



Statement: Update on the Joint Core Strategy – 4 November 2016

The Leaders of all three Joint Core Strategy councils met this morning to consider two issues that impact on the progression of the plan. Firstly, the resolution made by Tewkesbury Borough Council to consider a plan without the Twigworth part of the Twigworth and Innsworth strategic allocation. And secondly, confirmation from the Ministry of Defence and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation that a significant portion of the MoD site in Ashchurch will not be released for housing. In considering these issues, the Leaders recognise the importance of continuing to work together in partnership to deliver a sound JCS which meets the needs of all three council areas.

Mike Dawson, chief executive for Tewkesbury Borough Council and senior responsible officer for the Joint Core Strategy, said: *“The JCS is a hugely important plan that will shape the future of Cheltenham borough, Gloucester city and Tewkesbury borough and will guide housing and economic growth for the future. Therefore, we will be working together closely in the next few weeks and aim to bring a report to the three councils in January which will deliver a sound plan.”*

1. JCS Background – Extracts from CBC Members Briefing Documents

1.1 The JCS was last considered by the Councils of all three JCS authorities at the Pre-Submission stage in April 2014, this was after compiling an extensive evidence base and three public consultations. All three JCS authorities agreed to the JCS Pre-Submission version and this (with what the JCS team considered to be minor changes) was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in November 2014. The Examination has however been based on the Pre-Submission version of the JCS as this was the version agreed by each of the Councils and subjected to public consultation.

1.2 The Inspector appointed by PINS is Ms Elizabeth C Ord.

1.3 The Examination into the JCS commenced in May 2015. There have been three stages of hearings to discuss all aspects of the JCS since May 2015, the most recent one, Stage 3 was held and completed in April 2016.

1.4 A Preliminary Findings Report (Exam 146) was received from the Inspector on 16 December 2015 where Ms Ord set out her Preliminary Findings on the some key JCS issues, including her views on the strategic allocations (SAs) and their suitability for inclusion in the spatial strategy. The purpose of this was to assist the JCS authorities with her direction of thinking at that early stage of the Examination having not yet heard all of the evidence. A JCS response to the Preliminary Findings was provided on 25 January 2016 (Exam 146A).

1.5 The Preliminary Findings reflected the positive aspects of the Examination, in that much has been achieved already by the JCS team towards a position of soundness and legal compliance. In particular the Inspector largely supported the JCS position on a number of areas including:

- The vision and objectives;
- The duty to cooperate;
- The principle of releasing Green Belt land for our growth needs;
- The broad spatial strategy of focussing growth around the three main centres of Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury town;
- Support for most of the strategic allocations in the plan.

1.6 The main issues arising from the Preliminary Findings (and ongoing through the later hearings) were:

- The overall housing requirement and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment;
- The employment and retail land needs and supply;
- The need for growth to be rebalanced towards Tewkesbury and Gloucester;
- That the Inspector was minded to find the North Churchdown strategic allocation unsound due to Green Belt sensitivity;
- Local Green Space requirements and landscape sensitivity at North West Cheltenham and Leckhampton strategic allocations **including being minded to find the Farm Lane section (in Tewkesbury Borough) unsound;**
- The appropriateness of Safeguarded Land at North West and West
- Cheltenham including stating that part of the West Cheltenham site might be suitable for strategic allocation;
- The appropriateness of the strategic allocation size threshold and the potential role of smaller sites in the JCS;
- New strategic allocations would therefore be needed to address these issues.

1.7 The Inspector's Interim Report was issued on 31 May 2016 which sets out her recommendations on the JCS following the three hearings stages. The Interim Report reflects a progression of the Inspector's earlier thoughts set out in the Preliminary Findings. The Interim Report will be reviewed by the Inspector as necessary prior to the release of the formal Final Report from the Inspector (currently timetabled for February 2017).

2. Inspector's Interim Report

2.1 The Inspector's Interim Report provides a clear way forward towards the JCS being found sound and legally compliant.

2.2 Whilst the Interim Report focusses on recommendations to make the overall plan sound, a number of subject matters were discussed at the hearing sessions where the Inspector has not sought to make any further recommendations. Furthermore the Interim Report confirms the JCS approach in a number of areas including:

- The spatial strategy for future development
- The methodology in calculation the demographic OAHN;

- The approach to economic growth and employment land;
- The approach to retail growth
- The methodology for establishing the needs for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People;

2.3 Furthermore, at Paragraph 64, the Inspector states: *“For the reasons set out in my Preliminary Findings I am minded to find that, with the exception of North Churchdown, the proposed strategic allocations are sound, subject to reductions in the extent of development at North West Cheltenham and Leckhampton ...”*

2.4 Given these reductions and deletion and the Inspector’s higher housing requirements (as set out below), the Interim Report therefore also recommends additional strategic allocations to help meet the JCS housing requirement.

2.5 The Inspector’s Interim Report on the Objectively Assessed Housing Need and Apportionment, Green Belt and Sites can be summarised as:

Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN)

1. Increasing the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) from 31,830 to 33,500 to provide an appropriate economically led figure for OAHN.
2. Greater clarity should be provided on the provision for older peoples housing and student housing within the OAHN.
3. The affordable housing need is confirmed as 638 units per annum across the JCS area.
4. An additional 5% ‘policy uplift’ to OAHN is recommended to assist affordable housing delivery and support the five year housing land supply, and so the total JCS housing requirement is 35,175 dwellings.
5. The Inspector calculates that this would result in a total housing requirement of 14,340 for Gloucester, 10,851 for Cheltenham and 9,983 for Tewkesbury.
6. Housing supply buffers - 20% buffer (for Tewkesbury and Cheltenham) and 5% buffer (for Gloucester) applied to the 5 year housing land supply.

Apportionment, Green Belt and Sites

12. Green Belt land should only be released for Gloucester and Cheltenham needs, but not for Tewkesbury’s needs as there are other sustainable sites not in the Green Belt to meet Tewkesbury’s needs.
13. The strategic allocations are considered to be sound with the exception of the whole of North Churchdown and parts of Leckhampton and North West Cheltenham.
14. North West Cheltenham strategic allocation is considered sound subject to a reduction in housing capacity of 500 units to provide a green buffer around Swindon village to reflect the landscape and historic sensitivities in the area.
15. **Development at Leckhampton should be reduced in size significantly to around 200 dwellings within Cheltenham Borough to reflect the landscape and transport constraints in the area, and therefore removed as a JCS strategic allocation, and be considered for allocation in the Cheltenham Local Plan.**

16. There is a need for additional strategic allocations to meet Gloucester's and Tewkesbury's unmet needs.
 17. Twigworth is recommended as an additional housing-led strategic allocation (for at least 750 dwellings) for Gloucester needs. The allocation could be increased if it can be demonstrated that more housing in this location is appropriate and deliverability is addressed.
 18. Winnycroft is recommended as a JCS strategic allocation for Gloucester needs (albeit not adding to the supply as this site was previously included within the urban capacity figure for Gloucester).
 19. Sites to the south of Gloucester (at Brookthorpe/Whaddon and Hardwicke in Stroud) would make an appropriate strategic allocation if needed, and subject to agreement with Stroud District Council. Therefore the Inspector recommends that Stroud District Council be approached.
 20. The addition of West Cheltenham (Phase 1) is supported as a strategic allocation for strategic employment purposes and approximately 500 dwellings.
 21. The Inspector's judgement is that exceptional circumstances exist for the removal of a number of smaller Green Belt sites in the North and North West of Cheltenham to assist with Cheltenham's five year housing land supply. This would mean the redrawing of the Green Belt boundary in the JCS and could allow these areas to be allocated through the Cheltenham Local Plan.
 22. Fiddington is recommended as an additional strategic allocation to meet Tewkesbury's needs.
 23. A site at Mitton in Wychavon District would make an appropriate strategic allocation if needed, and subject to agreement with Wychavon District Council. Therefore the Inspector recommends that Wychavon District Council be approached.
 24. **The case for Local Green Space (LGS) designation at North West Cheltenham and Leckhampton has been made out. As the Inspector is recommending the removal of Leckhampton as a strategic allocation, LGS will not be designated for this site in the JCS. For the LGS at North West Cheltenham at Swindon Village, the Inspector recommends an indicative area to be identified in the JCS. The designation of the LGS will come through the Cheltenham Plan.**
-

Inspector Ord has reviewed the Cheltenham C6 strategic site under the EiP, her recommendations are informed by the three main environment reports covering the wider area which includes the TBC administered area of White Cross/SD2.

JCS Natural Environment and Broad Locations series reports and relevant sections

- EBLO 106 JCS Landscape and Visual Sensitivity (Oct 2012), section 6, p14-17, extract [E1];
- ENAT 100 JCS Greenbelt Assessment (Final, Sept. 2011), sections (5.2.6), (5.4.5) and (7.3.8), and
- E104 JCS Halcrow Strategic Flood Risk Assessment level 2, (Final July 2012), reference site T10 (SD2), section 7

Inspector Ord has convened five sessions on Leckhampton and made three formal visits to the area including Leckhampton Hill. Additional common ground work was requested from the Parish Council on their NPPF Local Green Space application. Cheltenham completed the first public consultation on their local plan this summer, local green space was included and CP107 is the designation given to a small Local Area of Play (LAP) which is on the proposed site, this important amenity has not been given consideration by Tewkesbury Borough Council in granting planning permission ahead of the completion of the JCS and C6 Masterplanning.

**Relevant Extracts for Inspector Ord's Interim Report (original para numbers)
Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN)**

6. The demographic OAHN for the Gloucestershire Housing Market Area has been assessed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). This assessment uses the 2012-based population and household projections as the starting point, making adjustments based on appropriate assumptions and judgements to come to the demographic figure of 31,830 dwellings. The overall figure is then broken down into figures for the three districts resulting in demographic needs of 13,290 dwellings for Gloucester, 9,900 dwellings for Cheltenham and 8,640 dwellings for Tewkesbury. I accept the workings of this assessment and the resultant figures.

7. Nonetheless, taking account of updated economic evidence and the Councils' revised economic strategy for the JCS area, in my judgement, the full OAHN should be economically led to accommodate the proposed 39,500 jobs target. Given the uncertainties of economic forecasts, a broad-brush approach to assessment is appropriate. Therefore, taking the average number of required dwellings in the adjusted employment OAHN note6, with a range between 31,200 and 36,600, seems a reasonable approach. This results in an OAHN of 33,500 dwellings for the JCS area for the Plan period (2011-2031). 33,500 is, therefore, the OAHN for the JCS area.

23. For these reasons, there should be a policy uplift of 5% on 33,500 (1,675), making a total housing requirement of 35,175 dwellings. In order to boost significantly the supply of housing in accordance with national policy, this requirement should be expressed as a minimum figure. There is no justifiable reason to defer the provision of any of the housing requirement to the next Plan review and full provision should be made now within the JCS.

26. On the figures presented in the most recent trajectories only Tewkesbury could demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply using the Sedgefield method. Whilst the figures will change with the recommendations set out in this report, there is nonetheless a good argument for using the Liverpool method. In order to increase the chances of maintaining a 5 year housing land supply, particularly in the case of Cheltenham, I take the view that the Liverpool method is justified.

51. For the reasons set out in my Preliminary Findings, I take the view that the JCS spatial strategy, which focuses on urban extensions to Gloucester and Cheltenham, and strategic allocations at Tewkesbury, is generally sound. However, there should be greater emphasis on the development

potential of the wider Tewkesbury Town urban area to reflect its sustainable location for housing and its planned employment growth.

55. As set out in my Preliminary Findings, due mainly to land constraints around Gloucester and Cheltenham and their inability to meet need outside the Green Belt, exceptional circumstances exist for the release of

some Green Belt land for Gloucester's and Cheltenham's urban extensions. However, Tewkesbury does not have such land constraints and there are sustainable strategic sites available in the vicinity of the wider Tewkesbury Town area, which are outside the Green Belt and accord with the spatial strategy. These alternative sites could make a significant contribution to Tewkesbury's requirements and, if brought forward, would enable the urban extensions around Gloucester and Cheltenham to serve primarily the needs of those areas.

57. In order to meet the three authorities' housing requirements there needs to be a re-balancing of land supply towards Gloucester and Tewkesbury. Despite the land constraints around Gloucester, there are appropriate options available. I therefore recommend additional urban extensions around Gloucester to replace supply from Cheltenham's extensions and to meet Gloucester's housing requirements. I also recommend additional strategic allocations within the wider Tewkesbury Town area, outside the Green Belt, to meet Tewkesbury's requirements and to replace supply from Gloucester's and Cheltenham's extensions.

58. Subject to a small increase in District capacity, Cheltenham has sufficient supply within its urban extensions to meet its requirements in full.

Therefore, no additional allocations are recommended. However, a small release of Green Belt land is recommended adjacent to the north Cheltenham urban boundary to free up smaller sites for potential allocation in the Cheltenham District Plan.

63. In percentage terms 52% would be in Tewksbury, 26% would be around Cheltenham and 22% would be around Gloucester. If the additional 1,670 dwellings were to be allocated according to these percentages, Tewksbury would have an additional 868 dwellings totalling 9,508, Cheltenham an additional 434 totalling 10,334, and Gloucester an additional 367 totalling 13,657. Adding a further 5% would result in a requirement of 9,983 for Tewkesbury, 10,851 for Cheltenham, and 14,340 for Gloucester.

64. For the reasons set out in my Preliminary Findings⁶⁵

I am minded to find that, with the exception of North Churchdown, the proposed strategic allocations are sound, **subject to reductions in the extent of development at North West Cheltenham and Leckhampton**. In reaching these conclusions, I have considered all additional evidence submitted

subsequent to my Preliminary Findings.

Cheltenham

101. The housing requirement for Cheltenham is 10,851 dwellings, and the district capacity⁹⁵ (excluding strategic allocations) is 4,827, leaving a residual requirement of 6,024 (10,851 – 4,827) dwellings.

102. The Cheltenham side of the North West Cheltenham allocation is proposed for 2,225 dwellings and the Tewkesbury side for 2,560, totalling 4,785. The Leckhampton allocation is proposed for 1,124 dwellings in the JCS but has since increased to 1,141, consisting of 764 dwellings on the Cheltenham side and 377 on the Tewkesbury side. Taking this higher Leckhampton figure of 1,141, the total number of proposed dwellings amounts to 5,926 which, if accepted, would leave another 98 (6,024 – 5,926) dwellings to find.

103. I indicated in my Preliminary Findings, that I was minded to find both of these allocations sound, at least in part. This remains my view for North West Cheltenham, albeit with some reduction in housing numbers. With respect to Leckhampton, I take the view that the housing numbers should be substantially reduced, bringing it below the JCS threshold for strategic allocation within the JCS. I am therefore recommending its removal from the JCS. I shall now consider each proposed allocation in turn.

Leckhampton

112. In my Preliminary Findings I indicated that I was not minded to find the Tewkesbury side of the Leckhampton allocation, West of Farm Lane, sound and that overall, built development should avoid areas of high landscape and visual sensitivity. Having considered additional evidence submitted since then, including Redrow's planning application documents relating to Land West of Farm Lane, I remain of this view.

113. Whilst the Cotswolds Conservation Board did not object to the West of Farm Lane planning application, the Board commented that the most suitable option for the land's future management and retention of character would be to leave it undeveloped as agricultural land. Although Natural England in their letter of August 2015 stated they did not wish to comment, deferring to the Conservation Board's knowledge of the location, they did raise significant concerns over the impact on the AONB in their earlier letter of November 2014.

114. I also note that the Council's Landscape Officer referred to stunning

views from Leckhampton Hill from the Devils Chimney and Cotswold Way, which would be negatively impacted, bringing the perception of the southern edge of Cheltenham closer to the viewer with a greater mass of conurbation in view. In my judgement, development on the West of Farm Lane site is environmentally unsustainable mainly due to its impact on the setting of the Cotswold Hills AONB and the high landscape and visual sensitivity of the site.

115. Tewkesbury Borough Council has granted planning permission for the West of Farm Lane site and the developers are ready to proceed. Whilst it was suggested at the March hearing that this part of the allocation could be retained for pragmatic integration reasons, in my judgement, this is inappropriate. The permission is now being challenged by residents and a letter before claim has been issued. Consequently, the permission could be overturned. Given my finding of unsoundness and the uncertainty surrounding the site, I recommend that it be removed from the allocation and the urban extension boundaries be accordingly redrawn.

116. As the Tewkesbury side of the allocation was proposed for 377 dwellings, removing this site increases the number of remaining dwellings to find to 975 (598 + 377).

117. From my site visit observations, the adjacent land, East of Farm Lane, is also highly sensitive to development mainly due to its proximity to the AONB and stunning views into and out of the AONB. The various significant heritage assets in the south of the site add further interest and sensitivity, rendering this area unsuitable for built development on environmental sustainability grounds. Therefore, the area to the south of the allocation, coloured red for high landscape and visual sensitivity on the Landscape and Visual Sensitivity plan¹¹³, should remain as green infrastructure.

118. Furthermore, the Urban Extensions Definition Study shows other areas of high landscape sensitivity¹¹⁴ scattered throughout the site. Additionally, there are important views from the A46 Shurdington Road across the site onto the Cotswolds Hills, the most spectacular being from the junction with Kidnappers Lane¹¹⁵.

119. Moreover, the site is crossed by an intricate network of footpaths over the fields, providing impressive views of the Hills from the site's own pleasant, rural environment. On landscape and visual grounds Natural England and the Conservation Board objected to the recently dismissed Bovis/Miller planning appeal for development of up to 650 dwellings on the Cheltenham side of this allocation¹¹⁶.

120. I note that the Cheltenham Assessment of land availability¹¹⁷ states “In general, a site is considered unsuitable where it is assessed as being of ‘high’ landscape sensitivity.” On this basis, a large part of the site would be unsuitable for built development and, in my judgement, the extent of the proposed development should be significantly reduced.

121. Of further concern is the impact of traffic generation from the proposed allocation. The limited highway capacity on the surrounding roads has been highlighted in the evidence before me, and the issue has recently been examined in detail at the Bovis/Miller Homes inquiry. I have considered the Inspector’s report on this appeal¹¹⁸ and particularly the sections on transport. Taking account of the Inspector’s finding that the cumulative impact of the proposed development would be severe¹¹⁹, this strengthens my view that the extent of residential development at this location should be significantly reduced.

122. Whilst Stagecoach highlights issues with new bus services to the south of the site, it supports some development on the northern flank on public transport grounds. It indicates that an existing bus service could directly serve the northern part of the allocation and that a small diversion might be possible, bringing a larger proportion of the allocation within convenient reach of a bus stop.

123. Overall, in my judgement, a limited amount of development could be supported towards the north of the site where public transport is more accessible, subject to the avoidance of land of high landscape and visual sensitivity. Therefore, for reasons of landscape/visual amenity and highway impacts, I recommend that the Cheltenham part of the site be allocated for a modest level of built development in the order of 200 dwellings.

124. This remaining modest level of housing would not classify as an urban extension and, therefore, it would be more appropriate to allocate the site in the emerging Cheltenham Local Plan rather than in the JCS. **It is, therefore, my recommendation that the Leckhampton urban extension be removed in its entirety from the JCS.**

125. As the Cheltenham side of the allocation is proposed for 764 dwellings, lowering the capacity to 200 reduces the overall supply by 564, thereby increasing the number of remaining dwelling to find to 1,539 (975 + 564).

Overall conclusion

150. The removal of Leckhampton as a strategic allocation and the

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

Local Green Space

174. As indicated in my Preliminary Findings, in my judgement, the case for Local Green Space designation within both the proposed North West Cheltenham and Leckhampton urban extensions has been made out¹⁶⁶. However, as I am recommending the removal of Leckhampton as a strategic allocation, the Local Green Space designation can be made in either the emerging Cheltenham Local Plan or the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan. Consequently, I no longer propose recommending indicative areas for Local Green Space in the JCS.

The JCS and Inspector Ord's Interim Report dated 26th May 2016 was taken back to the three JCS councils in October.

CHELTENHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL (FULL COUNCIL) Thursday, 18th October, 2016 - JCS

The Leader highlighted the following changes which were proposed through the main modifications:

..... (just those relevant to the this hearing)

- The Leckhampton Strategic Allocation was removed from the JCS as a strategic site and will now be dealt with in the Cheltenham Plan.
- Leckhampton Farm Lane Planning Permission has been accorded to Cheltenham Borough Council's housing numbers (377 dwellings). The Inspector was minded that the allocation of the Farm Lane site was not sound in the JCS but had noted that there was an extant planning permission and that this could be accorded to Cheltenham supply figures, should Tewkesbury Borough Council and Cheltenham Borough Council agree. The planning permission was currently subject to legal challenge.
- Tewkesbury sites close to Cheltenham boundary and allocations - the Senior Planning Policy Officer explained that there would be another sites consultation early in the new year. The sources of supply were coming from the sites allocation in the JCS and the Memorandum of Understanding between the JCS partners. He gave the example of the 377 Farm Lane site which had been allocated to Cheltenham via the Memorandum.

.....

Upon a vote it was RESOLVED (Voting: For: 32, Against 1, Abstentions 1) THAT

1. Approve for public consultation the proposed main modifications to the June 2014 Pre-Submission Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy as set out in Appendix 1 to this report (including proposed modifications to the Proposals Map and Key Diagram) as those it endorses and considers necessary to make the JCS sound.
2. delegate authority to the Chief Executive of Tewkesbury Borough Council, the Corporate Director of Services and Neighbourhoods of Gloucester City Council and the Director of Planning of Cheltenham Borough Council in consultation with the relevant Leaders of each those Councils to make minor changes to the proposed main modifications and proposed modifications to the Proposals Map and Key Diagram) in terms of formatting, presentation and accuracy, including any minor changes arising from the consideration of the proposed modifications by each of the Joint Core Strategy councils, prior to publication for consultation purposes.
3. Agree that the “additional layout for appendix a1,”the City of Gloucester Proposed Primary Shopping Area, Primary Frontage and Secondary Frontage” and the “Superseded Development Plan Policies on Adoption of the JCS” and the “Addendum for Council-Primary frontages” documents be incorporated into the proposed main modifications to the June 2014 Pre-Submission Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy as set out in Appendix 1 to this report (including proposed modifications to the Proposals Map and Key Diagram) as those it endorses and considers necessary to make the JCS sound.
4. Conduct an urgent review of the Local Green Space Strategy in relation to the West Cheltenham emerging Strategic Allocation.

GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL (FULL COUNCIL) 24th October 2016 - JCS

Councillor Organ (Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning) presented his report, stated that the JCS was a result of joint working between Gloucester City Council and Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Borough Councils to provide a robust plan to guide growth over the next fifteen years. He noted that the Council had last considered the JCS in June 2016 when Members noted the Interim Report of the Inspector. The Inspector supported the spatial strategy of the JCS and had made clear the modifications she considered necessary to steer the JCS to adoption.

37.10 RESOLVED that the Council: no voting information provided
(resolution points 1, 2 & 3 as above for Cheltenham)

TEWKESBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL (FULL COUNCIL) 25th October 2016 - JCS

RESOLVED That it be AGREED that: DEFERRED awaiting further flood risk assessment of the Twigworth Site and phasing of the Ashworth MOD site

STATUS ON JCS 5YR LAND SUPPLY – DELIVERY SCENARIOS

Please note the following amendment was made on the morning of 18/07/16: Corrected formulae for the 5 year supply calculation in terms of the number of years taken into account for the five years. JCS officers have looked at 12 housing delivery scenarios across all the JCS strategic sites following the guidance from Inspector Ord's Inspector's Preliminary Findings on Green Belt Release, Spatial Strategy and Strategic Allocations (JCS EXAM 146) [E787 – E829]. This demonstrates that it is possible to achieve a 5YR land supply with Leckhampton removed

Index of Trajectory Scenarios produced for JCS EiP hearing sessions 19th – 21st July 2016 (EXAM248)

Scenario No.	Needs Figure Used	Scenario	Cheltenham 5 year supply	Tewkesbury 5 year supply
1	35,170	Leckhampton included as a Strategic Allocation delivering 650 dwellings	5.0 years	-
2	35,170	Mitton (Wychavon) included as a Strategic Allocation delivering 400 dwellings	-	5.5 years
3	35,170	Mitton (Wychavon) included as a Strategic Allocation delivering full site capacity of 1,100	-	5.5 years
4	35,170	Not including Leckhampton as a Strategic Allocation or any of the Green Belt sites in the North of Cheltenham around Prestbury	4.6 years	-
5	35,170	Not including Leckhampton as a Strategic Site, but including the sites identified in the Inspector's Interim Findings within the Green Belt in North Cheltenham, but not including Hunting Butts	5.5 years	-
6	35,170	Not including Mitton (Wychavon) or Leckhampton as a Strategic allocation, but including Green Belt sites in North Cheltenham	4.9 years	5.0 years
7	33,495	Leckhampton included as a Strategic Allocation delivering 650 dwellings	5.3 years	-
8	33,495	Mitton (Wychavon) included as a Strategic Allocation delivering 400 dwellings	-	6.2 years
9	33,495	Mitton (Wychavon) included as a Strategic Allocation delivering full site capacity of 1,100	-	6.2 years
10	33,495	Not including Leckhampton as a Strategic Allocation or any of the Green Belt sites in the North of Cheltenham around Prestbury	4.9 years	-
11	33,495	Not including Leckhampton as a Strategic Site, but including the sites identified in the Inspector's Interim Findings within the Green Belt in North Cheltenham, but not including Hunting Butts	5.8 years	-
12	33,495	Not including Mitton (Wychavon) or Leckhampton as a Strategic allocation	5.2 years	5.7 years