

STRATEGY OPTIONS

1. HOUSING ALLOCATIONS

<u>Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<u>(A) Stick to Local Plan housing allocations and numbers</u>	CDC allocations are unlikely to be delivered within the Plan period in practice, so further impact on local infrastructure will be minimised.	They will not contribute to ‘significantly boosting the supply of housing’ as required by national policy; to the extent that they might be delivered, they will in practice continue the trend towards more ‘dormitory’ housing for out-commuters and do little to help the sustainability of Fairford. Since they are unlikely to be delivered in the Plan period, they will not contribute to addressing infrastructure deficits or meeting locally generated housing need in the short term – Only positive planning can do this.
<u>(B) Propose limited additional/alternative sites</u>	Alternative NDP sites can meet genuine local housing need as it arises and provide basis for addressing infrastructure issues earlier	Some potential sites would need to be sensitively developed due to their locations and relationship with the Special Landscape Area, Conservation Area and listed buildings (This can be managed through appropriate conditions in NDP policies).
<u>(C) Larger expansion</u>	Larger scale development could enable more comprehensive infrastructure improvements to be planned (although, based on past experience and taking account of the legal and financial position, it would by no means guarantee that these would actually happen).	This is unlikely to be acceptable to the people of Fairford at the present time; it would inevitably encroach significantly more into the countryside, further urbanise the character of the town (both physically and socially) with increasingly remote ‘suburb’ estates, and have greater impact on Fairford itself and neighbouring settlements due to increased traffic; it also risks furthering a trend towards ‘ribbon’ development along the A417.

STRATEGY OPTIONS

2. TOWN CENTRE AND LOCAL ECONOMY

<u>Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<u>(A) Promote town centre and other employment</u>	Local businesses (and tourist attractions) contribute to footfall in town centre and hence its vitality and viability (and ability to service the local community)	Potential issues with traffic and parking
<u>(B) Allow it to decline</u>	Less traffic and parking issues in the town centre	Likely further loss of shops and services (inconsistent with designated role of Fairford as a District Centre), with out-commuters shopping elsewhere and increasing difficulty of access to facilities for the ageing population.
<u>Conclusion/Recommendation:</u> [On this basis option A is preferred]		

3. SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR FACILITIES

<u>Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<u>(A) Centre-focused</u>	Supports vitality/viability of town centre	Constrained by limited space and distances from newer developments on outskirts
<u>(B) Distributed facilities</u>	Potential to create community focus points for outlying developments and provide opportunity for facilities of a kind less compatible with the historic centre (or other parts of the Conservation Area)	This could undermine vitality of town centre and 'integrity' of Fairford as a community
<u>(C) Combination of these</u>	Facilities which are complementary rather than directly competing with those in the town centre would add to overall provision in Fairford and provide local focus points for outlying developments without undermining the overall sense of community; would also relieve some pressure on parking etc. in the town centre.	Could detract to some extent from footfall and vitality of the town centre
<u>Conclusion/Recommendation:</u> [On this basis option C is preferred]		

STRATEGY OPTIONS

4. INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTIONS

<u>Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<u>(A) Rely on Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions (only)</u>	Contributions according to charging schedule; share will come to FTC automatically once we have a NDP in place.	CDC site allocations are unlikely to be developed in the Plan period, so financial contributions can only come from windfalls or NDP allocations that could be delivered earlier; does not address location-specific issues.
<u>(B) seek sites that can help deliver specific benefits</u>	Some requirements/benefits relate to specific locations and can only be delivered there; CIL contributions alone will not help to deliver these.	These may not be available; CIL charging basis may impact viability, unless specific exemption can be obtained.

5. GREEN SPACES/COUNTRYSIDE

<u>Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<u>(A) Develop spaces/sites within town</u>	avoids encroachment into countryside and keeps distances shorter	Extends/creates hard urban boundary, impacting rural nature of edge communities; green spaces within the town make an important contribution to its character.
<u>(B) Develop outside boundary</u>	Preserves green spaces within town and green gaps/wedges and rural character of edge communities	Encroachment into 'countryside'; potentially extends distances from centre

STRATEGY OPTIONS

6. PREFERRED DIRECTION FOR FUTURE GROWTH

<u>Options</u>	<u>Pros</u>	<u>Cons</u>
<u>South-East (East End/London Road)</u>	Employment sites to SE; possible infill opportunity between London Road industrial site and previous development, although other gaps are in use as sports ground	Generally low lying with high ground water levels; impacts popular walking area with river landscape noted in White report (this is also some of the best agricultural land, although increasingly disconnected); some access constraints and relatively remote from schools and town centre facilities; contributes to undesirable 'ribbon development' along A417 between Fairford and Lechlade
<u>South-West (Cirencester Road/Horcott)</u>	Employment site in Horcott (at capacity with little/no scope for expansion)	Generally low lying with high ground water levels; popular walking area at Horcott lakes; infill development would further impact rural character and setting of the town and the western end of the Conservation Area, and lead to the coalescence of Horcott with Fairford; access constraints and relatively remote from schools and town centre facilities; Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1.
<u>North-West (Milton Farm/West End)</u>	Low fluvial flood risk;	Surface water issues; access routes constrained and have limited capacity (except to Quenington); GWSPZ 1; continues urbanisation and loss of rural character on western side of Fairford; relatively distant from schools and other facilities; potential impact on important part of Special Landscape Area (noted in White report update re site F_35B) as well as on NDHA at Milton Farm and setting of Conservation Area.
<u>North- East (Leafield Road/Hatherop Road)</u>	Identified by Local Plan SA as most sustainable area for development; low flood risk; close to schools; more pleasant location than next to industrial estate; generally open flat landscape interspersed with patches of woodland; potential for public open space and access also serving existing housing in NE Fairford (as part of a Master plan).	Adjacent to Fairford Park BAP priority habitat, Special Landscape Area and NE corner of Conservation Area, also possibly visible from edge of AONB just over 1 mile away, so would need to be appropriately screened by new tree planting (which could also provide biodiversity benefits).