

Q1.2.2 – Local Policy

The JCS, as adopted, does not stipulate that for individual allocations, each subsequent planning application must not go ahead in advance of any road improvement scheme but to set out how it proposes to ensure the particular scheme would need to address “the provision of infrastructure and services required as a consequence of development,” Paragraph 5.8.7 of the JCS goes on to say “This policy will primarily be delivered through the development management process. Early engagement with the Local Planning Authority at pre-application stage is encouraged. Developers may note in this respect that Gloucestershire County Council has adopted a ‘Local Developer Guide: Infrastructure & Services with New Development’ (February 2013) that relates to infrastructure requirements and associated matters for which it is responsible.” (Our Highlighting)

(i) Is it not the case, that even if the ExA were to accept the Applicant’s case that the need for the broad infrastructure improvements has been established through the evidence base for the JCS, the actual policy and supporting paragraphs do not specifically require this proposed development, or specifically justify it in need terms.

(ii) Does it not remain the case for the developer to demonstrate to the LPA’s satisfaction that the scheme proposed provides the infrastructure and services required as a consequence of the individual developments?

Our interpretation of the policy position is consistent with that expressed by the ExA in part (i) of the question.

When we prepared our Outline Planning Application the proposals for improvements at J10 were well advanced and funded. As a result, it was assumed in the transport modelling that they would be delivered.

It is vital for the development of Golden Valley that we endeavour to commence construction in 2025 and proceed with development as demand requires. As a mixed use development, the commercial component also needs to proceed in parallel with residential development.

Had the J10 improvement scheme not been advanced and funding had not been committed through HIF, alternative highways measures would have been proposed in support of the development.

Q1.3.1 - Alternatives

Noting the evidence provided in support of the applications for allocations A4 and A7 and recognising that it is a decision for the LPA as to whether to grant planning permission for the applications. What is the IPs position on the consideration of

As explained in response to Q.1.2.2, given the status of the J10 scheme, it has been assumed that the works would come forward in the transport modelling supporting the planning application. No alternative proposals have therefore been developed or promoted by HBD which address the transport implications of the proposed with separate, alternative highways mitigation.

<p>alternatives for the delivery of the Proposed Development?</p>	
<p>Q5.0.1 - Funding</p> <p>At CAH1 the Joint Councils advised that there had been a change to the Community Infrastructure Levy Funding Statement. Please can all parties explain what implications this has for the funding in respect of Compulsory Acquisition and the obligations under those regulations, and secondly in the Applicant's capacity to fund the construction of the project. In responding, please set out any implications for the timing of the delivery of such funding, and as far as you can the changes to the amount of funding this could ultimately deliver, relative to the sums which might be delivered through s106 alone?</p>	<p>The inclusion of the J10 improvement works on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Funding Statement means that CIL receipts could now be used as a contribution towards the funding of the scheme. CIL monies would be phased over the lifetime of the development and linked to the commencement of detailed phases as they come forward.</p>
<p>Q5.0.2 – Funding</p> <p>The ExA understand that the Community Infrastructure Levy Amendment Regulations 2019 removed the restrictions on pooling funds and on funding the same item of infrastructure from both CIL and s106 obligations. Can each party explain the changes that the inclusion of the M5 J10 within the Infrastructure Funding Statement has in respect of the potential to facilitate funding in combination with any s106 money?</p>	<p>See 5.0.1 above</p>