

Tewkesbury Borough Plan – Preferred Options

Consultation Statement

July 2019

1. Introduction

1.1. This consultation statement sets out how Tewkesbury Borough Council has undertaken public and stakeholder engagement on the Preferred Options Tewkesbury Borough Plan in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

1.2. Regulation 18 states that:

Preparation of a Local Plan

18. (1) A local planning authority must—

- (a) notify each of the bodies or persons specified in paragraph (2) of the subject of a local plan which the local planning authority propose to prepare, and
- (b) invite each of them to make representations to the local planning authority about what a local plan with that subject ought to contain.

(2) The bodies or persons referred to in paragraph (1) are—

- (a) such of the specific consultation bodies as the local planning authority consider may have an interest in the subject of the proposed local plan;
- (b) such of the general consultation bodies as the local planning authority consider appropriate; and
- (c) such residents or other persons carrying on business in the local planning authority's area from which the local planning authority consider it appropriate to invite representations.

(3) In preparing the local plan, the local planning authority must take into account any representation made to them in response to invitations under paragraph (1).

1.3. This consultation statement summarises how we consulted and who was invited to make representations in accordance with Regulation 18. Furthermore, the statement sets out the main issues that were raised and how these representations were taken into account in the production of the Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) Tewkesbury Borough Plan.

2. Previous Consultations

2.1. Prior to the TBP Preferred Options, the Borough Council, has undertaken two previous consultations on a draft plan under Regulation 18, these are:

- Scoping Issues and Options – consultation undertaken from 16th October to 26th November 2013.

- Draft Policies and Site Options – consultation undertaken from 27th February to 13th April 2015
- 2.2. Separate consultation statements have already been produced for these consultation documents. These can be viewed here: <https://www.tewkesbury.gov.uk/local-plan>

3. Preferred Options Consultation – What we did

- 3.1. The consultation on the Preferred Options Tewkesbury Borough Plan took place over a seven week period between Wednesday 10th October and Friday 30th November 2018.
- 3.2. In compliance with Regulation 18 and the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement publicity for the consultation was undertaken via the following methods:
- Setting up of a dedicated webpage on the Council’s website to host the consultation and access consultation documents (<https://www.tewkesbury.gov.uk/tewkesbury-borough-plan>)
 - Providing copies of the consultation documents at the Borough Council’s offices as well as at all libraries and advice centres within the Borough.
 - Sending out emails to all people and organisations signed up to the local plan consultation database.
 - Holding three public consultation events at Shurdington, Tewkesbury and Winchcombe.
 - Issuing of press releases to local media to publicise the consultation
 - Publishing a series of ‘tweets’ on Twitter and ‘posts’ of Facebook, through the Council’s own social media accounts, to publicise the consultation and consultation events.
- 3.3. The list of statutory and stakeholder consultation bodies specifically invited to make representations is set out at Appendix 1. A copy of the notification sent to all consultees is included at Appendix 2.
- 3.4. People were invited to respond to the consultation via email, by post or through a dedicated online consultation portal. The online portal involved the setting up of a dedicated response form that people were able to fill out electronically and submit the comments to the consultation, as well as sign themselves up the consultation database for any future notifications. This online form was replicated both as an electronic and hard copy format to enable people to complete it to email and post in response. This form can be viewed at Appendix 3.

4. Preferred Options Consultation – The response

- 4.1. The consultation generated over 1,100 individual comments submitted by approximately 430 separate respondents.

- 4.2. During the consultation period there were over 4,000 visits to the Tewkesbury Borough Plan webpage, and the social media publicity reached over 1,700 people via Facebook and over 1,000 people via Twitter.
- 4.3. Over 100 people attended the three public consultation events held at Shurdington, Tewkesbury and Winchcombe.

5. Preferred Options Consultation – Summary of responses

- 5.1. All the comments received on the Preferred Options consultation, including a summary of the each, can be viewed through the council's website:
<https://www.tewkesbury.gov.uk/tewkesbury-borough-plan>
- 5.2. A summary of the key issues raised are set out in the tables below.

Table 1 – Introduction

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
Vision & Objectives	<p>A number of comments stated that the vision and objectives should make clear that the plan is a pro-growth document and more strongly highlight the need to deliver housing in line with the Joint Core Strategy requirements.</p> <p>Some comments set out that objective 7 seeks to steer development away from 'protected areas' however sites a proposed within the AONB and Green Belt.</p> <p>One comment stated that, in line with the NPPF, the need to maintain green infrastructure and ecological networks should be included in the objectives.</p>	<p>The wording of the vision has been amended to include reference to having a sufficient supply of homes available.</p> <p>The first objective has been made clear that that the Borough Plan is to implement the housing and economic intentions of the Joint Core Strategy and the Council Plan.</p> <p>Objective 7 has been amended to state that development will be steered away from the most sensitive areas as this better reflects the plan's strategy.</p> <p>Objective 7 has also been amended to include wording around maintaining and enhancing habitat networks and green infrastructure.</p>
The development plan for Tewkesbury	<p>Some confusion was expressed over what area the Tewkesbury Borough Plan covers, including whether it covers the JCS strategic allocation sites.</p> <p>A few comments felt that the Borough Plan should be</p>	<p>Wording has been included which clarifies that the policies of the Borough Plan apply Borough-wide including the JCS strategic allocation sites within the Borough.</p>

	addressing the housing shortfall from the JCS, the extended plan period being considered through the JCS Review and the implications on housing growth of the standard methodology.	A stated through the JCS, it is the role of the JCS Review to address the housing shortfall as this is a strategic matter. The JCS Review is still to consider the plan period and housing growth to be planned for in future. It is therefore not appropriate for the Borough Plan to deal with these matters that are to be resolved through a future strategic plan. The Borough Plan can only be led by the current adopted JCS.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 2 – Housing Allocations

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
Tewkesbury Town		
A Land at Odessa Farm (Pre-Sub ref: TEW1)	<p>A number of comments were raised regarding the impact of this site on landscape, habitat (including Tewkesbury nature reserve) and the Tewkesbury battlefield.</p> <p>There were concerns about developing in flood risk areas and exacerbating flooding issues. Concerns were raised over the potential highways access to this site.</p> <p>Some respondents were worried that developing in this location would open up the wider area along the A38 for development.</p>	<p>The developable area of the site is to be constrained to the north and north-west of the site – within flood zone 1 only, away from the nature reserve, outside of the battlefield and to limit intrusion into the open countryside.</p> <p>A site specific policy is included within the plan to address these points. This also includes requirements to incorporate green infrastructure and biodiversity improvements, connected with the nature reserved.</p> <p>Access has been explored through the associated Transport Assessment and is achievable.</p> <p>Furthermore, a heritage impact assessment has been undertaken for this site to address concerns around impacts on the battlefield, and other heritage assets.</p>
B Land adj to John Moore Primary School (Pre-Sub ref: TEW2)	<p>Some respondents raised an issues with the additional traffic that development here would generate.</p> <p>A number of people considered that the site would be better left for the expansion of the school.</p>	<p>This site has been granted planning permission (Ref: 19/00627/APP) for residential development subsequent to the Preferred Options consultation.</p>

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
C Former MAFF site (Pre-Sub ref: TEW3)	There was some support for the development of a brownfield site. However, there was also some concern about flood risk on the site and potential damage to biodiversity and wildlife habitats.	Site specific policy is included to guide development. The policy references the need to enhance the sites biodiversity value and its contribution to green infrastructure. The developable area of the site is within Flood Zone 2 and the site specific policy requires future development to address site specific requirements set out in the Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment.

Bishops Cleeve		
A Land adj Breakers Yard (Pre-Sub ref: BIS1)	One comment stated that the site has traditionally be prone to flooding.	This site has been granted planning permission (Ref: 14/01233/FUL) for residential development subsequent to the Preferred Options consultation.
B Land at Homelands Farm (Pre-Sub ref: BIS2)	The site promoter considers that further capacity is achievable on this site. A comment stated that the site needs to be integrated into the existing Homelands development and use it for access.	Site capacities included in the plan are expressed as approximate figures and more detailed masterplanning may support different levels of development. Site integration and access issues have been dealt with through the site specific policy.

Winchcombe		
A Land off Harvey's Lane	A large number of objections were received for both sites. The landscape impact of development was a significant concern amongst many who responded as the sites are within the Cotswolds AONB. A number of people commented that there are other sites outside of the AONB that could meet needs.	Site A has been removed from the Pre-submission plan. The site is not within 115m contour, which provides a defined limit to development in the context of the sensitive AONB areas.
B Land off Delavale Road (Pre-Sub ref: WIN1)	An objection raised from Cotswolds Conservation Board questioning the justification for the need for housing in Winchcombe and that there has been no consideration about whether the proposals would constitute 'major development' in the AONB as defined by the NPPF.	The site specific policy included for Site B sets out that development should be landscape led and suitable areas for development informed by and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. The policy also requires that the site should promote accessibility to local services for pedestrians and cyclists. It is not considered that the proposal would constitute 'major development' in the AONB. More

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	Concerns also raised about the transport impact of development on the surrounding residential streets and congestion in the town centre.	detail on this is provided through the Housing Background Paper.

Coombe Hill		
A Land at junction of A38/A4019 (Pre-Sub ref: COO1)	A number of comments stated that the development proposed would be disproportionate relative to the size of the existing settlement. It was felt that development would have an impact on the landscape and character of the village and have an urbanising affect (particularly Site A) on the rural area. Concerns were also raised about the resulting traffic impact.	Both sites have been granted planning permission for residential development (Refs: 17/01337/OUT & 18/00173/FUL) subsequent to the Preferred Options consultation.
B Land adj to the Swan PH (Pre-Sub ref: COO2)		

Gotherington		
A Land to the north of Malleson Road (Pre-Sub ref: GOT1)	No comments received.	No action required.
B Land to the south of Malleson Road	No comments received.	The site has been removed from the plan as the development is not substantially completed.
C Land to the north of Gretton Road (Pre-Sub ref: GOT2)	No comments received.	No action required.

Maisemore		
A Land at Bell House Farm (Pre-Sub ref: MAI1)	Comment received that the settlement boundary for Maisemore should not include the green spaces proposed as part of these two developments.	Site B Land to the south of Rectory Farm has been removed from the plan as it is now substantially development.
B Land to the south of Rectory Farm		Settlement boundaries have been reconsidered through policy RES2 and amended at the village.

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
Norton		
A Land at Wainlode Lane	No comments received.	Site has been removed from the plan as it is not substantially development.

Shurdington		
A Land at corner of Badgeworth Ln and A46 (Pre-Sub ref: SHU1)	Concerns were raised about the removal of the site from the Green Belt and whether this is in compliance with the NPPF. In addition responses questioned the need for this Green Belt site when the overall housing needs for Service Villages can be met. Concerns were raised about the traffic impact of the site on Badgeworth Lane and A46, particularly with the nearby location of the school.	Site has been retained in the plan. It is deemed important to provide some growth at the village which has been previously constrained due to the Green Belt.
B Land north of Leckhampton Lane (Pre-Sub ref: SHU2)	Some concerns were raised about the suitability of the access to this site.	Access has been considered as part of a supporting transport assessment. A site specific policy regarding access has also been included to address this.
C Garage Site at Harrison Road (Pre-Sub ref: SHU3)	Some support for the redevelopment of a brownfield site.	No action required.
D Land to south of Badgeworth Lane	A large number of objections received for this site. Concerns were raised about the removal of the site from the Green Belt and whether this is in compliance with the NPPF. In addition responses questioned the need for this Green Belt site when the overall housing needs for Service Villages can be met. Some responses set out that they felt that this would be a disproportionate addition to the village. Concerns were raised about the traffic impact of the site on	Site has been removed from the plan due to concerns over Green Belt and potential pollution impacts on the site from a nearby business.

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	Badgeworth Lane and A46, particularly with the nearby location of the school. Some felt that this site was relatively isolated from the village. A number of comments raised the potential dust and noise pollution issue from the adjacent aggregate processing business.	

Toddington		
A Land at B4077	It was recognised that the site has planning permission and is currently being developed.	Site is removed as an allocation from the Pre-submission plan as the development is substantially complete.
B Land adj to Pheasant Public House (Pre-Sub ref: TOD1)	A few comments received stated that the site would be out of character with the surrounding settlement.	Site specific policy expects development to be landscape led.

Woodmancote		
A Land adj Oxbutts Caravan Park (Pre-Sub ref: WOO1)	Some support for the allocation was noted.	No action required.

Forthampton		
A Land at corner of Bishops Walk and School Lane (Pre-Sub ref: FOR1)	Some support for the allocation was noted.	No action required.

Table 3 – Housing Policies

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
RES1 – Housing Allocations	Comments were made on RES1 were regarding the individual housing allocation sites set out at Table 1.	The assessment of sites is included within the Housing Background Paper. Generally, no new omission sites have be

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	<p>A range of omissions sites were submitted to the consultation for consideration for the Pre-Submission plan.</p>	<p>considered suitable for inclusion in the Pre-Submission plan. Further sites are also not needed to meet the requirements of JCS policy SP2.</p> <p>Three new sites have however been included in the plan, one at Bishops Cleeve and two at Brockworth. The site at Bishops Cleeve is effectively an infill site that was included within the settlement boundary in the Preferred Options plan. This is also the case for the two sites at Brockworth, however they also have already received resolutions to grant planning permission for residential development.</p>
RES2 – Settlement Boundaries	<p>A number of comments made against RES2 requested boundaries be amended to include parcels of land; many being promoted as omission sites for housing development.</p> <p>Comments were received stating that the approach to development outside settlement boundaries is too restrictive and does not provide the flexibility for growth. Others felt the boundaries were draw too tightly around the built up area of a village and this would not allow for any infill development.</p> <p>Comments were received from Maisemore and Minsterworth Parish Councils making suggested amendments to their respective boundaries.</p>	<p>The approach to development outside of settlement boundaries is deemed to be appropriate and follows from JCS Policy SD10. Growth at settlements with boundaries is already provided for, in accordance with JCS Policy SP2, through allocations both in the JCS and the TBP and Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>A review of settlement boundaries at Maisemore and Minsterworth has been undertaken. Changes have been made to the Maisemore boundary.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to the boundary at Winchcombe to take into account the removal of one of the proposed site allocations.</p>
RES3 – New Housing Outside Settlement Boundaries	<p>Comments were received stating that the approach to development outside settlement boundaries is too restrictive and does not provide the flexibility for growth. Others felt the boundaries were draw too tightly around the built up area of a</p>	<p>The approach to development outside of settlement boundaries is deemed to be appropriate and follows from JCS Policy SD10. Growth at settlements with boundaries is already provided for, in accordance with JCS Policy SP2, through allocations both in</p>

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	<p>village and this would not allow for any infill development.</p> <p>There were also some comments of support for the approach and reinstating of settlement boundaries through the TBP.</p>	<p>the JCS and the TBP and Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
<p>RES4 – New Housing at other rural settlements</p>	<p>Some comments questioned the clarity of the approach of this policy for Green Belt settlements.</p> <p>Some comments stated that they felt the policy was too restrictive, particularly references to ‘very small-scale development’ and the need to consider the cumulative impact of development since the start of the plan period.</p> <p>Some support for the policy and its aims to enhance the vitality of smaller-scale settlements.</p> <p>Some objections were received that felt that the policy was too vague in regard to the definition of ‘very small scale’ and that this could lead to developments out of proportion with smaller settlements. Other comments felt that this would undermine the JCS spatial strategy and the approach through Policy SD10.</p>	<p>Wording in policy has been amended to clarify approach for Green Belt settlements, reflecting the NPPF.</p> <p>The policy provides more flexibility than current position of policy SD10 of the JCS.</p> <p>Clarification to the policy has been provided to state that, in general, no more than 10 dwellings or a 10% increase on the size of the settlement will be allowed. The caveats included in the policy are there to carefully manage the size and scale of development at settlements that range in size, some being very small.</p> <p>The policy is not considered to undermine the JCS strategy, it provides additional opportunities for very small scale growth. Policy SD10 specifically allows for district level plans to set out other circumstances where residential development may be acceptable.</p>
<p>RES5 – New Housing Development</p>	<p>A number of comments made reference to other criteria that should be included within this policy, including: climate change, transport, green infrastructure etc</p> <p>Some objections were received to policy caveats stating that are overly restrictive and could prevent development. Particularly those covering reduction of open space, being an unacceptable intrusion in the countryside and needing to</p>	<p>The TBP is to be read as whole, with the JCS, which provides a suite of policies covering a wide range of issues that any development needs to consider. Therefore this policy does not seek to encapsulate all potential considerations.</p> <p>The policy caveats are not considered to be too restrictive or onerous. They are important issues that are factors in considering any proposals for residential development.</p>

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	incorporate natural or built features worth of retention.	
RES6 – Rural Exception Sites	<p>Some concern was expressed that this policy could lead to development in unsustainable locations in the countryside.</p> <p>A few responses requested that a set percentage limit on the amount of market homes should be introduced.</p> <p>Some responses set out that the number of affordable homes shouldn't be restricted to just the needs of a housing survey – more may be needed for site viability.</p>	<p>Provision for rural exception sites is already established through JCS Policy SD10. Policy RES6 has been updated to make clear that rural exception sites should be within or on the edge of a rural settlement.</p> <p>The policy has not included a set percentage of market units to provide flexibility. However the supporting text sets out that all proposals involving market housing much be robustly justified though a viability appraisal.</p>
RES7 – Reuse of rural buildings for residential use	<p>A number of comments set out that the caveat requiring the building to be worthy of retention is too restrictive and subjective. It was felt that the issue of controlling the conversion of buildings not capable or suitable is covered under another caveat.</p> <p>Comments highlighted the need to carefully manage conversions in sensitive landscape areas.</p>	<p>The caveat requiring the building to be worthy of retention has been removed.</p> <p>The policy has been amended to require proposals to preserve or enhance the landscape setting of the site and the rural character of the area.</p>
RES8 – Sub division of existing dwellings	A comment expressed the opinion that the policy is contrary to the NPPF as making use of existing buildings is sustainable irrespective of location and should not be treated as if it were new residential development.	<p>The caveat requiring the number of new units to be commensurate with the sustainability of the site location has been removed.</p> <p>A further caveat has been added to deal with buildings of architectural or historic importance; requiring the need to preserve or enhance those features of importance.</p>
RES9 – Replacement Dwellings	Support for this policy was expressed but it was questioned whether this should apply to all development, not just residential.	<p>No change to the policy proposed. A similar specific policy for employment development has been provided.</p> <p>JCS Policy SD4 – Design Requirements set outs the overarching requirements for the</p>

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
		design of new development. In addition to all other policies in the JCS and TBP covering a wide range of considerations need to be factored into any development.
RES10 – Alteration and extension of existing dwellings	Support for the policy was voiced.	A change to the reasoned justification has been made to remove reference to extensions of up to 50% in the Green Belt being considered proportionate. A future SPD may be produced to provide further guidance on this issue.
RES11 – Change of use of agricultural land to domestic garden	Comments supported the policy but suggested amendments to extend the policy and make specific reference to the Special Landscape Areas.	No change to the policy proposed. The policy is considered suitably robust, particularly when read with other policies in the plan.
RES12 – Affordable Housing	<p>Comments made highlighted that the policy should clarify that the 40% requirement does not apply to JCS strategic allocation sites.</p> <p>Concern was raised that, unlike the JCS policy, no provision is made for the consideration of viability and the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Objections were received to the stated tenure split requirements stating that this is beyond the JCS requirement and is not evidenced. It was also noted that a new SHMA is being produced for the JCS review.</p> <p>Concern was expressed over the requirement for affordable housing to always be provided on site.</p> <p>Comments were made that there is a need for the plan to undergo a viability assessment to ensure that this policy would not burden new development.</p>	<p>The policy now clarifies that 40% does not apply to the JCS strategic allocations (where 35% applies).</p> <p>The policy has been amended to include a number of caveats relating to viability which follow the approach taken in the JCS.</p> <p>The caveat setting out the tenure split has been removed. This will be considered as part of the JCS review which the updated SHMA.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing on site is seen as an important approach. However, the viability caveats allow for the consideration of circumstances where this would not be viable.</p> <p>A viability assessment of the plan, including this policy, has been undertaken. This has shown that development would be viable.</p> <p>The policy has been amended to require the provision of affordable housing on the smaller sites within rural designated areas to be on site. This has been enabled</p>

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	<p>There was concern from some about the approach to allowing affordable housing on smaller sites in designated rural areas to be provided in the form of off-site contributions; that it should be on-site in the first instance. Others questioned why there was only a 20% requirement in these circumstances</p>	<p>due to a recent change in the Planning Practice Guidance. On undertaking viability assessment it has been established that a 40% requirement would be viable and therefore has now been included.</p>
RES13 – Housing Mix	<p>One comment supporting the approach that development meets the needs of the local community</p>	<p>Policy has been amended to reflect the removal of the specific policies on accessible and adaptable dwellings and self-build housing and incorporate them into the housing mix policy (See RES15 and RES16 below)</p>
RES14 – Specialist accommodation for older people	<p>A few comments stated the need to demonstrate that allocated sites or sites within settlement boundaries are not available, should not be necessary and is unduly restrictive.</p>	<p>It is considered that looking at the most sustainable options for this type development is important. However, recognising that the available of such sites is likely to be restricted within settlement boundaries, wording has been made more flexible.</p>
RES15 – Accessible and Adaptable Homes	<p>Some support for this policy was expressed. A number of comments however stated that there is not sufficient evidence of need for setting higher accessibility/adaptability and wheelchair standards over and above Building Regulations.</p>	<p>The policy has been removed. It is recognised that the evidence is not yet available to fully support this policy approach. This will be further explored through the JCS review supported by the updated SHMA. Consideration and encouragement for the provision of accessible and adaptable homes has been included in the general housing mix policy.</p>
RES16 – Self and Custom Build	<p>A number of objections were received regarding the requirement in this policy for sites over 20 dwellings to provide at least 5% plots for self and custom build. Objectors stated that there was no requirement for this in the JCS and there was no evidence to justify this approach. Others highlighted that the self-build register indicated that plots on larger</p>	<p>The policy has been removed. Consideration and encouragement for the provision of self and custom build has been included in the general housing mix policy.</p>

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	<p>sites was not what the demand was for in the Borough.</p> <p>There was general support for encouraging self-build provision, but not through a specific on-site requirement.</p>	

Table 4 – Economy and Tourism Policies

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
EMP1 Major Employment Sites	<p>A range of omissions sites were submitted to the consultation for consideration as Major Employment Sites for the Pre-Submission plan. This includes a range of existing employment sites that are currently undesignated.</p> <p>Some comments raised that there should be flexibility for non-B-class uses at major employment sites as they often provided important facilities for workers – such as crèches and food outlets.</p> <p>A comment was received stating that additional areas of Major Employment Sites to be allocated should be defined in the policy and their size set out.</p>	<p>The assessment of sites is included within the Employment Background Paper. No new major employment sites have been considered suitable for inclusion in the Pre-Submission plan – although an additional area has been included at Gloucester Business Park to correct a mapping error.</p> <p>It is recognised that there are a wide range of employment sites/areas across the Borough that are covered by a formal designation of a Major Employment Site or Rural Business Centre. However, policy EMP4 provides a flexible and positive approach to the future growth of such sites/areas and that not every piece of employment land needs to be specifically identified.</p> <p>Some flexibility has been included in the policy regarding non B class uses where these would support and compliment the operation of the major employment site.</p> <p>A table listing all the major employment sites has been included in the policy that sets out where the new allocations would be and their sizes.</p>
EMP2 – Rural Business Centres	<p>A range of omissions sites were submitted to the consultation for consideration as Rural Business Centres for the Pre-Submission plan. This includes a range of</p>	<p>The assessment of sites is included within the Employment Background Paper. No new Rural Business Centres have been considered suitable for inclusion in</p>

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	<p>existing employment sites that are currently undesignated.</p> <p>A comment was received stating that additional areas of Rural Business Centres to be allocated should be defined in the policy and their size set out.</p>	<p>the Pre-Submission plan – although an additional area has been included at Highnam Business Centre.</p> <p>It is recognised that there are a wide range of employment sites/areas across the Borough that are covered by a formal designation of a Major Employment Site or Rural Business Centre. However, policy EMP4 provides a flexible and positive approach to the future growth of such sites/areas and that not every piece of employment land needs to be specifically identified.</p> <p>A table listing all the Rural Business Centres has been included in the policy that sets out where the new allocations would be and their sizes.</p>
EMP3 – Employment Sites within Settlement Boundaries	No objections but a comment was received that there is likely to be limited scope for employment development within settlement boundaries.	No action required.
EMP4 – Rural Employment Development	Support for the policy was presented. However, a comment noted that criteria 3 of the policy should be reworded to better align with existing JCS policy SD1.	Criteria 3 of the policy has been amended to allow for the redevelopment or expansion of established employment land, not just established businesses.
EMP5 – New Employment Development (General)	A number of comments supported this policy. One response did highlight the issues of employment areas providing suitable parking and facilities to delivery/lorry drivers and this should be addressed.	The policy has been amended to include a requirement for sufficient parking for heavy goods vehicles where necessary.
EMP6 – Safeguarding of Employment Sites	A number of objections were received that stated that the policy should recognise that there may be circumstances where it can be demonstrated that a site is unlikely to come forward for employment uses, and that an alternative use may have wider economic benefits.	No action required. The policy as presented provides three circumstances where it may be demonstrated that a loss of B class employment land may be acceptable. This includes where a site is no longer fit for purposes, where it has detrimental impact on the surrounding area and where the alternative use would

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
		provide significant benefits that would outweigh the loss of employment land.
AGR1 – Agricultural Development	<p>A response received commented that the potential impact of livestock on air quality had not be stated in the policy.</p> <p>A few responses received felt that intensive farm should be discouraged and avoided.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended a criteria 5 to set out that arrangements for the storage and disposal of waste do not have an unacceptable impact on air quality. Further wording also added to the reasoned justification.</p> <p>It is beyond the remit of the plan to specifically discourage the use of particular farming practices.</p>
AGR2 – Agricultural Diversification	One responses received which supported the policy.	No action required.
AGR3 – Agricultural and other rural workers dwellings	Two responses received that supported the policy.	No action required.
AGR4 – Removal of occupancy conditions	A couple of responses commented that the policy needs stronger wording around a requirement to prove that the dwelling is no longer required to support agricultural workers.	<p>No action required.</p> <p>The policy sets out that the removal of occupancy conditions will only be permitted where there is no longer a need now or in the foreseeable future. The reasoned justification explains that this will only be done in exceptional circumstances where the Council is satisfied that the retention of conditions serve no useful purpose.</p>
TOR1 – Tourism Related Development	<p>Mainly support expressed for the policy.</p> <p>One comment felt that the policy shouldn't just support development involving the reuse of existing buildings but should be expanded to new buildings also.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>The policy encourages the use of existing buildings and states 'where possible' proposals should do this. It does not state that new buildings would not be permitted.</p>
TOR2 – Serviced/self-	Two responses supported the policy. However, one response commented that settlement	No action required.

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
catering accommodation	boundaries may be too tight to allow for development within them.	
TOR3 – Caravan and camping sites	One comment highlighted a concern that a policy needs to be provided that regulates the expansion of existing sites commensurate within the size of the area.	The policy has been amended and wording added to state that all proposals must be of a scale commensurate with the surrounding area, including the scale of existing settlements.
TOR4 – Herefordshire and Gloucestershire Canal Restoration	All responses supported this policy. Although one comment stated the list of benefits in the reasoned justification should include health and wellbeing.	The list of benefits in reasoned justification has been amended to include its value to health and wellbeing.
TOR5 – Gloucestershire Warwickshire Railway	A number of comments supported this policy.	No action required.

Table 5 – Green Belt Policies

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
GRB1 – Green Belt Review	<p>A significant number of comments were received supporting that the plan does not propose to remove a potential site at Two Hedges Road, Woodmancote from the Green Belt.</p> <p>A number of objections were made in relation to the proposed release of land at Shurdington for housing allocations. Responses felt that were not exceptional circumstance present and that other non-Green Belt options were available within the Borough.</p> <p>A number of omission sites within the Green Belt were put forward for consideration.</p>	<p>The pre-submission continues the approach of not proposing release of Green Belt land at Woodmancote.</p> <p>The Green Belt land at Site D at Shurdington has been removed from the plan. Other allocations at the village have been retained in order to provide some growth at a sustainable location which is unable to grow without Green Belt land being considered.</p> <p>The assessment of sites is included within the Housing Background Paper. Generally, no new omission sites have be considered suitable for inclusion in the Pre-Submission plan. Further sites are also not needed to meet the requirements of JCS policy SP2.</p>
GRB2 – Gloucestershire Airport	A number of comments expressed concern regarding the release of Green Belt land in a	The employment around the airport is a key strategic economic area within the Borough. The

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	sensitive area between Cheltenham and Gloucester and that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated.	development of employment uses at this location is important to support the Borough's own Council Plan and Economic Strategy. Although its Green Belt location is recognised, it is felt that there are exceptional circumstances for release of land to provide additional employment growth at this location in order to meet JCS requirements for employment land provision.
GRB3 – Bamfurlong Operational Policing Site	One comment received in support of this policy.	No action required.

Table 6 – Town Centres and Retail Policies

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
RET1 – Maintaining the viability and viability of the town, borough and local centres	A number comments stated that the proposed retail centres to be delivered as part of the JCS strategic allocations should be covered by this policy.	The policy has been amended to clarify that local centres within the JCS strategic allocations are also subject to this policy.
RET2 – Tewkesbury Town Centre and Primary Frontages	A number of comments present different perspectives on the flexibility or rigidity of the approach to maintaining retail uses within the town centre, and the primary frontages in particular. The changing nature of retail and the role of centres is recognised. The JCS retail review is underway and ongoing. This will inform and impact on the approach to be taken within Tewkesbury and the JCS review may in time supersede some of its retail policies based on the latest evidence and information. However, in the meantime it is important to provide policy guidance through the Borough Plan now. The policy provides a flexible approach to encourage A1 retail uses within primary frontages but also allow for circumstances where it may be beneficial for alternative uses that contribute to the town's economy.	
RET3 – Retail Centres		
RET4 – Out of Centre Development	A number of comments stated that there is no justification provided for setting the gross floorspace threshold for a retail impact assessment at 280sqm.	This requirement has been removed and the NPPF threshold will be used. This will be explored further through the emerging JCS retail review.
RET5 – Single or Small groups of shops in residential areas	A responses commented that the approach to the sequential test for small units needs to be clarified.	Wording has been clarified to set out that small units, under 280sqm, will not be subject to the sequential test.

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
		As per policy RET4, the retail impact assessment threshold has been removed.
RET6 – Hot Food Takeaways	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
RET7 – Local Shops and Public Houses	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
RET8 – Agricultural/Horticultural Retail in the countryside	<p>A comment set out that it is not clear whether the policy covers extensions/additions to existing farm shops and garden centres.</p> <p>It was also stated that the approach for garden centres and farm shops is potentially more onerous than for other out of centre retail developments.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to make clear that it also applies to extensions.</p> <p>The policy wording has been clarified to set out that in all cases for proposed agricultural/horticultural retail (even if it must be considered under RET4) that the stated policy criteria would apply.</p>
RET9 – Tewkesbury Town Regeneration	<p>A number of comments relating to the specifics of development of these sites were made. Particularly around parking and uses.</p> <p>A few comments highlighted that the housing potential of these brownfield sites should be recognised.</p>	<p>The specific nature of the developments on these regeneration sites is not to be determined by the Borough Plan.</p> <p>The sites at Spring Gardens and Healings Mill are recognised as housing opportunities and have been included as housing allocations under policy RES1 as well as regeneration sites under this policy.</p>

Table 7 – Town Centres and Retail Policies

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
DES1 – Housing Space Standards	A number of objections were received stating that there was not sufficient evidence on viability and need – as required by the Written Ministerial Statement and the PPG – to introduce these optional space standards.	Updated and expanded evidence around viability and need is set out within the Housing Space Standards Background Paper.
DES2 – Street Signage & Furniture	Two comments received in support of this policy.	No action required.

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
DES3 – Advertisements, Signs & Notice Boards	Two comments received in support of this policy.	No action required.
DES4 - Shopfronts	Two comments received in support of this policy. One comment queried whether the emerging Shop Front Design Guide could be referenced.	No action required. The Shop Front Design Guide is referenced in the reasoned justification to the policy.
HER1 – Conservation Areas	General support was expressed for the policy, although a new of specific local issues were highlighted by some respondents. One comment pointed out that the removal of trees in conservation areas had been highlighted and this should be expanded to hedges, water features and open spaces. Another comment stated that policies do not give adequate protection to the most historic villages and that a policy should be included which only permits development in exceptional circumstances.	Along with trees, the reasoned justification text has been expanded to highlight the importance of hedges, water features and open spaces in conservation area. It is considered that the policy provides adequate protection to historic settlements and conservation areas within the scope of the NPPF.
HER2 – Listed Buildings	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
HER3 – Historic Parks and Gardens	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
HER4 – Archaeological Sites and Scheduled Monuments	Support was expressed for this policy. However, one comment objected to the policy and stated that it does not accord with the requirements of the NPPF and the need to balance harm against potential benefits.	The policy and the reasoned justification has been amended to better reflect the NPPF in regards to loss and/or harm.
HER5 – Locally Important Heritage Assets	A number of comments stated that the success of this policy will depend on the availability of an up to date register of assets, including a local list. One respondent stated the Gloucestershire Historic Record should be referenced.	The need to consult the Gloucestershire Historic Record had been added to the reasoned justification to this policy.

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
HER6 – Tewkesbury (1471) Historic Battlefield	A number of objections were received on this policy stating concern that the wording could lead to inappropriate development that could harm the battlefield.	The wording of the policy has been amended to clarify that battlefield related tourist infrastructure will be supported where it conserves the character and integrity of the battlefield. Wording has been removed that provides an exception to harm or loss as this is covered through the NPPF.

Table 8 – Natural Environment Policies

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
LAN1 – Special Landscape Areas	A number of objections were received for this policy stating that it constitutes a protectionist and negative approach, contrary to the NPPF, and that there is not adequate justification for rolling forward the special landscape areas from the current Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan.	No action required. The Special Landscape Areas were established to protect the setting of the Cotswolds AONB. It is considered that they do form a valued landscape in regard to the NPPF. There is no justification to consider altering the extent of the SLA as already established. However, it is not agreed that the policy is negatively worded. The policy states that proposals for new development will be permitted, providing that they do not harm landscape character, maintain the quality of the environment and seek opportunities to enhance these.
LAN2 – Landscape Protection Zone	A number of supportive responses to the policy were received. However, some comments objected to the policy on the basis that there is a lack of justification for the extent of the LPZ.	No action required. The extent of the LPZ is consistent with the Severn Vale Nature Improvement area and includes large areas of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh – a priority habitat. It is therefore not proposed to alter extent of the LPZ from that featured in the current Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan.
LAN3 – Strategic Gaps	Support for this policy was received by many respondents. A number of objections stated this policy was too restrictive and effectively trying to recreate Green Belt policy, or be more	It is not agreed that the policy is too restrictive and recreating Green Belt policy. The policy is permissive providing that development retains the separate identity, character and/or

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	<p>restrictive than AONB policy. This was felt to be contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>Some comments objected specifically to the strategic gap identified at Winchcombe stating that it will result in development being directed towards the AONB.</p>	<p>landscape setting of settlements and prevent their coalescence.</p> <p>In regards to Winchcombe, landscape character analysis evidences that the area between Winchcombe and Greet is highly sensitive and development may reduce the separation between the two settlements. Therefore providing some protection in this area is considered to be justified.</p>
LAN4 – Locally Important Open Spaces	General support for this policy was expressed. A number of additional important open spaces were suggested.	No amendment to the policy required. However additional spaces have been considered and added.
LAN5 – Local Green Space	General support for the policy. One comment proposed that the Local Green Spaces identified in Cheltenham on the cross-boundary West Cheltenham JCS strategic allocation should be identified.	Recognition of the Local Green Spaces on the West Cheltenham allocation have been added to the reasoned justification.
NAT1 – Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Important Natural Features	<p>A number of comments stated that they didn't feel the policy was strong enough in the protection of habitats and encouraging net biodiversity gain.</p> <p>A few comments questioned the conclusion of the HRA and potential impacts of development on the Cotswolds Beechwoods SAC and how the Borough Plan could deal with this.</p>	<p>The policy has been redrafted to include a requirement for development to deliver biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>A specific policy has now been included in the plan regarding the Cotswolds Beechwood SAC (NAT5 – Cotswolds Beechwoods). This requires residential development to mitigate any adverse impacts on the SAC from recreational impact and road traffic emissions.</p>
NAT2 – The Water Environment	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
NAT3 – Building with Nature	<p>General support for this policy provided.</p> <p>One comment stated that the specific Building with Nature standards shouldn't be referred to in case they are superseded.</p>	<p>No action required.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to refer specifically to Building with Nature as it sets out best practice principles rather than specific set standards. Furthermore, future reviews of the plan can consider this again in due course.</p>
NAT4 – Tewkesbury Nature Reserve	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
ENV1 – Development near sewage treatment works	Two comments received in support of this policy.	No action required.
ENV2 – Flood Risk and Water Management	A number of objections were receiving highlighting that this policy would effectively give statutory development plan status to the Council’s adopted Flood and Water Management SPD. This was not consider to be compliant with the NPPF or plan making regulations. A number of comments, including from the Environment Agency, felt that the policy should be an opportunity to set out further guidance on key issues.	The policy has been significantly amended to address this issue. The policy no longer refers to the SPD but sets out key principles around flood risk and water management that the Council will apply to new development. The SPD is instead referred to in the reasoned justification to highlight that it adds further detail to the JCS and TBP policies.
Policy ENV3 – Solar Farms	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.

Table 9 – Communities, Health and Recreation Policies

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
HEA1 – Healthy & Active Communities	A number of objections were received to the requirement of this policy for developments over 100 dwellings to submit a health impact assessment (HIA). It was considered that this is not justified quoting that the PPG states that a HIA can be useful tool and consultation with the director of public health can established whether a HIA would be of use.	The policy text has be amended to provide further flexibility around the need for a HIA. The policy requires a HIA where there is expected to be a significant impact on health. Developments over 100 or 10,000m2 will be required to undertake a screening to determine the need for a HIA.
RCN1 – Public Outdoor Space, Sports Pitch and Sports Facility Provision	A number of comments raised issue with the reliance of this policy of the Social, Sport and Open Space Study to provide the evidence of need. Sport England stated that the point 1 of the policy relating to the loss of provision should refer to the requirement for a robust and up to date assessment in order to demonstrate any excess of playing field.	The policy has been amended to require provision informed by the most up to date evidence, including the Social, Sport and Open Space Study. Policy has also been amended to require a robust and up to date assessment to demonstrate an excess provision in the area.

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
RCN2 – New Sports and Recreational Facilities	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
RCN3 – Allotments & Community Gardens	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
RCN4 – Horse Riding Facilities	Some support was expressed for this policy. However, one objection set out that the policy is too restrictive and negative.	It is not considered that the policy is too restrictive. The policy sets out design and siting considerations to guide new equine development. The name of the policy has been amended to RCN4 – Equine Facilities to recognise the broader scope of equine related development that may occur.
COM1 – Protecting Community Assets	General support for this policy provided. One objection stated that the policy should recognise that the loss of community facilities can occur due to modernisation and rationalisation programmes which require the revenue for the reuse of the existing facility to maintain services.	Wording has been included in the reasoned justification to set out that the closure of some facilities, and their subsequent reuses, may be require to enable reinvestment in other facilities to allow for services to be provided.
COM2 – Broadband Provision	General support for this policy provided. One representation commented that a definition of ‘high quality broadband’ should be provided.	The reasoned justification has been amended to include that superfast broadband should be provided as a minimum. It was not consider appropriate to quote a specific download speed as technology, and potential speed, changes very quickly.
COM3 - Telecommunications	General support for this policy provided. However one comment stated that the policy should include a restriction on the installation of masts in close proximity to schools and hospitals.	The policy is not able to introduce blanket restrictions on locations for new masts. However the policy does state that development will permitted there are no unacceptable adverse impacts.
COM4 – Neighbourhood Development Plans	General support for this policy provided. A number of comments specifically objected to proposed allocations under policy RES1.	No action required.

Table 10 – Transport & Accessibility

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
TRAC1 – Pedestrian Accessibility	General support for this policy provided. One comment suggested that routes should be provided from the development to local services.	Policy has been amended to state that new development should provide pedestrian routes to local services.
TRAC4 – Cycle Network & Infrastructure	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
TRAC3 – Bus Infrastructure	General support for this policy provided. One comment stated that ‘where possible’ should be removed from the requirement for major development to be located to provide easy access to bus facilities. A further comment suggested that one type of transport (i.e bus) should not be specified to mitigate a development. Instead developments should be supported by a transport statement to determine this.	The council recognises that for some development, particularly in more rural settlements, that it is not always possible for a development to have easy access to bus facilities due to nature of services provided. Accessibility to bus services, particularly from strategic scale development, is considered to be important as part of a sustainable transport mix – although policies provide approaches to pedestrian, cycle and train links. The policies do not prescribe exact infrastructure provision.
TRAC4 – High Frequency Bus Routes	General support for this policy provided. One comment suggested that policy should state that strategic scale developments should design-in mitigation for their impact on the local highway network by providing contributions to enable the design and implementation of bus and cycle routes.	It is considered that the need for development to mitigate and enhance transport networks is provided by policies TRAC1-3 as well as JCS policies INF1 and INF6.
TRAC5 – Ashchurch for Tewkesbury Rail Station	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
TRAC6 – M5 Junction 9/A46 Corridor	While there was some support for the policy, a number of comments objected to the indication that an ‘offline’ A46 would be provided.	The policy does not make any proposals for infrastructure improvements, but recognises that measures to enhance highway

Policy Area	Summary of Responses	Actions for Pre-Submission
	One objection states this policy is covering a strategic matter to be dealt with in the JCS Review and should not be included in the plan.	infrastructure will be supported in general. Although transport improvements in this area need a strategic approach, it is considered important for the Borough Plan to highlight a specific issue that is local to the area.
TRAC7 – Tewkesbury Northern Bypass Corridor	General support for this policy provided. A number of comments stated the bypass should be for walking and cycling only.	No action required.
TRAC8 – Old Railway Line Tewkesbury	General support for this policy provided.	No action required.
TRAC9 – Parking Provision	A few comments set out that parking provision should include electric charging points and incorporate SuDS. One comment set out that a specific SPD on parking standards would be beneficial.	The policy includes a requirement to provide electric charging points and has been amended to incorporate a SuDS requirement.

APPENDIX 1 – List of statutory and stakeholder consultation bodies

Statutory Consultees and Government Departments
The Coal Authority
The Environment Agency
Historic England
The Marine Management Organisation
Natural England
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
Highways England
Gloucestershire County Council
Worcestershire County Council
Malvern Hills District Council
Wychavon District Council
Forest of Dean District Council
Stroud District Council
Gloucester City Council
Cheltenham Borough Council
Cotswold District Council
Electronic Communications Operators (British Telecommunications Group; Virgin Media)
West Gloucestershire Primary Care Trust
NHS Gloucestershire Clinical Commissioning Group
National Grid
Western Power Distribution
Wales & The West Utilities Ltd
Severn Trent
Thames Water
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
Department for Digital, Culture Media and Sport
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Department for Transport
Ministry of Defence
Homes England

National organisations
Age UK
The Conservation Volunteers
CAMRA
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Canal and River Trust (formerly British Waterways)
Church Commissioners

Civil Aviation Authority
Friends of the Earth
Great Western Railways
Health and Safety Executive
House of Commons
National Farmers Union
Sport England
National Playing Fields Association (Fields in Trust)
National Trust
Sustrans
The Ramblers
The Showman's Guild of Great Britain
UK Rainwater Harvesting Association
Gypsy Law Reform Coalition
Travellers Movement
Advisory Council for the Education of Romany and other Travellers
RSPB
Association of Independent Showmen
The Woodland Trust
South West Councils

County organisations
Cotswolds Conservation Board
Carers Gloucestershire
Active Gloucestershire
Active Gloucestershire (alt)
Alzheimer's Society
County Community Projects
GAVCA
Glos CC (Economic Growth)
Glos CC (Education)
Glos County Cricket Club
Gloucestershire FA
Gloucestershire Rugby Football Union
Gloucestershire Domestic Violence Support and Advocacy Project (GDVSAP)
Gloucestershire Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Gloucestershire Care Providers Association (GCPA)
Gloucestershire Environmental Trust Company
Gloucestershire County Scout Office
Gloucestershire Police and Crime Commissioner
Gloucestershire Care Services NHS Trust

Gloucestershire Association of Parish and Town Councils
Gloucestershire Constabulary
Gloucestershire Fire Service
Gloucestershire Playing Fields Association
Gloucestershire Rural Community Council
Gloucestershire VCS alliance
Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust
Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust (alt)
Gloucestershire First (LEP)
Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership
Gloucester Youth & Community Service
Tewkesbury Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Gloucester Chamber of Commerce
Gloucestershire Association for Disability (GAD)
Gloucestershire Disability Forum
Adult Opportunity Centre
Diocese of Gloucester
Guinness Partnership
Severn Vale
Bromford
Fortis
Hanover
Sovereign
Rooftop
Cottsway
Stonewater
Two Rivers
Merlin
Gloucester City Homes
Sanctuary
Liverty
Housing & Care 21
South West Housing Body
Severn and Wye Energy Agency
Marchants
Stagecoach
Ecotricity
EDF Energy
SSE Energy
Developers Planning Consultants and Agents

APPENDIX 2 – Notification sent to all consultees

Dear Sir/Madam

Tewkesbury Borough Plan Preferred Options Consultation

I write to inform you that the Preferred Options Tewkesbury Borough Plan was approved for public consultation at a meeting of the Council on 26th September 2018.

This consultation will take place for the minimum statutory 6 week period between the 10th October 2018 and 30th November 2018.

All comments must be received by 5pm on 30th November 2018. Comments received by the deadline will be considered and will help to inform the preparation of the plan.

If you wish to make comments on what the Tewkesbury Borough Plan should contain you can respond to the consultation via our website: www.tewkesbury.gov.uk/boroughplan where there is additional information about submitting representations.

In order to make it easier to submit responses an online consultation form has been set up and we are encouraging people to use it to make their comments. This form can also be downloaded so responses can be emailed and posted to the Council.

Representations on any of the documentation should be made in writing, either via:

- the online consultation available via: www.tewkesbury.gov.uk/boroughplan
- by email localplanconsultation@tewkesbury.gov.uk
- by post to: Planning Policy Team, Deputy Chief Executive's Unit, Tewkesbury Borough Council, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury, GL20 5TT

Supporting documentation can be viewed on the council's website at www.tewkesbury.gov.uk/boroughplan or at Tewkesbury Borough Council's main offices (at the above address) and at all libraries and Advice Centres in the borough - opening times and other details are available at www.tewkesbury.gov.uk.

If you have any other questions on this consultation the Planning Policy Team can also be contacted on planningpolicyenquiries@tewkesbury.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

Planning Policy Manager

Tewkesbury Borough Council

APPENDIX 3 – Consultation response form

Response Form for the Preferred Options Tewkesbury Borough Plan

The Tewkesbury Borough Plan (TBP) is a plan for the area that will allocate sites for housing and employment development as well as provide planning policies to guide future development in the Borough. It provides a plan covering the period from 2011-2031. The Preferred Options TBP is the next step in process of creating the final version of plan.

The Preferred Options is the next draft of the plan that builds on the previous stages of the process; further refining site allocation and policy options into a version of the plan that the Council believes will promote sustainable development in Borough.

We are seeking your views on the policies and the proposals in the draft plan and would encourage you to respond by using the online consultation facility at: www.tewkesbury.gov.uk/boroughplan

However, you may also send completed forms to us via email and post:

- Email: localplanconsultation@tewkesbury.gov.uk
- Post: Local Plan Consultation, Tewkesbury Borough Council, Gloucester Road, Tewkesbury, GL20 5TT

The consultation opened on 10th October 2018 and you will be able to submit comments up to 5pm on Friday 30th November 2018.

Please complete a separate box for each policy/site option or section that you wish to comment upon.

(Additional forms can be printed from the website above).

Your details

Title:
Name:
Company:
Email Address:
Address:

If you are acting on behalf of a client, please supply the following details:

Client Name:
Client Organisation:

Keeping you updated

Would you like to be notified of future progress on the Tewkesbury Borough Plan? (* we will do this via email)

YES

NO

YOUR COMMENTS

This consultation seeks your views on the policies and sites that are presented in the Preferred Options plan.

We want to know whether you support or object to what is being proposed and, importantly, your reasons why.

Furthermore, is there anything you think that should be covered by policies in the TBP that are not currently included in the TBP (bearing in mind that the JCS also provides policies for the Tewkesbury area).

Please state the section or policy of the plan that you wish to make a comment on. This will help us understand easily which areas of the plan people have a view on.

Please state which policy, site option or section you are commenting upon?

Please state whether you are (please tick as appropriate)

Objecting

Supporting

Comment

Please give your reasons below (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

