Gleeson Strategic Land's Hearing Statement in response to Examiner's Hearing Questions dated 29 August 2017 (7 August 2017)

MATTER 1: The SA/SEA Process (total word count: 503)

Q1. Does the revised SA (incorporating SEA) meet the requirements of the SEA Directive?

Yes we consider it does. See below

SEA Requirements	Requirement	Gleeson Comments
	met?	
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan	\checkmark	The revised SA makes clear within the
or programme, and relationship with other relevant		opening paragraphs its purpose that
plans and programmes		being to <i>"provide an assessment of any</i>
		significant social, environmental and
		economic effects resulting from the
		policies and proposals in the submitted
		Plan". Although there is no contents page



	 within the document, we consider the introduction sufficiently clear in this regard. Section 3 identifies the main objectives of the Plan and is clear from paragraph 3.5 onwards about the Plan's relationship with other relevant Plans or programmes.
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	 Section 5 covers 'Environmental Characteristics' and outlines the relevant environmental context. Section 4 deals with 'Local Social, Environmental & Economic Issues' and rationally indicates the likely future baseline position for the area in the



			absence of the Plan.
<i>c)</i>	The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be	\checkmark	This is covered by Section 5.
	significantly affected;		
d)	Any existing environmental problems which are	\checkmark	Section 4 covers in a concise manner
	relevant to the plan or programme including, in		relevant existing social, environmental
	particular, those relating to any areas of a particular		and economic problems.
	environmental importance, such as areas designated		
	pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.		
e)	The environmental protection, objectives, established	\checkmark	Section 3 covers the National Planning
	at international, Community or national level, which are		Policy Framework and makes reference
	relevant to the plan or programme and the way those		to sub-regional Plans forming part of the
	objectives and any environmental, considerations have		statutory Development Plan. Although the
	been taken into account during its preparation;		Report does not provide a review of any
			international Plans or Programmes that is



			because none are of relevance.
f)	The likely significant effects on the environment,	\checkmark	Section 6 identifies the Neighbourhood
	including on issues such as biodiversity, population,		Plan SA/SEA Objectives and Measures
	human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic		and paragraph 6.2 confirms that these
	factors, material assets, cultural heritage including		have been established so that likely
	architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape		significant effects can be identified. The
	and the interrelationship between the above factors.		Objectives cover a host of environmental
	(Footnote: These effects should include secondary,		considerations.
	cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term		Section 7 provides an assessment of
	permanent and temporary, positive and negative		Plan's key objectives against each of the
	effects);		identified SA/SEA Objectives. This
			section also adopts a simple scoring
			system to determine whether effects are
			positive, negative or neutral.



			Section 8 then assesses each of the Plan's policies against the SA/SEA Objectives using the same scoring criteria for consistency.
g) The	measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as	\checkmark	This criterion is satisfied by Sections 7
fully	as possible offset any significant adverse effects		and 8. Under each sub-heading where
on th	ne environment of implementing the plan or		negative effects have been identified
prog	iramme;		measures to prevent, reduce and/or offset
			the effect have been identified.
h) An o	outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives	\checkmark	Section 9 considers the 'Reasonable
deali	t with, and a description of how the assessment		Policy Alternatives'. In respect of the
was	undertaken including any difficulties (such as		development management policies
techi	nical deficiencies or lack of know -how)		contained within the Plan we agree that
enco	ountered in compiling the required information;		the alternative would be to have no policy



Gleeson Strategic Land's Hearing Statement in response to Examiner's Hearing Questions dated 29 August 2017 (7 August 2017)

			and rely on other national and/or local
			policies. In respect of site-specific policies
			the rationale for the selection of the
			alternatives considered is outlined at
			paragraphs 9.2 and 9.3.
			Paragraph 9.2 describes how the
			alternatives were selected.
i)	Description of measures envisaged concerning	\checkmark	Covered by Section 11 and refers back to
	monitoring in accordance with Art. 10;		Neighbourhood Plan SA/SEA Objections
			and Measures set down in Section 6.
j)	A non-technical summary of the information provided	\checkmark	Covered from pages 2 to 5 of the Report.
	under the above headings		

Word Count: 378



Gleeson Strategic Land's Hearing Statement in response to Examiner's Hearing Questions dated 29 August 2017 (7 August 2017)

Q2. Has it assessed reasonable alternatives in an appropriate fashion?

The Site Assessment Report published alongside the SA details at length the process undertaken to identify sites. Something not contained within this Report but undertaken earlier on in the planmaking process was the testing of the preferred and alternative sites popularity.

The approach adopted by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group ("**NPSG**") is on the whole qualitative in its nature and seeks to rely on technical or otherwise evidence publically available. Whilst a qualitative assessment can have a tendency for bias, it is clear when undertaking a comparative assessment that the NPSG has remained objective throughout.

The qualitative exercise is then in turn supported by a '+/-'scoring systems found within the SA Report itself.

Gleeson considers the assessment has been carried out in an appropriate fashion.

Word count: 125



Gleeson Strategic Land's Hearing Statement in response to Examiner's Hearing Questions dated 29 August 2017 (7 August 2017)

MATTER 2: The proposed allocation of land for residential use at Leafield Road (FNP16) (total word count: 371)

Q1. Would the proposed housing site contribute towards the achievement of the social and the environmental dimensions of sustainable development?

Gleeson submits that the Site FNP16 contributes towards the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. The merits or otherwise of FNP16 are:

- New market and affordable housing stock to provide a wide choice of • high quality homes, widen opportunities for home¹, including an element of self-build all within an attractive environment.
- Land can be made available for the school great weight should be given to the need to expand or alter schools².
- Parked school traffic can be removed from Leafield Road thereby reducing congestion along Leafield Road back into Fairford – encouragement to be given to solutions which support reductions in congestion³.
- The site is well situated to much of the town's services and facilities and may reasonably encourage the use of non-car journeys – planning policy

³ NPPF paragraph 30



¹ NPPF paragraph 50 ² NPPF paragraph 72

Gleeson Strategic Land's Hearing Statement in response to Examiner's Hearing Questions dated 29 August 2017 (7 August 2017)

should ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities⁴.

- Delivery of on-site high quality open space to encourage active and continual use⁵.
- Delivery of substantial net gains in biodiversity through on-site provision of a landscape buffer, retention of field hedges and new seed and planting consistent with NPPF paragraph 109.

Through the technical evidence already provided no adverse impacts have been identified that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the above benefits.

Word Count: 209

Q2. What is the significance of the sixth criterion of the policy (the potential for a link between Leafield Road and Hatherop Road) and the associated paragraph 5.58 in the supporting text?

The safeguarding of an access for a future route through to Hatherop Road is twofold as Gleeson understand and see it. Firstly, it provides the town with an opportunity to establish a direction for future growth well beyond the life of the Plan, endeavouring to retain an element of control over speculative development in unwanted locations. Secondly a new road has the potential to

⁴ NPPF paragraph 70

⁵ NPPF paragraph 70



Gleeson Strategic Land's Hearing Statement in response to Examiner's Hearing Questions dated 29 August 2017 (7 August 2017)

remove a large amount of traffic associated with the School and sports centre from Leafield Road, High Street, Lower Croft and Park Street. NPPF paragraph 185 affords Neighbourhood Plans the opportunity to shape and direct sustainable development. As such, the criterion 6 response to local ambition and is seen by Gleeson as a positive approach in the longer term to fostering the delivery of sustainable development. In our respectful submission, the Plan should not be dissuaded from such an approach when sustainable development is about "positive growth – making economic, environmental and social progress for this and future generations"⁶.

Word Count: 162

⁶ NPPF Ministerial Forward

