

Main Mod	Policy / Paragraph	Summary of representations related to Main Modifications	CBC Officers' comment
MM002	EM1	Submissions from Gfirst LEP and Hintons argue that the plan is not sound without further allocations of employment sites.	Officers are satisfied that the Cheltenham Plan satisfies the employment requirements set out in the JCS. New business parks in Cheltenham will likely require a review of the Green Belt and possibly cross boundary allocations with Tewkesbury. These are strategic issues which will be addressed in the ongoing JCS Review.
MM006	GB1	One comment objects saying the naming of specific roads in the Green Belt is required. Another comment suggests widening the policy to cover all development in the Green Belt rather than only housing.	The previous Local Plan contained specific roads in its version of this policy. However, time has moved on and the situation now is that there are several roads in the Green Belt which have a similar character. There is no evidence to support a policy that relates to any specifically named roads. There is no convincing evidence to suggest that non-residential development needs to be included in the policy.
MM008	8.4-8.5	One comment proposes that the reference to the NPPF should not be removed but instead references the latest iteration of the NPPF.	Care has been taken in the preparation of the Cheltenham Plan to reference the correct version and sections of the NPPF. It is not possible to be able to prejudge what would be in any future national policy.
MM010	9.21-9.30	A comment was received which objects to this modification because it removes scrutiny from the potential changes to conservation areas.	Any changes to conservation areas will be undertaken in consultation with local communities in line with national regulations and Historic England guidance.
MM013	Table 2	Comments from two land promoters say that because there is a lack of a five year supply that more allocations are required within the plan.	As discussed at the hearing sessions the Council believes that the Cheltenham Plan must meet the requirements set out in the JCS. As it does this there is no need for additional residential allocations to be included.
MM016	HD4	Local residents' group think that site HD4 should be removed from the plan completely following the outcome of a recently dismissed planning appeal on the site. The land promoters have some comments on detailed wording of HD4.	The appeal Inspector's findings did not make a judgement on the principle of development on this site. The Council still consider that an acceptable scheme can be found for this site.
MM021	MD2	The landowner objects to the contents of MD2 and suggests amending the wording to remove references to health care and retail on the site in order to make it purely residential.	The current wording is based on evidence gathered during the plan preparation period. The specific site requirements in MD2 do not override all other considerations but will be taken into account during any relevant planning decision. If strong evidence is presented as part of an application then it could be possible to permit a scheme with a different mix of uses.
MM024	MD5	Several representations, including from the local Parish Council, object to the increase in the number of dwellings in MD5. Several reasons for objection are listed including traffic, landscape, biodiversity impacts. Support for MM022 is provided by the landowners and Gloucestershire County Council Education.	The evidence produced to support the Cheltenham Plan has been reviewed by the various specialist stakeholders and found to be adequate. The Council do not consider that the potential impacts of this allocation outweigh the benefits.
MM026	GI1	Land owners with an interest in land around Swindon Village object to the extent of the Local Green Space in that area. They believe it is too large and is not justified. A number of local residents have expressed their support for this LGS. Land owners with an interest in land at Leckhampton also object to the extent of the Local Green Space in that area. However, there are also objections from residents and the Parish Council who believe that the Local Green Space is not large enough and should cover additional areas. A number of objections have been received from residents who believe that the A40 corridor should be included in the list of designated Local Green Spaces. Railfuture object to the proposed deletion of the paragraph referring to Policy TN1 because it appears to remove safeguarding of the former rail route which is currently the Honeybourne cycleway.	The Council has produced further work to clarify the justification for the proposed Local Green Spaces. This work resulted in some amendments to the boundaries at Leckhampton and Swindon Village and officers stand by these results. The A40 corridor Local Green Space proposal was discounted from the Cheltenham Plan process because it is highway land. The selection methodology has been consistently applied and this includes a stipulation that highway land is generally not appropriate for LGS designation. The reference to TN1 within GI1 was removed because it was unnecessary. Policy TN1 has not been removed.
MM027	Table 9	One representation from a planning agent objects to this modification because they disagree with several of the figures used in table 9. They believe that their figures justify the inclusion of two additional residential allocations in the plan.	A Five Year Housing Land Supply position statement has been published after the close of the consultation. It may be appropriate to include updated figures from this work within the Cheltenham Plan. The Council consider these would be minor modifications. The lack of a five year housing land supply is mentioned above. It does not justify the inclusion of additional residential allocations.