

M1 Introduction

Procedural Objection

ED002 stated:

*"I will not therefore consider the merits of any proposals for **alternative or additional allocations** which are not put forward in the Plan as it has been submitted."*

I therefore object to GCC-McLoughlin's late introduction (end-November) of **moving the proposed Secondary school into the LGS area**, including to their introduction of a weak and biased "landscape planning appraisal" by Pegasus (Cirencester) arguing for various development layouts involving three fields of the JCS-indicated LGS area.

In their letter (admitted as ED011), GCC-McLoughlin claims to:

"address the fundamental soundness issue apparent in the Plan if the Miller Homes Objection is successful vis-à-vis removing the provision of a new Secondary School."

But that is nothing other than advancing an "alternative" site; and moreover it is conditional upon the School being found unsound in MD5.

If a school is unsound in MD5, for reasons either of traffic or of 'unjustified evidence of need in the South of town', then it will necessarily also be unsound if sited in the adjacent LGS area.

If however GCC simply wishes to avoid the extra land cost (or the negotiation/CP) of delivering the School in MD5, and is trying to argue that its possible non-delivery of a school makes the MD5 proposal fail against the "Effective" strand of soundness (ED007, para. 4.1), that is too tenuous.

And MD5 can simply revert to being all housing, roughly 200.

Miller Homes claimed to GCC that CP (Compulsory Purchase) would fail to be granted because GCC owns "available" land adjacent; but that claimed 'obstacle' will be removed as soon as the JCS-indicated LGS is confirmed (including its key Amenity, the figure-of-eight footpath walking loops).

Contrary to McLoughlin's letter (ED011) there are no "soundness implications" here, nothing that is "critical to the soundness of allocation MD5", and there is no present imperative for the County to be advancing "a viable alternative solution (in its view)".

McLoughlin further claims a "benefit" from introducing this alternative site now "at an early stage in the EiP process, allowing all parties to debate the issue now".

On the contrary, this is a last-minute change, which serves to outflank objectors and residents who cannot now re-submit all the detailed JCS evidence for the individual LGS fields, nor submit challenges to GCC-McLoughlin's commissioned "landscape appraisal" and its 14 other documents (accepted and published on 25th January 2019).

Therefore, on further consideration, the School's relocation into LGS should not now be considered at this Examination.

However, what cannot properly or reasonably be deferred or postponed by this Examination is **the finalising of the Leckhampton LGS**, lest GCC repeat the 'SD2 trick' (from

further up Farm Lane) and hastily give themselves planning permission, regardless of the site being found unsound in a Plan examination.

[Last-minute insertion is a feature of planning in Gloucestershire, aimed to surprise and disbar objectors.]

It is not clear what LGS outcomes are at risk of emerging from the Matters 3 & 4 hearings. Can an alternative LGS school properly be considered at all ?

I seek some clarity in advance, to be able to prepare for those discussions.

In the absence of that clarity I continue to object to GCC's consultant (439) having just submitted a cut-down version of Gloucestershire's 'School Places Strategy' document (labelled "SPS Document - Edited Extract") under Matter-3.

As it excludes the data for the Cheltenham "feeder" Primary schools, and for the very relevant Secondary schools just outside CBC's boundary, I emailed the Director of Education on 4th February asking for a complete copy and was directed to a webpage:

<https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/education-and-learning/school-planning-and-projects/gloucestershire-school-projects/>,

where the document is now available as a blue bar/button, (14.5 Mb).

If there is to be any discussion or (even worse) approval of this Secondary school proposal, I continue to request that the full document be an Examination document.

I can then submit my conclusions/challenges drawn straight from it. (I ought not to have to make the document my Appendix.)

DtC

CBC has produced no reasoning or evidence to justify its acceptance of GCC's claim "*that the new Secondary School needs to be provided in the Leckhampton/Warden Hill area*", (McLoughlin's submitted SOCG for Matters-3 & 4).

For CBC, GCC is not an unquestionable outside agency.

Land planning for Education is not a DtC (Duty to Cooperate) input external to Gloucestershire, but instead ought to be established thoroughly and transparently through Gloucestershire's JCS and Local Plans.

GCC has a 'Duty to Participate' in the above plans, yet it has failed (evaded) to do so, preferring late disclosure, and now hiding behind consultants (who can easily excuse themselves from answering any statistical or other queries, however blatantly dubious or inconsistent).

What are the reasonable limits of LGS **adjustments** by the CLP ?

- (1) keep KL (Kidnappers Lane) itself inside the LGS, as an integral part of the walking loops Amenity;
- (2) do not pre-permit "playing fields" to be 'coded into' this one particular LGS; leave that decision to any planning application, for it to set out any 'exceptional circumstances';

- (3) do not allow fields **R2 and R3** to be subtracted from the LGS;
- (4) do not allow plot **HB** of the LGS to be eroded.

Could GCC's two fields (its "Site B") and its "Site C" (near the Listed Buildings of Leckhampton Farm Court) be subtracted from the JCS-indicated LGS ?

No, not when the only evidence is a paltry bought 'landscape assessment' and all the opposing JCS evidence is neither re-included nor allowed to be resubmitted to this Examination.

So, if there is no valid and fair evidence basis for removing GCC's two fields from the indicated LGS, then could the CLP properly 'approve' the School's move into those fields ?
No, because there has not been a proper consultation on that specific proposal.

Should/can the Examination approve the School siting in MD5 (even though GCC no longer requests it) ?

In October 2018, GCC wrote to Gloucester Diocesan Board of Finance (owner of MD5) stating that GCC "*will not be pursuing the purchase of any of that land at the present time*", (Appendix-7 to Miller Homes' M3 statement; my underlining).
Thus, there is nothing to prevent GCC reverting to land purchase (compulsory or otherwise) once the LGS 'door' is closed.

A further problem is that if GCC still does not revert to (CP on) MD5, then the housing allocation is uncertain: is it less than 200 (because of the hectares subtracted for the school), or 200, or 250, or 350, or 370 ??

The viable quota all too uncertain, and should therefore be left at no higher than the JCS 'indicative' figure of around 200 (proportionally less if a school proceeds), and the matter should wait to be precisioned by a planning application (and public inquiry, which can fully investigate the Transport constraints (i.e. the "severity" of impact upon the A46 and on Church Road and its lanes-off).

In summary, the CLP Inspector has been presented with a planning mess at Leckhampton, just as the JCS inspector encountered, (and did endeavour to solve, especially Cheltenham's "Apportionment" mess).
