel Plan will sit within the wider FTP for the entire Elms Park site. This document has been prepared to incorporate the FTP measures and targets. It is intended that GCC will adopt the role of Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC) for the wider site once planning permission has been granted. Until that point, Persimmon Homes will take responsibility for the TPC role.”

The statement appears to imply that the Residential Travel Plan will come into existence following the consenting of the full 4,100 house development. Phase 1 is of a size that has made it necessary for Persimmon Homes Ltd to submit a Travel Plan specifically for Phase 1. However, the detail provided within it is wholly inadequate and unrealistic for a development of this size.

- 5.7.16 Section 7.1.3 of the Travel Plan states:

“The target model split is based upon the full transport strategy for the wider site – including new public transport services, cycling infrastructure and on-site facilities. It is therefore not anticipated that these targets will be met until the wider site is delivered and interim targets will be agreed with GCC.”

This is unacceptable. The proposed modal shift targets should be part of the consented application. Manor Road already suffers from heavy congestion leading to long journey times and low journey reliability during peak times. It is essential that ambitious, but substantiated modal shift targets are included within the application. This will require investment by Permissions Homes Ltd.

6 AIR QUALITY, NOISE & ECOLOGY

6.1 AIR QUALITY

6.1.1 Section 5.5 of the Air Quality Assessment states:

“Based on the findings of the assessment prepared in 2016, and the continued improvement in baseline pollutant concentrations in the study area, it is judged that the air quality effects of the proposed development will be ‘not significant’. This will, however, be confirmed through dispersion modelling.”

The Parish Council believes that the air quality impact of this site needs to be fully modelled and substantiated before the development commences and it should be taken into account when deciding on the best location for the exit point from the Phase 1 development.

The proposed site entrance and associated additional traffic will likely lead to significant congestion. As noted in section 5.2 detailed traffic modelling has not been undertaken. As such it is impossible to assess the air quality impact on local receptors. The Air Quality modelling should include sensitivity analysis based on traffic movements to assess different scenarios.

6.1.2 Air quality and odour issues from Wingmoor farm are a significant problem in this area. The application considers the distance of that landfill site from the proposed development (1.4km) as too far for there to be any issue. Swindon Parish Council works with the Wingmore Farm liaison group and can provide contrary evidence. Odour issues and related complaints are frequently recorded in the wider area including the proposed development areas.

6.1.3 Section 6.2 of the Air Quality Statement states:

“A Framework Travel Plan has been prepared for the proposed development to promote sustainable transport modes to help reduce the reliance of future residents on car use. Strategies to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use are included within the Framework Travel Plan. The package of measures will help to reduce emissions associated with the proposed development.”

As noted in Section 5.7, the Travel Plan’s assumption on modal shift as a result of the proposed mitigations are extremely unrealistic and unsubstantiated. No credit from these measure should be included with the Air Quality Statement.

6.2 NOISE

6.2.1 The Parish Council believe that the noise impact must be considered fully before this application is approved. This can not be completed until a detailed and reliable traffic model has been developed and validated.

6.3 ECOLOGY

6.3.1 It is essential that there is a firm commitment not to disturb trees T93 and T9 (high quality trees, which are not designated for removal). T93 protection measures need a full Arboriculture Method Statement (AMS). The Arboriculture Assessment states

“It is recommended that the AMS is conditioned as part of any future planning consent; to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to the commencement of construction”

We fully agree with this and expect to receive a copy before site preparation work commences.

- 6.3.2 The application calls for the removal of trees T45, T48, T92, H2, H3. This is a very high percentage of Category B trees (70%). The plan is also to remove 87% of Category C trees. This is an extremely large reduction in tree cover which will have an impact on biodiversity and amenity for people (trees and green features are positive for mental health). Sections of hedgerow are also to be removed, and we consider this to be a negative impact on the area. The ecological appraisal report states: "Hedgerows provide the habitat of greatest biodiversity value on site". There are also dormice living in the hedgerows. We therefore argue that more hedgerows and trees should be retained in addition to the planting of new trees and hedgerows.
- 6.3.3 Section 5.17 of the Arboriculture Assessment states:

"It is considered that all such tree and hedgerow losses can be mitigated through the provision of an adequate volume of new tree and hedgerow planting within areas of public open space. To this end, the loss of trees and hedgerows on site should not be considered a constraint to the proposals. For recommendations in terms of new planting see Section 6."

This application should include details and firm commitments regarding the planting of new trees and hedgerows, implementing the recommendations provided in Section 6.

- 6.3.4 It should be a condition of consent that badger monitoring be carried out immediately before building.
- 6.3.5 It should be a condition of consent that bat boxes and habitat for birds and other wildlife in the green areas of the site be provided.

7 FLOODING & DRAINAGE

- 7.1.1 The Parish Council is concerned that this application does not consider the impact of the flood mitigation proposed in the wider Elms Park development. The proposals in this application should be demonstrated as consistent with the proposed full site drainage scheme.
- 7.1.2 The draining of the attenuation pond into the Swilgate may have implications for flooding downstream or for the river ecology. Supplementary evidence to prove that the proposed flood alleviation from Fluvial and Pluvial flooding and water treatment plans are sufficient should be provided.
- 7.1.3 A condition of the planning approval must be a total review of the surface road drainage in Manor Road. Today, Manor Road frequently floods near Dog Bark Lane, with flood water flowing south on Manor Road towards the area of development. During heavy rainfall the existing drainage is unable to cope with the surface water. This must be factored into the development.
- 7.1.4 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 44):

"The Scheme Layout for this full planning application is shown opposite. Its main elements include ... A surface water attenuation basin located in the north of the site adjacent to the River Swilgate."

The Parish Council are concerned about the proposed method of dealing with storm water and the proposed location of the attenuation basin which will need to be checked against the flooding and drainage strategies to see if the impact includes the occasional flushing of the lake in Pittville Park.

8 SERVICES & UTILITIES

- 8.1.1 With the exception of telecommunications, the Utility Statement and the Construction Environmental Management Plan fail to provide details of the work required to connect to existing utilities and how the impact of these activities will be managed to mitigate excessive impact on the community. This is unacceptable. Manor Road, at peak, is heavily congested. Previous work has significantly impacted journey time and travel reliability throughout North West Cheltenham.
- 8.1.2 The Utility Statement does not provide details of the type and speed of the broadband connection to be provided. The Parish Council encourages the developer to explore options for offering superfast fibre to houses in support of the Government's Building UK's Digital scheme. This could significantly contribute to the modal shift presented in the Travel Plan.

8.1.3 Section 4.3 of the Utility Statement states:

“There is a requirement for a dismantlement and alteration to the WPD network. This consists of dismantling an 11KV main and an alteration to an existing property”.

Details of these alterations are not included within this application.

8.1.4 Section 5.1 of the Utility Statement states:

“There are existing BT mains located in Manor Way.”

The Parish Council objects to residents of the development being limited to a single network provider as it reduces residents future's choice, and costs. There should be provision for Fibre To The Home (FFTH) suppliers to service this development (e.g. Gigaclear or Virgin Media).

8.1.5 Section 5.3 of the Utility Statement states:

“It is also anticipated that there will be diversion works required when the 278 works take place.”

No details of the work required, diversions, and expected impact has been provided. This is unacceptable. Manor Road is a significant travel corridor for NW Cheltenham. Previous work has significantly impacted journey time and reliability throughout North West Cheltenham.

Section 3.4.11 of the Travel Plan states:

“The above assessment demonstrates that there is a primary school located within the preferred maximum walking distance. The Gallagher Retail Park and Sainsburys Convenience Store are located within acceptable walking distances to facilities ‘elsewhere’, whilst the majority of those listed at Table 3-2 are located within the preferred maximum distance; including food stores, restaurants and leisure facilities.”

We note that the Swindon Village Primary school is already operating to capacity and has little room for on-site expansion. The walk between Phase 1 and the school is not a safe trip for young children. There is no controlled crossing, and there are no traffic reduction measures proposed for Manor Road as part of this application. Church Road, opposite the school, already experiences significant on street parking during school arrival and departures times. This has caused a number of traffic accidents and near misses. The situation has also resulted in a number of incidents of anti-social behaviour requiring a police presence. Without the provision of adequate and safe walking routes (notably the crossing of Manor Road) this development will make the current situation worse as families will be forced to drive to the school.

9 SUSTAINABILITY, ENERGY & WASTE

9.1.1 There is a distinct lack of specific evidence to support the implied notion that this application is a sustainable development.

9.1.2 An Energy Policy is required by the NPPF for an application of this scale. None has been provided. We expect to receive an energy policy as part of this application.

9.1.3 There are many positive sweeping statements regarding infrastructure provision as part of the development site, however there are no specific commitments to provision of specific services or facilities by specific time periods and no commitment to give assurance that they would be in place before residential occupancy. There are gaps in specific information which are said to be addressed later in reserved matters, but for this application to be approved they must be identified now.

9.1.4 The document is correct in stating that Policy SD3 does not establish energy efficiency targets or renewable energy generation targets for new residential development. In the absence of such a policy one is directed to national policy. The NPPF includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and specifically benchmarks this to national standards. Paragraph 150, NPPF states:

“New development should be planned for in ways that...can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through location, orientation and design. Any local requirements for sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government’s policy for national technical standards.”

In July 2019 Cheltenham Borough Council declared a climate emergency so this development as the first phase in one of the largest ever to be built on previously green belt agricultural land should set the standard for carbon neutral development. This development should lead by example, going beyond the minimum standards set out in the NPPF, targeting significantly reduced emissions per building.

During development of the JCS and the outline application for the whole Elms Park development the proposals were promoted as sustainable development. This development as phase 1 of approx. 4100 homes and additional industrial and retail units must adhere to that statement. More details are required to support sustainable development. The details included in the Sustainability and Climate Emergency Statement should include specific measures to achieve carbon neutral status in this development.

All the homes should meet the Passivhaus standards (see Passivhaus Trust).

9.1.5 The Persimmon Website states “We use the latest construction techniques and renewable energy sources such as solar panels and air-source heat pumps to make your home future-proof” but this application does not specify any such measures.

10 COMPLIANCE

10.1.1 Section 1.1.4 of the Compliance Statement states:

“An outline application (known as ‘Elms Park’) was submitted in line with this allocation in October 2016 (16/02000/OUT) and is yet to be determined. Swindon Farm is located within Phase 1 of that site.”

As stated in paragraph 1.1.4, the outline application for the whole Elms Park site has yet to be determined and the detail of some of the topics listed in the bullet points of paragraph 2.1.2 are still under consideration.

The parameters that will eventually form part of the outline consent are, as stated, parameters and by definition are variables that are given a series of arbitrary values. Therefore the parameters are an indication of the information and topics that will be required in detail for each submission that is made.

It is therefore necessary for Persimmon Homes Ltd to illustrate how Phase 1 meets the parameters that have been identified in the Outline Planning Application (16/02000/OUT) and to provide the detail required to illustrate that Phase 1 is compliant with the relevant standards, legislation and regulations.

10.1.2 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Red Line Boundary: The proposed development falls entirely within the limits of the red line shown on the Elms Park Site Boundary Plan (ref: 21614:9001F).”

This is false. The proposed site access requires modification to land outside the red line boundary (see section 5.1.3 for details).

10.1.3 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Land Use: The proposed development is in broad compliance with the land uses shown on Parameter Plan 01 submitted with the Elms Park application (ref: 16/02000/OUT). The Parameter Plan shows residential development within the northern parcel of the site and mixed-use development (including residential / business / retail) as options within the southern parcel.”

The summary that has been made in Table 1 is false. The colour coding of Parameter Plan 01 shows that the proposed usage allocation for the southern parcel is Residential, Education and Commercial (to include business, retail and residential). By comparing the Revised Parameter Plan 01 with the Housing Mix Plan of the current application it appears that 73 houses will be constructed on the

identified mixed use area at the southern end of the current application site. This is approximately 28% of the total number of houses proposed for construction on the current application site. Whilst we appreciate that the area already has Commercial, Retail and Business use, we believe it is very important that the commitment to educational use should be retained and incorporated into this proposal. This development will overburden the existing schools and facilities in the area and the development should be providing some support for the incoming young families as a means of reducing at least some of the burden on the existing facilities. We believe that this could be achieved by the provision of a nursery school with facilities for secure outside play, parking and safe dropping off and collecting of children.

10.1.4 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Land Use: As the proposed development includes housing, it is in broad compliance with the Parameter Plan. High quality housing is proposed along the frontage adjacent to Manor Road, while future business and retail uses will not be prejudiced in future phases of the wider Elms Park development, including the 10ha business park.”

The phrase ‘broad compliance’ is not acceptable because the application should illustrate compliance. The term ‘broad compliance’ has been used to say that out of all the uses listed on the Revised Parameter Plan the developer’s intent is only to provide residential and brushes aside all other uses. This totally ignores the commitment to education that is listed on the Revised Parameter Plan for this site.

As this is the first detailed application for a site that has only received outline consent it is worrying that, at such an early stage in the submission of development proposals, a term such as ‘broad compliance’ is used to sweep aside all uses other than residential.

Whilst housing is needed, so are various support facilities for housing, including: business, retail, commercial and very importantly education. New housing on this scale should not overwhelm existing services and facilities to the detriment of both existing and new communities.

10.1.5 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Access: The proposed development is in compliance with the access arrangements shown on Parameter Plan 01. A secondary access is proposed from Manor Road via a mini-roundabout junction in the approximate location that it is indicated on Parameter Plan 01.”

The location of the proposed access shown in Revised Parameter Plan 01 is much further to the South West of where it is now shown in application 20/00759/FUL. The creation of a new site access junction in the location proposed in Revised Parameter Plan 01 would be much safer as it would be further away from the junction of Manor Road and Runnings Road. The slightly increased distance would reduce the issues that are likely to arise as a result of a new roundabout being constructed too close to the ‘T’ junction format of the Manor Road / Runnings Road junction.

10.1.6 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Density: Parameter Plan 02 indicates that the site should include residential development of higher densities of up to 60 dwellings per hectare (dph). In compliance with this, the proposed development has a density of approximately 40 dph.”

The density relates to the proposal contained within the outline application (16/02000/OUT) and the provision of a junction with Tewkesbury Road combined with other control measures. However, this Phase 1 application will not benefit from any of these measures in the short term. If the full Elms Park development is never completed (noting the outline application has yet to be determined), the proposed control measures will never be implemented.

If a phase is constructed on the West and / or South west sides of the proposed spine road, prior to the Tewkesbury Road junction being constructed, the number of vehicles exiting onto Manor Road via the proposed roundabout junction will be considerable and result in significant traffic and congestion. The design limitations, not only of the proposed roundabout junction, but also of the other

junctions along Manor Road, need to be fully modelled and detailed in order to establish the maximum acceptable traffic flow that can be accommodated from the Phase 1 development (see section 5.2 for further details).

The submitted Travel Plan states that the Travel Plan is part of the Full Site Outline Planning Application and will only be activated when the full Elms Park development is under construction. No Sustainable Transport Plan has been submitted for this development. Therefore, as none of the measures that are contained within the yet to be determined Outline Application are included in this application, the proposed density of this phase and the number of residents, vehicles, cycles and pedestrians that will be generated by the 260 houses is too high.

10.1.7 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Green Infrastructure: Parameter Plan 03 shows only a small L-shaped area of Green Infrastructure to be created within the site, in the approximate location of the overhead electrical cables in the east of the site. The proposed development goes above and beyond compliance with this by extending the Green Infrastructure under the entire length of the overhead electrical cables. In addition, an attenuation basin surrounded by an area of green space is proposed at the north-west of the site. The Parameter Plan also shows the retention of hedgerow along the north western boundary of the site as Green Infrastructure. The proposed development will retain this hedgerow and is therefore in full compliance with Parameter Plan 03.”

Unfortunately Persimmon Homes Ltd have decided to include an additional emergency vehicle access along Manor Road which will result in the loss of additional hedgerow. No details have been submitted for this junction and no reason has been given for the need to include it from Manor Road.

10.1.8 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Transport & Accessibility: It was agreed through draft Condition 14 (see Appendix 1) of the Elms Park application that access to and through the site should be in general accordance with the Access and Movement Strategy on pages 110 and 113 of the Elms Park Design and Access Statement. In accordance with this strategy and Parameter Plan 01, the proposed scheme will provide secondary access from Manor Road via a mini-roundabout junction. An emergency vehicular access route is proposed to the north-east of the site off Manor Road which will also provide cycle and pedestrian access.”

The location of the proposed access shown in Revised Parameter Plan 01 is much further to the South West of where it is now shown in application 20/00759/FUL. The creation of a new site access junction in the location proposed in Revised Parameter Plan 01 would be much safer as it would be further away from the junction of Manor Road and Runnings Road. The slightly increased distance would reduce the issues that are likely to arise as a result of a new roundabout being constructed too close to the ‘T’ junction format of the Manor Road / Runnings Road junction.

We are also concerned that as the larger expanse of Elms Park is developed that the spine road shown on the Phase 1 plan will be extended to link to all areas of the larger development site enabling even higher numbers of vehicles to link to the proposed Phase 1 roundabout junction with Manor Road. In addition to being a through-route for the Elms Park development it is very likely to become a link between Tewkesbury Road and Manor Road that will be used by motorists wishing to avoid the traffic light controlled junctions along Tewkesbury Road and the roundabout junction with Gallagher Retail Park and Sainsbury’s. We are concerned about the dangers of this and the negative impact which will result in:

- An unacceptable increase in traffic movements through Swindon Village
- An exceedance of the design capacity of the proposed roundabout and other junctions (e.g. the double mini-roundabouts at the junction of Kingsditch Lane and Runnings Road) during peak times leading to increase journey times and reduced journey reliability
- A related increase in noise and reduction in air quality in a mostly residential area

10.1.9 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Transport & Accessibility: A realignment of the existing public right of way between Dog Bark Lane and the existing farm track is proposed in order to retain links through the site, in accordance with the Main Pedestrian and Cycle Access Points Plan on page 111 and the Street Hierarchy Plan on page 113 of the Elms Park Design and Access Statement. As part of the agreed mitigation strategy, draft Condition 16 outlines the need for junction improvements. However, the accompanying Transport Assessment indicates that the development does not trigger the need for any of these junction improvements.”

As we demonstrate in section 5.2, the accompanying Traffic Assessment fails substantiate that the additional traffic movements resulting from the development will “not trigger the need for any of these junction improvements”. This statement is factually incorrect and misleading.

10.1.10 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Surface Water Drainage: The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) submitted with the Elms Park application showed that all built development is proposed within Flood Zone 1, including at the Swindon Farm site. There have been no identified changes to baseline conditions since this FRA and the proposed development still lies within land assessed as Flood Zone 1. Following consultation with the Environment Agency (EA) and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), a condition was agreed (draft Condition 11) to allow for a phased approach with each development parcel coming forward to include provision for detailed surface water drainage proposals. A Drainage Strategy has therefore been prepared as part of the application which proposes an attenuation basin at the north-west corner of the site to discharge to the River Swilgate.”

It is not acceptable at such an early stage in the development of Elms Park to ignore the impact that later phases of the development may have on the current Phase 1 proposals. The existing River Swilgate regularly floods and ponding occurs regularly on the road at the point where the River Swilgate passes beneath Manor Road. We would hope that the existing local issues are addressed as part of the proposals of the current application.

We note that the letter of response to Travis Baker Ltd from Severn Trent Water dated the 21st February 2020 was suggestive only, noting the following extract:

“Should the above method prove unsuccessful, a surface water discharge into the River Swilgate to the north of the site would be the preferred option, If both options have been exhausted, we may consider a connection to the existing 750mm dia public surface water sewer to the east of the site may be acceptable subject to formal S.106 approval (see later). In accordance with the SGN (Greenfield site) agreed with the LLFA. Please note the following comments.....”

As for the foul sewer, the letter from Severn Trent Water does not confirm whether this comment relates to the whole of the Elms Park Site or just to this Phase 1 development. Therefore, the Severn Trent letter raises obvious concerns regarding the storm water drainage not only of the Elms Park development but also that of the adjoining developments. When the proposed development of Elms Park was reviewed through the examination process of the JCS it was generally agreed that any proposals for Elms Park should take into account any known adjoining development proposals. We believe that it is necessary to ensure that a Site Wide indicative scheme is included to provide future design parameters on which all future phases are based. We are seeking confirmation that the proposals have taken into account the use of the River Swilgate as an outlet when the Lake at Pittville Park is drained.

10.1.11 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Foul Drainage: A phased approach to foul drainage has been taken in compliance with draft Condition 12 (see Appendix 1). Draft Condition 12 Foul Drainage: Prior to the commencement

of development for each phase, a Neighbourhood Foul Drainage Strategy for that phase shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, reserved matters applications for each sub-phase or development parcel shall include detailed foul drainage proposals to be in accordance with the Neighbourhood Foul Drainage Strategy unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the foul drainage scheme for that parcel has been implemented in accordance with the approved details. A Sewer Capacity Assessment has been completed and confirms that there is capacity at the Hayden Sewage Treatment Works.”

Copied below in black italic text is the response received by Travis Baker Ltd from Severn Trent Water dated the 21st February 2020:

“According to the sewer records, The nearest public combined sewer is 600mm combined water public sewer located within the proposed site. A gravity foul connection from your proposed site ,The anticipated flows from the site of 5.17l/s(Houses and commercial unit) should be able to be accommodated in this sewer, with no adverse effect on the public sewer. Please note a sewer of this size carries a 10m no build zone, 5m either side of the pipe and your development should be designed that this and any other public sewer are not within gardens of the proposed properties and should be incorporated into either highway or open space on the proposed development.”

What is not clear from the Severn Trent Letter is whether their response is related to the current application site only and therefore is restricted to the proposed 260 houses or whether it is a response to the whole development of Elms Park and also any additional adjoining development proposals for, residential, commercial, trade, educational, retail, business or employment uses. It was agreed, when this proposed development was reviewed through the examination process of the JCS, that any proposals for Elms Park should take into account any known development proposals. Therefore, we should be grateful to receive confirmation that the above response is a confirmation of adequate capacity based on the complete development of Elms Park plus the known adjoining developments along the Tewkesbury Road. Hopefully the letter is not simply confirming that the existing sewer has the capacity to serve the 260 proposed houses.

The reason for raising this issue is to ensure that, should it be necessary in the future to increase the capacity, treatment capacity, number and size of the foul sewer provision in order to accommodate the developments and to avoid any detrimental impact on the existing developments (both on and off the site) that it should be taken into account now. A development guidance document should be produced as part of the development briefs for all future phases and external future developments outlining the requirements for those developments.

10.1.12 Table 1 of the Compliance Statement states:

“Economy: Within Parameter Plan 01, the southern parcel of the site is proposed as mixed-use development including residential and employment uses. While it is proposed that this parcel will only include residential use, it will not prejudice the delivery of employment land in future phases that come forward, including the development of a 10ha business park.”

As stated in the foregoing comments Parameter Plan 01 defines the proposed use allocation for this southern parcel of the Elms Park site as Residential, Education and Commercial (to include business, retail and residential). The heading of this section is ‘Economy’ and the intent is that all people should be able to work whether from home or by travelling to work. In order to do this and to be able to raise a family or ‘grow old’, the facilities required to achieve this should not be swept aside. The Parish Council believe that it is important that education should include nurseries and we can see no reason why a nursery provision could not be incorporated into Phase 1 of the development of Elms Park. The Elms Park development will overburden the existing schools and facilities in the area until it has fulfilled its agreement to construct a new school. However, not only should the Phase 1

development be required to include some support and provision for the incoming young families it should also recognise the need to include facilities that will help to reduce the burdens on the existing communities and the facilities of those communities. Therefore, whilst we appreciate that the area around Manor Road already has Commercial, Retail and Business use, we fully believe that it is very important that the commitment to Educational use should be retained and incorporated into this proposal. We believe that this should be achieved by the provision of a nursery school with facilities for secure outside play, parking and safe collecting and off-loading of children. This would reduce the need for small children to have to travel or be taken long distances.

By comparing the Revised Parameter Plan 01 with the Housing Mix Plan of the current application it appears that 73 houses will be constructed on the identified mixed use area at the southern end of the current application site. This is approximately 28% of the total number of houses proposed for construction on the current application site.

- 10.1.13 We do not believe that the Compliance Statement (Planning) produced by White Peak Planning has demonstrated that the full planning application by Persimmon Homes Ltd. for Phase 1 of the Elms Park development encompasses or adequately reflects compliance with the controlling parameters of the 'as yet to be determined' outline application for the whole site.

The Parish Council is concerned that so many of the parameters are reliant on the development of the wider site that little or no provision is being included in Phase 1 which is a large development of 260 houses that will impact on the local area and its communities.

The outline application for the full Elms Park includes an indicative plan and a number of parameters which phase 1 does not mirror in its Layout, Access Positions or Land Use. Therefore, there does not appear to be a drawing or document that has been submitted with the outline application that can be referenced with certainty when reviewing this or other future proposals.

11 LOCAL ENGAGEMENT

- 11.1.1 The Design and Access Statement states (pg. 32):

“Persimmon Homes are committed to effective and meaningful community engagement regarding proposals for Swindon Farm.”

Under Further Updates it states:

“Since 2013, key stakeholders have been kept informed directly and a meeting was also held in Swindon Village in February 2015, with the Swindon Village Parish Council and local residents to make them aware of changes made following the 2013 consultations and allow the opportunity for comment.”

Further, the Planning Statement states:

“Pre-application meetings were held with CBC in February and March 2020 and these have informed the proposed layouts.”

The engagement by Permissions Homes Ltd with Swindon Parish Council has been minimal. The only presentation delivered to the Parish Council was by a team who were unable to answer basic questions due to the absence of key people. The information focused on the benefits to the residents who would live on the development; no indication was given about how the development would integrate with the existing communities. No information was forthcoming on traffic management or how the parish would be protected from the numbers of vehicles that this development would generate.

The Parish Council have written and requested an opportunity to discuss its concerns regarding the management of traffic, pedestrian and vehicular access, with the highways engineer's, planning officers and developers. With the exception of the discussion of Local Green Space, we do not feel that the Permissions Homes Ltd has had any effective and meaningful community engagement with the Parish Council despite our best efforts.

The Parish Council would have welcomed a presentation by the developer and their team and to be given an opportunity to discuss our concerns and to obtain a better understanding of their proposals before the submission of this application.

11.1.2 Section 4.4.34 of the Planning Statement states:

“In accordance with Policy IN7, financial contributions towards services and infrastructure required as a consequence of the development will be negotiated through a Section 106 agreement and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).”

The Parish Council, along with representatives from the Swindon Village Hall Committee, would like to be involved in any discussions that relate to the financial contributions.

11.1.3 The Parish Council would like to invite Permissions Homes Ltd to establish a regular forum with the Parish Council to discuss matters associated with this application and the wider Elms Park development. Such a forum would be beneficial for both parties. Permissions Homes Ltd would benefit from local knowledge regarding sensitive issues, allowing mitigations to be incorporated into their applications, ultimately de-risking the planning application process. The Parish Council, would benefit from being able to help shape the wider Elms Park development to better support current and future residents. We seek to work collaborative with Permissions Homes Ltd and other developers to ensure that the Elms Park development provides a sustainable environment for our future community.

13

15

17

19

21

23

25 REFERENCES