

Planning Application Ref: P13_01605

Outline Planning Application for up to 650 dwellings, other uses including A1 retail, surgery, pharmacy, primary school of up to 1.72ha land area, principal access and open space.

Suggested Grounds for Refusal

**Submission to Planning Committee 31/07/2014
of Lufton & Associates Chartered Planning Consultancy on behalf of LEGLAG**

Abbreviations;

NPPF	- <i>National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012</i>
PSJCS	- <i>Pre-Submission Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy - June 2014</i>
LP	- <i>Cheltenham Borough Local Plan Second Review 2006</i>

1. The proposed development is of such magnitude, scale and impact that it prejudices plan-making for the whole plan area and is premature to determine in terms of the progress of the PSJCS that is at a late stage but not yet been subject of public examination and as such is contrary to paragraph 17 of the NPPF and paragraph 17 and 18 of The Planning System General Principles statement (ODPM 2005).
2. The proposed development is not accompanied by a comprehensive master-plan and is inconsistent with the PSJCS provisions to ensure adequate and proportionate infrastructure supports development across the Plan A6 area contrary to policy SA1 of the PSJCS.
3. The proposed development does not relate to the comprehensive and integrated planning delivery of a draft strategic allocation consistent with Plan A6 (p.138) of the PSJCS.
4. The proposed development would result in the permanent loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and in the absence of any evidence to show that areas of poorer quality land cannot be developed in preference to that of a higher quality, the proposal is contrary to paragraph 112 of the NPPF, Strategic Objective 6 and policy SD15 of the PSJCS and policy CO10 of the LP.
5. The proposed development would by virtue of its scale and encroachment into the open countryside, have a significantly adverse impact on the character of the countryside and the adjoining AONB and would have a significantly adverse impact on the distinctive character and appearance of the landscape and relationship with the adjoining AONB in this location. As such, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 109 and 115 of the NPPF, policies CO1 and CO2 of the LP and policies SD7 and SD8 of the PSJCS.

6. The proposed development fails to protect and adequately mitigate important and cherished vistas to and from the adjoining AONB and would have a significantly adverse visual impact on the AONB and the wider landscape. As such, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 109 and 115 of the NPPF, policies CO1 and CO2 of the LP and policies SD7 and SD8 of the PSJCS.
7. The application, the supporting Transport Assessment and the proposed transport and highway mitigation fails to prevent significant residual cumulative traffic impact on the local and Cheltenham wide highway network. As such, the proposal is contrary to NPPF paragraph 32, policies TP1 of the LP and policy INF1 of the PSJCS.
8. The application does not demonstrate that the adverse impacts of the proposal are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by any benefits of the development. The proposal therefore represents an unsustainable development that is contrary to the guidance of the NPPF paragraph 14.