

## CHAPTER 2 - STRATEGY

### APPENDIX 1

## GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO STRATEGY CHAPTER AND PARAGRAPHS 2.6.1 TO 2.6.4 – LIST OF OBJECTIONS

### The Objections

Strat/514/2194	Pamela Evans
Strat/188/0454	Gavin Owen
Strat/139/0372	Miss Maureen Stone
Strat/31/0220	Mr Richard Westcott
Strat/77/0276	Mr Julian Bendle
Strat/613/2627	Cllr Mr Ellerby
Strat/320/0979-CW	Country Land & Business Association
Strat/581/2539	Mr RD Grist
Strat/543/2312	Government Office for the South West
Strat/619/2643	Mr Byrne
Strat/615/2631	Mr J Berry
Strat/164/0421	Mrs Kear
Strat/107/0325	Mrs Linda Purchase
Strat/97/0297	Mr Roger Smith
Strat/188/0452	Gavin Owen
Strat/108/0327	Mr David Manzi-Fe
Strat/413/1485	Barratt Bristol Ltd
Strat/397/1318	Stroud District Task Force
Strat/397/1319	Stroud District Task Force
Strat/397/1320	Stroud District Task Force
Strat/397/1322	Stroud District Task Force
Strat/518/2200	Mr & Mrs Bell
Strat/50/0241	Mrs Mary Vaughan
Strat/516/2197	Mr & Mrs Bennett
Strat/510/2188	Alan Steward
Strat/390/1271	George Wimpey UK Limited
Strat/513/2192	Duncan Hall
Strat/515/2196	Jackie Hall
Strat/409/1381	Buchanan Partnership
Strat/143/0380	Mrs Mary Boddy
Strat/190/0458	Graham Stanley
Strat/189/0455	J M Clarke
Strat/155/0393	Mrs Joanne Smith
Strat/195/0464	Mrs V C Baker
Strat/para. 2.6.0./406/3392	Mrs J Dunlop
Strat/para. 2.6.0./234/0624	David Wilson Homes South West
Strat/para. 2.6.0./29/0215	Mr A J King
Strat/para. 2.6.0./393/1283	Orchard Trust
Strat/para. 2.6.0./404/3385	Mr & Mrs H Shuttleworth
Strat/para. 2.6.0./408/3405	Hardwicke Court Estate
Strat/para. 2.6.0./415/1503	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited

Strat/para. 2.6.0./215/0507	Diocese of Gloucester
Strat/para. 2.6.0./407/3399	Smith Barry Estate
Strat/para. 2.6.0./413/3475	Barratt Bristol Ltd
Strat/para. 2.6.0./396/3375	Mr & Mrs E J Young
Strat/para. 2.6.0./228/0530	Stroud Town Council
Strat/para. 2.6.0./543/3751	Government Office for the South West
Strat/para. 2.6.0./409/1383	Buchanan Partnership
Strat/para. 2.6.0./215/3100	Diocese of Gloucester
Strat/para. 2.6.0./413/1487	Barratt Bristol Ltd
Strat/para. 2.6.0./296/0746	Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd
Strat/para. 2.6.0./412/3472	Crest Strategic Projects Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.0./412/1452	Crest Strategic Projects Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.0./543/2245	Government Office for the South West
Strat/para. 2.6.0./398/4052	Mrs E Akhurst
Strat/para. 2.6.0./299/0805	Gloucester City Council
Strat/para. 2.6.0./306/3185	Persimmon Strategic Land
Strat/para. 2.6.1.a/415/3493	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.b/228/3107	Stroud Town Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.b/415/3494	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.c/415/3495	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.d/415/3496	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.f/558/3810	Robert Hitchins Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.g/415/3497	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.h/228/3110	Stroud Town Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.h/415/3498	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.h/558/3808	Robert Hitchins Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.h./1/3000	Gloucestershire County Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.j/415/3499	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.j/558/3807	Robert Hitchins Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.j/300/3180	Eastington Parish Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.j/299/3176	Gloucester City Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.k/205/3097	Wotton under Edge Town Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.m/415/3500	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.n/415/3501	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.o/205/3096	Wotton under Edge Town Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.o/390/3362	George Wimpey UK Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.p./1/3001-CW	Gloucestershire County Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.p/390/3363	George Wimpey UK Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.q/390/3364	George Wimpey UK Limited
Strat/para.2.6.1.s/415/3502CW	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.t/175/3078	Richmond Healthcare Developments Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.t/552/3792	Painswick Parish Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.t./1/3002	Gloucestershire County Council
Strat/para. 2.6.1.u/558/3806	Robert Hitchins Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.1.v/558/3805	Robert Hitchins Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.2./315/0896	Bloor Homes
Strat/para. 2.6.2./415/3503	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.2./558/3809	Robert Hitchins Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.2./306/3186	Persimmon Strategic Land
Strat/para. 2.6.2./413/1488	Barratt Bristol Ltd
Strat/para. 2.6.2./577/2502	NHS Executive South West
Strat/para. 2.6.2./42/0231	Mr E Coates

Stroud District Local Plan - Inspector's Report

Strat/para. 2.6.2./558/2419	Robert Hitchins Limited
Strat/para. 2.6.2./408/1368	Hardwicke Court Estate
Strat/para. 2.6.2./408/1367	Hardwicke Court Estate
Strat/para. 2.6.4./415/3504	Redrow Homes (SW) Limited

**CHAPTER 2 – STRATEGY**

**APPENDIX 2**

<b>Item by Item Response to the Summary of Objections</b>	
<b>Summary of Objections</b>	<b>Inspector’s Response</b>
<b>Draft for Deposit Plan</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The strategy to develop Hunt's Grove will encourage migration towards Gloucester for shopping and leisure. It will not help to regenerate Stroud. It will also eat into the countryside buffer between Gloucester and Stonehouse. It is questionable whether the Council has investigated and searched for 'brownfield' sites</li> </ul>	<p>i) I have dealt with the general question of the sequential search for development sites in the main part of my conclusions in Chapter 2. I deal with the site specific objections to the Hunt’s Grove allocation in the Housing Chapter of my report. On the question of brownfield sites, I am satisfied that the Council has adequately investigated availability, especially by way of the Urban Capacity study.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing allocation at Hunt's Grove uses urban fringe land putting more pressure on Gloucester's facilities. It would be more sensible to redevelop on land within Stroud, thus increasing its population and assisting the town’s revival.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The south of Gloucester is not appropriate as a location to meet Stroud's housing needs and does not conform to the Structure Plan. Housing allocations should be within and adjacent to Stroud town firstly, and then dispersed to other settlements. Previously agreed targets for village housing should be reinstated and extended.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i). A dispersed strategy with allocations distributed in villages would not be sustainable or in accord with PPG3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no evidence in the Local Plan that sites within and adjacent to Stroud/Stonehouse have been assessed for potential development. Housing allocation at Hunt's Grove is unlikely to</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i).</p> <p>A considerable proportion of the housing within the plan period has and will be provided throughout the district, including in Stroud and Stonehouse. Housing development possibilities in</p>

<p>meet local needs and do nothing to promote the regeneration of Stroud town. These are more likely to be met by development in the Stroud/Stonehouse area.</p>	<p>Stroud and Stonehouse are dealt with in the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan fails to make appropriate allocations at Stroud town to meet Stroud's needs. More housing is required there to maintain economic prosperity and deliver reduced car usage.</li> </ul>	<p>Housing development possibilities in Stroud and Stonehouse are dealt with in the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An excessive proportion of development is proposed in the central Severn Vale at the expense of other parts of the District. Greater emphasis should be placed on the Stroud Valleys and the rest of the District.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing land allocations should be looked for around Stonehouse and Leonard Stanley in order to benefit Stroud.</li> </ul>	<p>See the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should look to land south of Stonehouse for future development to help the economies of Stroud and Stonehouse.</li> </ul>	<p>Housing development possibilities in Stroud and Stonehouse are dealt with in the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy is based on 'predict and provide' and there is no inbuilt mechanism to respond to changing needs.</li> </ul>	<p>The Plan follows the need to provide a level of development in accordance with the Structure Plan. Phasing policies have been incorporated into the Plan, and it will be monitored for effectiveness.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stroud and Dursley need regenerating. Evidence from the Peghouse Rise Study and the Shoppers Survey (commissioned by SDC) indicates housing in Stroud would be sustainable. Housing at Hardwicke will do nothing for Stroud and the opportunity to create a "critical mass" of development to regenerate Stroud will be missed. The AONB surrounding Stroud does not mean 'no development'. There are valid planning reasons to build in this area.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i), and the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is questionable whether the principles of the Strategy are viable. 'Prevention is better than cure' - is this reasonable? 'Polluter must pay' - will this be handled reasonably? - Often the landowner is not the polluter.</li> </ul>	<p>These questions do not provide a clear indication of how the Plan should be changed, but in any event the objection has been conditionally withdrawn. I need make no further comment.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Putting 55% of new housing allocations at the edge of the District will not assist regeneration of the District. Development should be allocated to the towns and rural areas of the District to assist the viability of those centres</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i). See also the Housing Chapter of my report. A dispersed strategy with allocations distributed in villages would not be sustainable or in accord with PPG3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale of development proposed at Cam/Dursley should be more fully explained, particularly in relation to the likely availability of employment in these settlements and existing and future provision of public transport.</li> </ul>	<p>See the Dursley Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be better if houses were dispersed throughout the District giving everyone a healthier life and a more liveable environment.</li> </ul>	<p>A dispersed strategy with allocations distributed in villages would not be sustainable or in accord with PPG3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little thought has been put into the housing allocation. The plan will not achieve the aims set out in the Gloucestershire Structure Plan, and will do very little for the economy, environment and quality of life for people living in Stroud district. The plan defeats the object it is there for.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i), and the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hunts Grove is not a brownfield site. It will lead to urban sprawl and encourage ribbon development along the M5 motorway</li> </ul>	<p>See the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing allocations for the villages are too low and unsustainable. Evidence in reports from the Rural Development Commission, Countryside Agency and a Women's Institute survey all point to declining rural services.</li> </ul>	<p>A dispersed strategy with allocations distributed in villages would not be sustainable or in accord with PPG3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy needs elaboration, in particular the role and functions of defined principal settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i) above.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regeneration strategies for town centres are not sufficiently developed.</li> </ul>	<p>The objection does not provide a clear indication of how the Plan should be changed. I take the view that a balanced approach has been taken, with, in general, sufficient attention being paid to the need for regeneration.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential of brownfield land should be further explored to contribute to the housing requirement of the District. Urban capacity studies should be undertaken for all urban areas in the District and a mechanism established for regular review.</li> </ul>	<p>This objection has been overcome by subsequent events: an Urban Capacity Study has been carried out, and it is intended to review the Plan as required by government guidance.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Towns should not be allowed to sprawl into the countryside.</li> </ul>	<p>I agree. See also Response i). See also the Housing Chapter of my report. A dispersed strategy with allocations distributed in villages would not be sustainable or in accord with PPG3.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is inadequate testing of the strategy and proposals of the Local Plan. There is no environmental appraisal of the Plan. The plan is lengthy and over-prescriptive, including unnecessarily detailed policies that do not contribute to the overall strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>I deal elsewhere in this report with the question of the testing of the Plan. I am not satisfied that the Plan has been properly appraised in an iterative process as it has gone along. However this shortcoming is to an extent addressed by the objection process and testing at the inquiry. More fundamentally, I consider that it is important for the Council to have an adopted and up-to-date local plan. In the review of the Plan which must follow (which is likely to be under the terms of the Government's new framework as set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) the shortcomings of an inadequate environmental appraisal should be addressed.</p> <p>I make recommendations which should result in the Plan being more concise.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A disproportionate level of development is directed to the central Severn Vale as compared to Stroud and the Stroud Valleys. The aim of regenerating Stroud and Dursley will not be achieved by the level of allocations in the central Severn Vale. Those allocations and the excessive levels of development in the villages may also fail to meet the aim of achieving the most efficient and effective use and provision of services and facilities. Sites in villages may not have access to urban areas by public</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i) and the Housing Chapter of this report. Also the Revised Deposit Plan has made changes to the distribution of development, taking into account the Urban Capacity Study.</p>

<p>transport and it compromises the policies to protect vulnerable countryside. More development should be located in the Stroud area; less in the central Severn Vale and the villages.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The strategy should make allowance for redevelopment of brownfield sites that may become available outside existing settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>Beyond the broad indication of government guidance on sustainable development, and the strategic policy which the Plan must follow, I see no need to make reference to brownfield sites in the Strategy Chapter of the Plan. Government guidance and RPG10 both emphasise and prioritise the use of previously developed land in urban areas, not such land in rural areas. GSP Policy S3 warns that such sites in rural locations may be intrusive in the countryside or highly unsustainable.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development that enlarges urban sprawl it will lead to traffic congestion and increased crime. Infrastructure provision does not accompany such growth, especially for younger people.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i) and the Housing Chapter of this report. Comprehensively planned development should not lead to traffic congestion or increased crime, and should be accompanied by adequate infrastructure provision. These are largely matters of detail which it is the responsibility of the local planning authority to deal with at the detailed stage.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 2.6.2 does not reflect the Structure Plan. Within the District clear priority should be given to growth at Stroud and Stonehouse and to Cam and Dursley.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The strategy makes little reference to transport considerations. It is not clear what account has been taken of Government or structure plan objectives for transport in the formulation of the strategy or how the plan seeks to promote the integration of land use and transportation. There is no reference to the Local Transport Plan or its relationship with the local plan strategy, policies or proposals. The plan should be redrafted to set out a clear, integrated strategy that takes full account of transport considerations. The strategy should explain more clearly the relationship between Stroud District and the urban areas of Gloucester and Cheltenham, particularly in relation to</li> </ul>	<p>Much of the concern in this objection was dealt with in the Revised Deposit version of the Plan. However, see also my conclusions in the main body of this chapter, where amongst other things I seek to reduce the amount of narrative and make the Plan more concise.</p>

<p>employment, transport and access to shopping, education and other facilities. A clearer context is needed for development in the district which, by virtue of its location, type and functional links, relates more closely to the Gloucester urban area than to Stroud district itself. The plan's strategy should be clearer about the respective roles of Stroud, extensions to the Gloucester urban area, Cam/Dursley and the smaller rural settlements. The aim should be to provide for development that is consistent with the scale and character of settlements and their access to employment, services and public transport. Particular attention needs to be given to demonstrating that the plan's proposals will not contribute to increased car travel, especially through commuting. This is especially relevant to the plan's proposals for significant amounts of housing at locations close to the M5 motorway. The scale of development proposed at Cam/Dursley also needs to be more fully explained, particularly in relation to the likely availability of employment in these settlements and existing and future provision of public transport.</p>	
<p><b>Revised Deposit Plan</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan's strategy could still be clearer, with particular attention needing to be given to demonstrating that the plan's proposals are indeed in line with strategic guidance and will not contribute to increased car travel, especially through commuting. It is difficult to demonstrate this via Table 2.2, for example.</li> </ul>	<p>I have taken the view that the Strategy Chapter is unnecessarily long, and that much of the explanatory material can be omitted. At the same time I consider that the Strategy as I recommend it to be modified, expressed in a very concise form, is in accord with Government, Regional and Strategic guidance, and in particular has taken account of the need to reduce the use of private motor vehicles.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of role and function of settlements is inadequate as a basis for housing land allocation and is inconsistent in different parts of the Plan. Criteria for identifying role and function of settlement is unclear. Analysis ignores role of smaller settlements. Also, major inconsistencies exist within the analysis which seeks to outline role of District's main settlements but includes small settlements (i.e. Sharpness, Whitminster).</li> </ul>	<p>I have recommended a modified settlement strategy which I consider makes clear the role and function of each level of settlement.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are major inconsistencies in settlement analysis expressed in section 2.6...             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.6.1b Plans should not prejudice the next plan period</li> <li>2.6.1c-f Influence of Cheltenham should be discussed in same way as that of Gloucester</li> <li>2.6.1j Not clear why Stonehouse is seen as a Principal Settlement whereas Nailsworth and Wotton are not</li> <li>2.6.1k-l Not clear why Cam/Dursley has changed status from Urban Area to Principal Settlement</li> <li>2.6.1m Why is Nailsworth not included under Other Settlements as it is neither Urban Area nor Principal Settlement.</li> <li>2.6.1n Role of Stroud Valley Settlements is ambiguous. Why is Box considered to be one of these settlements?</li> <li>2.6.1p-q Kingswood and Sharpness cannot be considered 'main settlements'</li> <li>2.6.1t-u Painswick and Eastington are very different in size and function. Therefore criteria for inclusion should be identified</li> <li>2.6.1v Suggests, by implication, that Whitminster is unsuitable for expansion.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>My analysis recognises inconsistencies in the Strategy and recommends modifications which is both more concise and internally consistent.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is inconsistency as to which settlements are 'principal settlements'. The hierarchy of settlements needs clarifying and to be used consistently in the Plan. The reasoning for the definition of 'principal settlements' needs clarifying. Is it their size or their function that determines the definition?</li> </ul>	<p>See Section 2.1 b of Chapter 2 and Section 6.4 of Chapter 6 of this report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is confusion between principal settlements defined for housing land policy and those defined for retail policy.</li> </ul>	<p>See Section 6.4 of Chapter 6 of this report</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy in 2.6 is inconsistent with sustainable principles or the planning policy framework identified in national, regional and strategic guidance because             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth is directed to the central Severn Vale - a rural area. This is inconsistent with the requirement to focus on existing urban areas.</li> <li>▪ There is no clear and robust assessment and identification of 'principal' urban areas having regard to the Structure Plan criteria.</li> <li>▪ Berkeley, previously categorised as a principal settlement, is excluded.</li> <li>▪ No justification is given why smaller settlements than Berkeley have been identified for development</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>See a) and b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Berkeley should be identified as a principal settlement.</li> </ul>	<p>See my recommendations on the Plan's Strategy.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the allocation of large scale sites on the edges of urban areas such as that at Hunt's Grove, south of Gloucester, as these lead to urban sprawl. Development should go where it is needed for regeneration at Sharpness, Dursley, Stroud/Stonehouse, and to Painswick for its appropriate growth.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i) above, and b) and c) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater effort could be made to integrate the aims of the Plan with the elements of the strategy. However, the strategy as expressed through the policies and proposals is fundamentally unsound. In particular it will not accommodate 'the anticipated levels of growth in a sustainable way' because it fails to achieve a locational balance between employment and housing. It is unbalanced in relating new development to existing development and in the relationship of new employment to new housing.</li> </ul>	<p>See Section 2.1 of this report and sub-section d) in particular.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst no objection is made to the strategy, it has not been followed correctly. More housing should be directed to the Stroud urban area and its immediate environs. This is a more sustainable location than many other areas subject of housing allocations in the plan. Brownfield sites outside Stroud should not be allocated just because they are brownfield. Greenfield sites should not be allocated in Small Towns/Large Villages.</li> </ul>	<p>See Response i) above.</p> <p>It is necessary to make provision for new housing throughout the District: it would be wrong to concentrate all housing within Stroud urban area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There is ambiguity in the Plan as regards the definition of 'Stroud', 'the Stroud Urban Area' and the 'Stroud Valleys'. It is not clear that Stroud is above other settlements in the hierarchy. The Stroud Valleys incorporates a number of settlements of varying scale and function. No distinction is made as to which settlements will accommodate a given level of growth. Also there is no distinction between Stroud and Cam and Dursley. The Plan fails to make sufficient allocations in the Stroud Valleys (table 2.2) and too many in Cam and Dursley and the rest of the District. Overall, the Plan places too much emphasis on other parts of the District than Stroud.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter and my responses to individual site specific objections.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient significance is given to the role of Stroud urban area and the adjoining land as a sustainable location</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-sections a) and b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter and my responses to individual site specific objections.</p>

<p>for housing - to accord with PPG3 para 67.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stroud and Stonehouse fall within the definition of the Central Severn Vale (addendum report of Structure Plan Panel) but inadequate housing allocations within or near their centres do not reflect this. As the next tier of the hierarchy Cam and Dursley should be allocated more housing. These increases in allocations should be at the expense of the Hardwicke allocation where too much reliance is placed, and instead of smaller unsustainable allocations made to smaller settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter and my responses to individual site specific objections.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The priority to be accorded to locations 'adjacent or close by' to Gloucester needs to be far more explicit within the strategy. It should also make it clear that having maximised brownfield sites in sustainable locations, next priority should be to locations within the Central Severn Vale. Following that, attention should be turned to locations adjacent Stroud urban area.</li> </ul>	<p>See Section 2.1 of this Chapter.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strategy does not take account of the Structure Plan EiP Panel comments on the appropriate scale of development for south of Gloucester and the suitability of Stroud/Stonehouse for development to meet the needs of the District. It is not in conformity with the Structure Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>It is the adopted Structure Plan which provides strategic guidance, not the EiP Panel. See also sub-section a) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role of Cam/Dursley as a principal settlement (focus for housing and services in southern area of District) is not reflected in the housing allocations in the Plan. Shortage of allocations will</li> </ul>	<p>In my opinion the Plan, with the modifications that I recommend, makes adequate provision for housing, bearing in mind the existing imbalance between the economically active population and employment. See also response i) above.</p>

<p>prevent growth and prosperity in the south of the District. Undue weight is given to allocating land adjacent to Gloucester.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dursley/Cam should be afforded equal priority to Stroud/Stonehouse in terms of housing provision. In line with PPG3 housing development should be located in and around main settlements and not within villages as this is unsustainable.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 to this Chapter. I recommend that Stonehouse be considered part of the Stroud Urban Area. The Urban Area is above a Principal Settlement in the hierarchy. Little housing is provided for in villages.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 2.6.1a as a whole provides no explanation for the fact that the Council has not produced an adopted Plan since it came into being in 1974.</li> </ul>	<p>I consider that there is no need for such detail, and I have recommended a much more concise version of the Strategy. In any event it is the adoption of a plan as quickly as possible which is now of importance.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan should not make proposals to carry forward into next plan period.</li> </ul>	<p>This paragraph is referring to making a strategy with sustainability at its heart – which will be reflected beyond the plan period. However, I consider that this is too detailed a statement, and I have recommended a much more concise explanation of the Strategy.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Gloucester being singled out as the only significant external influence on the District. This is not the case as the Plan acknowledges in 2.3.10.</li> </ul>	<p>This is part of the detail which I consider is unnecessary, and which will be deleted if my recommendations are followed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brockworth airfield is not part of Gloucester's urban form. It is in Upton St Leonards Parish and not the settlement as implied.</li> </ul>	<p>This is part of the detail which I consider is unnecessary, and which will be deleted if my recommendations are followed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gloucester's heyday as a manufacturing centre is long gone. It is misleading to refer to its strong industrial heritage. 1991 Census shows Gloucester to have lower percentage of its employment in manufacturing than County and national averages, and compared with Stroud itself.</li> </ul>	<p>This is part of the detail which I consider is unnecessary, and which will be deleted if my recommendations are followed.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to focus of development in the Central Severn Vale. This misinterprets the Structure Plan which makes it clear that Stroud's focus should be the urban area of Stroud and Stonehouse. The Structure Plan is clear that development south of Gloucester should not occur beyond the administrative boundary of Gloucester. The Hunts Grove proposal will compromise the ability of Gloucester to meet its own housing requirements and achieve urban renewal.</li> </ul>	<p>I have dealt with the general question of the sequential search for development sites, including the role of the Stroud Urban Area, in the main part of my conclusions in Chapter 2. I deal with the site specific objections to the Hunt's Grove allocation in the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 2.6.1g places inappropriate emphasis on the influence of Gloucester on Stroud.</li> </ul>	<p>This is part of the detail which I consider is unnecessary, and which will be deleted if my recommendations are followed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Stroud urban area is highly constrained for physical, environmental and policy reasons. This should be reflected in para 2.6.1h</li> </ul>	<p>The Council has proposed a charge which would meet the objection. However, this is part of the detail which I consider is unnecessary, and which will be deleted if my recommendations are followed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 2.6.1h incorrectly interprets the Structure Plan (H4 &amp; E2) on the extent of the Stroud urban area. Stonehouse should be considered as part of this urban area.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 to this Chapter. I recommend that Stonehouse be considered part of the Stroud Urban Area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stroud is not the District's only urban area. The Structure Plan refers to the urban area as being Stroud/Stonehouse. The sections on Stroud and Stonehouse should be re-written and amalgamated into Stroud/Stonehouse.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 to this Chapter. I recommend that Stonehouse be considered part of the Stroud Urban Area.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although Stonehouse could have separate identity to Stroud, it does not follow that it should be treated as separate for strategic planning purposes, when opportunities for development in and around Stroud are limited (2.6.1g). It is misleading to suggest the Structure Plan defines principal settlements as Structure Plan policy S2 leaves it to the District Councils to do this. However, it should be done appropriately.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 to this Chapter. I recommend that Stonehouse be considered part of the Stroud Urban Area.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The status of Stonehouse is open to mis-interpretation, giving rise to development proposals which would have a totally unacceptable impact on the community. It is not considered suitable as a focus for development. The adjacent employment area serves the whole of the District and not just Stonehouse. The town is constrained to the east by the AONB, to the west by industry and in the north the rural environs of Standish parish. Any new housing west of Stonehouse would in fact be west of the industrial estate and not be an extension of Stonehouse. It would be a 'new settlement' and be contrary also to Structure Plan policy. Stonehouse should not be defined as a principal settlement. It does not compare well with Cam and Dursley for that role.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 to this Chapter. I recommend that Stonehouse be considered part of the Stroud Urban Area. See also my conclusions on site specific aspects in the Housing Chapter of this report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to Cam and Dursley receiving equal status to Stroud in the settlement hierarchy. They should be below Stroud in the order. Some of the allocations in Cam and Dursley should be replaced at Stroud.</li> </ul>	<p>In the Council's latest version of the Strategy (see Appendix 3) they do not have equal status, since Stroud is shown as an Urban Area, and Cam/Dursley as a Principal Settlement. In my recommendations, the relative status of each remains.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object strongly to assertion that Dursley is the main principal settlement serving the South Vale. No evidence is presented to support this. People from a number of parishes in the South Vale are as likely to use Stroud, Wotton, Berkeley, Nailsworth etc for services and facilities in preference to Dursley. The scale, function and role of Wotton-Under -Edge as an important market town serving part of the South Vale is understated. It is perverse to link Wotton-Under-Edge and Berkeley together in view of considerable distances and differences between them. Acceptance of such policy statements by other agencies will add to the neglect of towns other than Stroud and Dursley in attracting funds for market town regeneration.</li> </ul>	<p>See Sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this chapter of my report.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing size and function of settlements and not development opportunities should be used to define principal settlements. The approach taken reinforces the point that the Stroud urban area (Stroud, Stonehouse, Nailsworth) should be treated as a single entity for planning purposes whose needs should be addressed comprehensively.</li> </ul>	<p>See Sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although 2.6.1n refers to Stroud town's hinterland it does not do so in a systematic way. It should also refer to Stonehouse Nailsworth, the other 'Golden Valley' settlements and Kings Stanley and Leonard Stanley.</li> </ul>	<p>See Sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst accepting that bus services link the town to a number of other settlements, the schedules are often unsatisfactory for many purposes.</li> </ul>	<p>This is part of the detail which I consider is unnecessary, and which will be deleted if my recommendations are followed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is inappropriate to link Berkeley with Sharpness for the settlement strategy. Housing growth should be allowed for at Berkeley. The environmental constraints are overstated for Berkeley. An appropriate scale of housing development should be allocated at Berkeley which does not impinge on these constraints.</li> </ul>	<p>See Sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this chapter of my report, and the site specific matters dealt with in the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extension of the Gloucester - Berkeley service to Sharpness (were it to be feasible) would not be sufficient to meet the public transport needs of additional development at these two settlements.</li> </ul>	<p>This is part of the detail which I consider is unnecessary, and which will be deleted if my recommendations are followed, but see the site specific matters dealt with in the Housing Chapter of my report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kings Stanley and Leonard Stanley are much less than 6km from the major employment area at Stonehouse.</li> </ul>	<p>This objection has been conditionally withdrawn on the basis that the Council was prepared to amend the 6km to 3km. I agree that this is more factually correct. However, my recommendations result in the removal of this paragraph. I consider that it is unnecessarily detailed for what should be</p>

	a brief explanation of the strategy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not necessary to describe either the size or scale of potential development sites and opportunities. This is more appropriately dealt with at the development control stage. Development opportunities on the edge of Painswick will not necessarily be limited to 'small pockets' of land nor small in scale.</li> </ul>	My recommendations result in the removal of this paragraph.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of 2.6.1t reads "Regular bus services connect the town to Gloucester and Stroud". This is incorrect. The service between Gloucester and Painswick is twice daily whereas there is an hourly service between Stroud - Painswick - Cheltenham.</li> </ul>	My recommendations result in the removal of this paragraph. I consider that it is unnecessarily detailed for what should be a brief explanation of the strategy. In any event, a twice daily service is 'regular'.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County Council as landowner, objects to the words 'small scale' in the sixth sentence of paragraph 2.6.1t.</li> </ul>	My recommendations result in the removal of this paragraph, but in any event, since the objection seeks to add a reference to sites which have already been identified, I find the suggested addition superfluous.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastington is capable of a level of growth commensurate with its role and character. Reference to a 'low' level of growth is unnecessary.</li> </ul>	I consider that my recommendations reflect the appropriate scale of development at Eastington as explained in section 2.1 of this chapter
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whitminster is capable of a level of growth commensurate with its role and character. Reference to a 'low' level of growth is unnecessary.</li> </ul>	I do not agree – see sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only 15% of new allocations are in the Stroud Valleys. This area is capable of accommodating much of the District's housing allocation from the Structure Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-sections a) and b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter and my responses to site specific objections in the Housing Chapter.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection is raised to Stonehouse as a principal settlement and the deletion of clauses at the end of the paragraph. Original drafting correctly interprets the Structure Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should not be focussed in the Central Severn Vale. Stonehouse should not be identified as a Principal Settlement.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-sections a) and b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Table 2.2 due to change of Strategy. See representation 306.15 (IRN:3185):- Role of Cam/Dursley as a principal settlement (focus for housing and services in southern area of District) is not reflected in the housing allocations in the Plan. Shortage of allocations will prevent growth and prosperity in the south of the District. Undue weight is given to allocating land adjacent to Gloucester. Dursley/Cam should be afforded equal priority to Stroud/Stonehouse in terms of housing provision. In line with PPG3 housing development should be located in and around main settlements and not within villages as this is unsustainable.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-sections a) and b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter. Also I consider that proposed changes affecting Cam/Dursley have to a large extent answered this objection. See the Housing Chapter.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst it may be appropriate in some isolated instances to make allocations to smaller settlements, there should not be a widespread attempt to disperse development into rural areas in unsustainable locations. Too much development (19%) is being allowed in the rural areas as shown in Table 2.2.</li> </ul>	<p>The percentages have changed over time, so that now 15% housing development over the Plan period is shown to be in the 'rest of the district'. But only 1% of allocations is shown to be within this rural part of the district</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no coherent definition of the principal settlements in Stroud District as required by the Structure Plan. Contradictory references are made to principal settlements in the Plan. Reference is also made to a third level of a settlement hierarchy but no definition is given.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Central Severn Vale is not defined (at the time of writing) in the Structure Plan and it remains to be seen where within the District's boundaries this is determined to be. There may be alternative sites within the area when it is defined and these should be assessed. There is inadequate justification for the allocation of a single site accommodating 44% of the District's housing allocations in this undefined area.</li> </ul>	<p>This Plan has to be prepared on the basis of existing strategic guidance. See also sub-section a) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Wotton under Edge being included in a list of villages. By reason of its size, function and form Wotton is a town. Its capacity to accommodate development is an entirely different matter, not affected by its description as a settlement.</li> </ul>	<p>See sub-section b) of Section 2.1 of this Chapter.</p>

## **CHAPTER 2 - STRATEGY**

### **APPENDIX 3**

#### **The text of paragraphs 2.6.1 to 2.6.4 as it would appear if the Proposed Changes were consolidated into the Revised Deposit Plan.**

#### **2.6 The Strategy**

2.6.1. The strategy of the Local Plan has a number of elements to it. These are outlined in the following paragraphs. They take account of preceding sections on the place of the Local Plan in the national, regional, strategic and corporate settings, the need for sustainable development, the existing situation and the forecast levels of growth for the District. From this background, the purpose and aims of the Plan have been established. The strategy now expands upon that framework and provides the basis for the more detailed policies and proposals to be found under topic chapters.

##### **Settlement role and function**

2.6.1a. In the past there has been little focus to housing growth in the District. The distribution of new housing has been largely dispersed around the District. At the same time we have seen the decentralisation of retail and leisure facilities away from town and village centres and a major growth in employment opportunities outside the District, particularly at Gloucester and Bristol. Assisted by the lack of significant investment in public transport, these trends have contributed to an increased use of the car and less sustainable lifestyles.

2.6.1b. There is a need to address these patterns of development over the rest of the plan period, and beyond, in order to bring them into conformity with the national, regional and strategic planning policy frameworks and to meet sustainability objectives. To help with this, the role of the District's main settlements and the major influence of Gloucester and Cheltenham at its northern borders is outlined below. This summarises the anticipated future role of the named settlements in accommodating development, particularly housing growth, over the plan period and provides a basis for development patterns beyond this plan period.

##### **Central Severn Vale**

2.6.1c. The Central Severn Vale as described in the Structure Plan includes parts of Stroud District. At the heart of this area are the Gloucester and Cheltenham urban areas. Gloucester abuts the northern borders of Stroud District and its urban form extends into the District at Hardwicke and at the former Brockworth Airfield in Upton St Leonards. Cheltenham lies further north of the District, separated from it by part of Tewkesbury Borough.

2.6.1d. Gloucester and Cheltenham's sphere of influence extends well beyond ~~its~~ their boundaries. They are both important economic, social, cultural and service centres with Gloucester also having a strong industrial past. There are good transport links by road and rail to most parts of the country. Bus services radiate out from their centres to their suburbs and into Stroud District. Gloucester is linked to Sharpness Docks and the Bristol Channel via the Gloucester and Sharpness Canal.

- 2.6.1e. Gloucester and Cheltenham are major shopping centres for many people living in the county both in terms of city centre shops and out-of-centre retail facilities. They draw visitors and workers from a wide area as important historic towns, major tourist destinations and as major employment centres.
- 2.6.1f. They are the major urban areas referred to in the Structure Plan and are central to Structure Plan policies that seek to concentrate growth in the Central Severn Vale in compliance with the principles of sustainable development. Since it borders Stroud District, Gloucester is of particular relevance in this context.

### **Urban Area**

- 2.6.1g. Stroud lies within the sphere of influence of Gloucester and many of its residents travel there for work, shopping and entertainment. However, Stroud forms the main cohesive built-up area within the District comprising most of the parishes of Cainscross, Stroud, Rodborough, part of Randwick and a few properties in Stonehouse and Thrupp. With a population of about 25,000, its focus is Stroud town centre which serves a broader unconstrained by environmental factors and is capable of accommodating a small level of growth. It is therefore a settlement capable of a low level of growth commensurate with its role and character. hinterland for shopping, employment and services. However, the town centre has seen significant decline in recent years with changes in patterns of shopping and the Council is seeking the regeneration of the town through a series of initiatives.
- 2.6.1h. Stroud town is served by a railway station on the Gloucester-London line and is a focal point for bus services serving the area. It is the meeting point of transport routes following the route of the five valleys and is a natural focus for many commercial, leisure and education facilities serving the wider area. Therefore, Stroud is the urban focus of the Stroud Valleys and forms the District's only urban area as referred to in the Structure Plan. However, the capacity of the area to absorb new development is constrained by physical and environmental attributes.
- 2.6.1i. Development has historically taken place in the valleys stretching out from the town. The distribution of such development reflects the topography of the valleys. Industrial development has taken place along the valley bottoms, historically based on the woollen and cloth industries. Smaller settlements, both clustered and linear, have formed along the lower slopes interspersed by important open gaps. These mostly are set in or against the high quality landscape of the Cotswold AONB and have the character of overgrown and scattered village settlements rather than towns. Together with Stroud urban area, they provide an immediate population catchment for the town of about 50,000 people.

### **Principal Settlements**

- 2.6.1j The town of Stonehouse lies to the west of Stroud in the Frome Valley. Its population of 7,000 is served by a good level of local facilities and services for everyday needs. Despite its proximity to Stroud, Stonehouse retains a separate identity. It is a working community, well located adjacent to the District's largest employment area at Oldends Lane and its associated industrial estates. It has good transport connections being under 1.5 kilometres from junction 13 of the M5 via the A419 and served by a rail station on the Gloucester-London mainline. Hourly bus services connect the town to Stroud and Gloucester. It functions primarily as a local service centre. Stonehouse should be regarded as one of the District's principal settlements as referred to in the Structure Plan.

### **Cam and Dursley**

2.6.1k. Whilst retaining separate community identities, these settlements together are the focus for employment and services in the southern part of the District. Historically Dursley has grown as the main town, and contains services and facilities typical of a small town centre to serve the wider area. Since Dursley is constrained by the steep topography and the AONB status of the surrounding land, residential growth in the area has more recently centred on Cam. Together they form a cohesive planning unit with a population of about 14,000 that is the main principle settlement serving the South Vale area of the District. The catchment population including the surrounding rural parishes is estimated to be about 30,000 people.

2.6.1l. Employment in the settlements has declined in recent years and there is a significant degree of out-commuting from the area. The loss of jobs coincides with the decline of manufacturing business on which the area's economy was based. This has presented some opportunities for redevelopment of aged industrial premises. However, there is a need to provide a better balance between employment and housing and to provide land and premises suited to modern employment needs. Dursley town centre has also suffered with changing shopping patterns and the growth in vehicular traffic. The town is therefore the subject of a range of initiatives aimed at regenerating its economy and environment.

### **Small Towns and Larger Villages**

2.6.1.1.a. Village services and facilities have declined over recent years and there is poor availability of affordable housing in the rural areas. These facts result from changes in lifestyles and social trends, much of which is outside the control of the planning system. Such problems are accentuated in those villages where there has been little growth. The continuing decline in average household size means fewer customers for services and facilities in those villages. The problem is compounded by small properties having been extended and upgraded, and new housing in villages comprising mainly the large, detached variety. Consequently, there have been few new small sized houses to replace the smaller stock lost.

2.6.1.1.b. Therefore, in order to build upon existing infrastructure, to help arrest the decline of services and facilities in villages serving a wider area, to provide opportunities for affordable housing and to help build thriving village communities, an allowance has been made for limited growth in small towns and larger villages in the District that act as service centres to a wider, though local, catchment area. These are Berkeley, Eastington, Kings Stanley, Kingswood, Leonard Stanley, Minchinhampton, Painswick, Sharpness, Whitminster and Wotton-under-Edge.

2.6.1m. Nailsworth is an important settlement in terms of its scale, role and function. It lies 8 kilometres south of Stroud at the head of the Nailsworth Valley and has a population of about 5,500 people. It too has a good level of community services and facilities and is well located in relation to employment opportunities. The town is relatively thriving and has good bus service connections to Stroud. However, Nailsworth is well contained by the steeply sloping valley sides and the boundaries of the AONB thus severely limiting any growth potential. There are no realistic development opportunities readily available. Therefore, Nailsworth is not defined as a principal settlement. Any expansion in housing is likely to come about through redevelopment opportunities within the defined settlement boundary. Nailsworth is considered to be suitable only for a scale of growth commensurate with its character and role. For the purposes of shopping policy, Nailsworth is acknowledged as an important town centre serving wider local needs.

- 2.6.1o. Wotton-under-Edge and Berkeley act as service centres for their immediate rural communities in the South Vale. These settlements have a good level of community facilities and services and have significant employment opportunities close to, though not within their boundaries. However, both are constrained in their immediate development potential. Wotton lies on the Cotswold escarpment and is within the AONB. Berkeley has other environmental constraints – historic landscape, flooding, power lines. In addition it only has public transport links to Gloucester and Bristol on an infrequent basis. Wotton has bus services linking to Bristol, Stroud, Dursley and Yate. The potential to improve public transport to these towns is to be looked at through the market towns initiative set out in the Local Transport Plan.
- 2.6.1p. Wotton and Berkeley may be seen in a wider context and associated with their nearby settlements of Kingswood and Sharpness which are both capable of accommodating some growth. These settlements lie about 1 kilometre from Wotton and Berkeley respectively. They are both equally close to significant employment opportunities. There are regular bus services between Kingswood and Wotton. These settlements would also be served by the proposed railway station re-opening at Charfield, approximately 3-5 kilometres away. Public transport between Berkeley and Sharpness requires improvement. Development opportunities may assist in improving these services.
- 2.6.1q. Development in the context of Wotton/Kingswood (joint population of about 7,000) and Berkeley/Sharpness (joint population of about 3,000) would support the roles of these communities in serving their immediate rural areas. It would help to protect existing services and facilities in the face of declining household sizes. It would provide better opportunities for reducing travel demands between existing and proposed employment opportunities and the nearby settlements. In this way development would improve their level of self-containment and prove sustainable at the local level. At the same time it would respect the environmental constraints around Wotton and Berkeley. These four settlements are therefore considered suitable for a low level of growth commensurate with their character and role.
- 2.6.1r. Minchinhampton: This small town of about 2,500 population has a reasonable level of facilities and services including a large primary school, library and doctors' surgery. It acts as a local centre for a wider area in this respect. The town lies entirely within the AONB and development is constrained by this designation. Provided care is taken to integrate new development into the town and adjoining landscape, Minchinhampton is considered suitable for a low level of growth commensurate with its character and role.
- 2.6.1s. Kings Stanley and Leonard Stanley: Whilst retaining separate community identities, the built up area of these villages adjoin each other and they can be regarded as a single planning unit. The joint population of about 2,800 is reasonably well served by community facilities and services and has regular bus services to Stroud and Gloucester. The villages lie in the open valley floor of the River Frome and below the Cotswold escarpment about 6 kilometres from Stroud town centre and about 3 kilometres from the major employment area at Stonehouse. Kings Stanley is bounded to the east by the AONB but otherwise the villages are not constrained by environmental designations. The villages comprise mostly of post war development and have a largely suburban character. Together they form a suitable focus for a low level of growth commensurate with their character and role.
- 2.6.1t. Painswick: The population of about 1,900 is well served by a good range of community services and facilities<sup>9</sup>. Painswick performs a similar role to Minchinhampton, providing a

local centre for a wider area. It is also acknowledged for its attractiveness to tourists. Regular bus services connect the town to Cheltenham, Gloucester and Stroud. The town lies on the steep sides of the Painswick Valley and is entirely within the AONB. There are small pockets of land on the edges of the village that may be suitable for small scale, well designed development if it can be integrated into the character of the settlement. However, it is not suitable for a large level of development and its longer term potential is limited by the topography. Therefore, Painswick is considered suitable for a low level of growth commensurate with its role and character.

2.6.1u. Eastington: This village of about 800 population has an adequate range of facilities including a primary school and local shops. It lies on a slight rise above the River Frome, 8 kilometres west of Stroud. The village comprises mainly post war residential development and is only about 1 kilometre from major employment opportunities at Stonehouse. Hourly daytime bus services connect the village to Stroud and Dursley. Gloucester can be easily accessed via junction 13 of the M5 motorway about 1 kilometre away. The village is unconstrained by environmental factors and is capable of accommodating a small level of growth. It is therefore a settlement capable of a low level of growth commensurate with its role and character.

2.6.1v. Whitminster: This village of about 500 population also has an adequate range of facilities and services including a primary school and shop. It lies in the Severn Vale about 9 kilometres west of Stroud, 10 kilometres south of Gloucester. It has undergone considerable growth in the last 10 years and is unconstrained by environmental considerations. There is a limited amount of local employment at Whitminster. The village is considered suitable for a low level of growth commensurate with its role and character.

### **Other Settlements**

2.6.1w Smaller villages with provision of only basic community facilities and services also have defined settlement boundaries. The prospect of growth is therefore retained through the possibility of windfall provision on infill plots and through affordable housing provision on 'exception' sites. These are the lowest order of settlements in terms of their suitability for development since they lack at least one of the following:

- Primary community facilities or services
- Proximity to employment
- Access to public transport

These settlements are considered to be suitable only for very small scale levels of development within their boundaries.

2.6.2 The approach taken to accommodating new development is to locate this in or adjacent to existing settlements. In doing this a clear priority is given to directing the greater part of growth towards:

- the Central Severn Vale;
- the Stroud urban area; and
- the principal settlements of Stonehouse, Cam and Dursley.

Low levels of growth are allowed for at the small towns and larger villages of Berkeley, Eastington, King's Stanley, Kingswood, Leonard Stanley, Minchinhampton, Newtown/Sharpness, Nailsworth, Painswick, Whitminster and Wotton-under-Edge. Other defined settlements will only provide very low levels of development through windfall provision.

2.6.2a Table 2.2 below demonstrates how the Structure Plan requirement to accommodate about 9,400 dwellings in the District up to 2011 is focused in this way. The greater part of the requirement is located south of the Gloucester urban area, in the Stroud urban area and at Dursley and Cam.

**Table 2.2: Distribution of about 9,400 Dwellings to 2011**

	Central Severn Vale	Stroud Urban	Principal Settlem'ts	Small towns/ Large Villages	Rest of District
Completions (3,653)	227	854	587	913	1072
% of total completions	6%	23%	16%	25%	29
Commitments (1,325)	201	238	382	339	165
% of total commitments	15%	18%	29%	26%	12
Allocations (3,599)	2,000	579	668	322	30
% of total allocations	55%	16%	19%	9%	1%
TOTAL (8,577)*	2,428	1,671	1,637	1,574	1,267
% of TOTAL	28%	19%	19%	18%	15%

*Note:*

Completions = 01/07/91 to 31/12/2000.

Commitments = at 01/01/01

Allocations = non-committed allocations in this Plan at 01/01/01.

\* Difference in total to Structure Plan figure is due to windfall allocation.

## **CHAPTER 2 – STRATEGY**

### **APPENDIX 4 - The Recommended text of The Strategy**

#### **“THE COUNCIL’S STRATEGY FOR DEVELOPMENT**

Stroud Local Plan seeks to further the Councils corporate purpose “to make Stroud District a better place to live and work in for everyone”. It must do this within the context of the principles of sustainable development, and must achieve both the protection of the fine quality of its built and natural environment, particularly the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, whilst achieving social and economic development. The key elements of the Council’s strategy are:

- In accordance with strategic requirement, provision will be made for the development of 9400 dwellings during the Plan period, and about 100 hectares of land for employment purposes.
- To accommodate the level of growth in line with the structure plan’s requirements. This will mean, bearing in mind the need to protect the environment, imposing restrictive policies limiting growth to those requirements and focusing on locations which provide a good linkage between housing and employment, particularly by the use of public transport and minimising the use of private motor vehicles.
- In doing so, it will ensure that most of the new development will take place in accordance with the search sequence set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note No 3 concentrating firstly on identified available sites on previously developed land within built up areas. Since not all of the 9,400 dwelling requirement from the structure plan can be met on previously developed land and other sites within the urban areas, new development will take place as extensions to the Principle Urban Area of Gloucester. Other requirements will be met on sites in or adjoining settlements according to the settlement hierarchy.
- Extensions to the Gloucester PUA will take place at Hardwicke and at the former Brockworth Airfield. Since structure plan Policy H5 specifically requires the local plan to make provision for a major urban extension south of Brockworth, and since the Structure Plan’s target for housing will not be met without these 2 sites, they are regarded as strategic sites to which high priority attaches.
- Allocations for development are made within and adjacent to the Stroud Urban Area, and the Principal Settlements of Cam/Dursley and Berkeley. Within the Stroud Urban Area, development will be encouraged to meet the full needs of the community, including employment and housing, town centre and social facilities. Principal Settlements will be the focus of development, consistent with the character and function of the settlement, which supports local services and the social and economic well-being of the local community and the surrounding area. This is to ensure a more sustainable form of development, rather than dispersed development within villages and rural areas.
- The Stroud urban area is defined on the proposals map as including with Stroud: Stonehouse, Thrupp, Brimscombe, North and South Woodchester, and Nailsworth.
- More modest allocations for development are made within and adjacent to the Small Towns and Larger Villages of Wotton-Under-Edge, Minchinhamton, Painswick, Kings Stanley/Leonard Stanley, Newtown/Sharpness, Kingswood, Eastington and Frampton on Severn. In these settlements allocations for development have been identified.
- Sharpness provides the county’s main port and also has a railway line connection with the main Bristol to Birmingham line. Opportunities for enhanced inter-modal freight transport will be sought and proposals which would prejudice the maximum use of the port facilities at Sharpness will not be permitted.

- There are a number of other settlements - smaller villages with only basic facilities and services – which are defined with settlement boundaries on insets to the proposals map. They are suitable for a level of growth which can be obtained through windfall provisions on infill plots and affordable housing on “exception” sites.
- The other settlements with defined settlement boundaries are: Amberley, Arlingham, Bisley, Box, Brookthorpe, Brownhill, Bussage, Cambridge, Chalford, Coaley, Cranham, Eastcombe, France Lynch, Haresfield, Hillesley, Horsley, Longley, Manor Village, Middleyard, Newport, North Nibley, Nymphsfield, Oakridge, Randwick, Saul, Selsley, Sheepscombe, Slimbridge, Stinchcombe, Stone, Uley, Upton St Leonards, Whiteshill & Ruscombe, and Whitminster.
- The Structure Plan’s requirement to provide about 100 hectares of employment land will be met. Employment development will be centred on the new mixed use development allocation at Hunts Grove and within the district’s economic base lying within the Stroud valleys, at Cam and Dursley, and with outlying major employers near Wotton-Under-Edge and Berkley. Protection will be given to identified key employment land where employment needs take precedence over other uses.
- The high quality environment within towns and villages will be maintained making them attractive places to live whilst making the best use of existing land within them.
- Adequate services and infrastructure will be provided.
- Development related to transport and traffic will be judged against the objectives of reducing the overall need to travel; reducing the overall length and number of motorised journeys; providing alternative means of travel to the private car; to locate uses which generate large numbers of trips in places which are, or have the potential to be, served by public transport; to protect the existing provision, and allow for the improvement of, a network of footpaths and off-road cycleways thus encouraging local journeys by foot or cycle; to improve the integration and interchange facilities of different modes of public transport; to ensure that new parking provision does not encourage high levels of car use; and to manage traffic effectively to improve the environment, decrease congestion and limit pollution.
- The regeneration of Stroud and Dursley town centres will be sought by, among other measures, seeking to increase populations and employment close to these centres. The role of town centres and local shopping areas generally will be maintained and enhanced, providing a focus for the community.
- Existing employment locations will be given protection where appropriate and new employment opportunities are provided for at a limited number of focal sites providing good access to the existing population and seeking to redress the current imbalance between housing and employment opportunities.
- New village housing will be limited to infilling in the defined settlements within the settlement boundaries. Small-scale employment opportunities and development for social purposes may be justified within the defined settlements subject to the underlying objective of seeking development which is sustainable.
- New housing in the countryside and in scattered settlements will be very strictly controlled. Unnecessary development in the countryside will be prevented.
- Long term protection will be given to the character and appearance of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and only limited forms of development will be permitted if shown to be appropriate and without harm to the natural beauty of the area.
- The rich historic and architectural heritage of the Cotswold and Severn Vale buildings will be protected, including the over 4,500 buildings listed as being of architectural or historic interest, and the 62 scheduled ancient monuments. Development within the 42 designated conservation areas will be required to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of each area.

- The flora and fauna of the district will be given protection and development will not be permitted which is harmful to any special protection area under the RAMSAR convention, to a Site of Special Scientific Interest, or a proposed Special Area for Conservation.
- Cultural and leisure facilities will be provided to serve the needs of the community. These facilities will include the provision of space and buildings for sport, art, entertainment and passive recreation.”