

	Representor	00587
	Type	Individual
	Method	E-mail
1. Key Issues	1.0a Have we identified the top 5 issues for you?	No
	Comments:	<p>Firstly, due to the complexity and length of time required to complete this online survey these responses are to be taken as the consolidated but individual views of the FOUR persons named hereon. Those are Mr B Price, Mrs A Price, Mr M Price and Miss A Huish. Any acknowledgement of receipt or further correspondence can and should be directed to any of these parties via the email address shown, that is bernie.price@btinternet.com. Thank You.</p> <p>So, to begin, you have failed to recognise the poor infrastructure and sustainability of the area this response refers to (KI 1). Furthermore you have elected to concentrate builds on mostly greenfield sites in contravention of your Stroud District statement (KI 2). I refer and add to my KI 1 comment that you are failing to utilise brownfield sites and instead are allocating builds to mainly greenfield sites without taking into account currently poor infrastructure, particularly transport links and logistics (KI 3). Again, I refer to my comment regarding KI 3 - you are suggesting here greenfield sites in contradiction to your statement to enhance open space and wildlife habitats (KI 4). The proposals appear to recognise some affordable housing but the majority will be high cost, unlikely to be afforded by those in need (locally) therefore the whole dynamic of the area will change given that most will be newcomers to the area and not 'downsizers' or rent to buy type schemes.</p>
	1.0b Do you agree with the ways we intend to tackle them?	No
	Comments:	As per my responses above. Little thought has been applied to adhering to your own planning statements. This will mean a free for all building programme with little thought to the impact on environment, current community dynamics and pressures on already pressured public services. Road networks, schooling, emergency and Doctors access to name but a few are extremely poor, as you previously recognised, but have since reassessed as good... and yet no improvements have taken place. This seems merely a thpographical change to massage to plan to suit. Indeed this questionnaire is so cumbersome it makes the consultation process difficult and time consuming, why?
2. 1 Local economy and jobs	2.1a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to support the local economy and the creation of jobs?	No
	2.1b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	There is little in the way of provision for employment. The proposal for the number of houses suggested is disproportionate to what MAY be created in terms of employment opportunity. Indeed the majority of the centres (not just the ones represented by this response) are dormitory centres serving the larger conurbations of Gloucester, Bristol, Avonmouth and beyond. There is little here to suggest that the proposals will do anything but merely compound that situation. To this end, rather than large scale development such as that proposed, a dispersal alternative should be investigated (more so than up to now) and pursued so that the proximity principle (live close to your work) may be applied, rather than a dump of a large scale development such as that here, likely to cause further migration issues within currently highly pressured infrastructures and transport routes as commuters nevertheless continue to find the most attractive employment outside the Stroud area and thus continue to travel.
2.2 Our town centres	2.2a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to support the District's town centres?	
	Stroud	Yes
	Nailsworth	Yes
	Dursley	Yes
	Stonehouse	Yes
	Wotton under Edge	Yes
	Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	With regard to all the above towns, their charm and character is a key ingredient to attracting both people wishing to live and work, or visit, so planning and change should sensitively manage this in partnership, and in consultation with those living, working and caring for those communities. Never assume, ask!
2.3 A Local need for housing	2.3a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to meet local housing need?	No
	2.3b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	No. Simply, your explanation of a need for a further 5700 homes to meet demand over the next 20 years suggests that the proposal for in excess of 5000 homes in the Sharpness/Berkeley are disproportionate and that the majority of new housing seems destined, if plans are approved, to be assigned to just one area, and, on mostly greenfield sites. All of my previous comments in earlier Sections could be repeated here, but I refer especially to your comment regarding young people and older people having their needs met. I see this proposal as failing to address this, with little by way of addressing affordability, as despite the good intention, developers will undoubtedly seek to maximise return by building the bare minimum of affordable properties (often done by variation to original pre-planning once formal planning is obtained) versus the optimum high value numbers. The dispersal of the number of properties suggested also appears to be a more attractive proposition so that the dynamic of current centres is not changed wholesale and irreversibly as will be the case here. Local people are proud of their current identity and diversity and wish to retain that whilst accepting that some change is inevitable, this should be shared across the district as a whole.
	2.4a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to protect existing or deliver new local green spaces and community facilities?	No

2.4 Local green spaces and community	2.4b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	I have already commented on the poor infrastructure, particularly in respect of community services. Where new developments are to go ahead this MUST be planned and addressed either prior, or simultaneously, with any those developments. That way at least there is some potential for actually delivering improvements to these essential services and easing already pressed areas. GP surgeries, Schools and transport links are key. Furthermore, any impact on currently designated nature areas, AONB's, SSSI's, RAMSAR, SAC, SPA, or other green spaces must be carefully monitored and managed. These need to be at the top of the priority list and any development likely to affect them must be carefully considered, and, if necessary vehemently objected to.
3.1 A vision for the future	3.1a Do you agree with the vision for 2040 as drafted? 3.1b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	No You have suggested (for the area this response refers to) up to 5000+ new houses and ancillary employment opportunity. Although this is commendable in terms of the long term commitment for the number of homes required over the next 20 years you have failed to recognise that the environmental impact, particularly CO2, that the homes themselves (despite current building requirements) and their associated owners vehicles will have on this area. It is doubtful many will secure employment locally, thus reducing travel, and as such, with poor transport infrastructures, it will necessitate using personal cars to travel to the conurbations already mentioned earlier, Gloucester, Bristol, Avonmouth and beyond - and with just one vehicle per household (unlikely) this will generate circa 10,000 journeys per day, five days per week, notwithstanding those being made at present. The environmental impact is obvious in relation to this issue alone.
3.2 Strategic Objectives	3.2a Do you agree with the strategic objectives as drafted? SO1: Accessible Communities SO1b: Healthy, inclusive and safe communities SO2: Local economy and jobs SO3: Town centres and rural hinterland SO4: Transport and travel SO5: Climate change and environmental limits SO6: Our District's distinctive qualities 3.2b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes These are merely statements. They become objectives when they can be realistically delivered, in harmony with and not at the cost of each other or the balance of the district as a whole. I refer to my earlier comment in relation to the maintenance of the identity of the centres within the district. You should take this into account when deciding planning strategies. Your focus should be on the district, over the years to come, and a quick 'fix' in terms of a large scale development that will alter part of the community irreversibly, just to satisfy a numerical requirement in terms of new home numbers must be CAREFULLY considered, along with the views of those likely to be affected.
	4.2a Do you support the broad approach of the emerging growth strategy in terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kingswood Leonard Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Woodchester Oakridge Lynch Painswick Slimbridge Stroud Stonehouse Uley Upton St Leonards Whiteshill & Ruscombe Whitminster Wisloe Wotton-under-Edge	No By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable Unsuitable

4.2 The emerging growth strategy	Please explain why you consider any of these settlements to be unsuitable.	Sharpness/Berkeley. If you read my previous statements you will already be aware of my unsuitability comments, but to reiterate. The development is disproportionate, does not recognise transport, public services, schooling and proximity to employment centres. Road networks, public transport (if any) and local amenities are poor. Large scale development without addressing these issues simultaneously will merely compound an already dire set of circumstances. There are few local shopping facilities, community centres and little employment, thus creating the need to travel for almost all eventualities. This is in contradiction to other statements within the plan. Whilst it is accepted that some development is necessary, this should be proportionate, preserve current community identity and be applied on a dispersal principle, rather than large scale.
	The following settlements have been identified as unsuitable for growth (other than identified through Neighbourhood Development Plans). Do any of these settlements have unidentified growth potential?	
	Arlingham	-
	Box	-
	Brookthorpe	-
	Cambridge	-
	Cranham	-
	Eastcombe	-
	France Lynch	-
	Haresfield	-
	Hillesley	-
	Longney	-
	Middleyard	-
	Newport	-
	Nympsfield	-
	Old Bussage	-
	Randwick	-
	Saul	-
	Selsley	-
	Sheepscombe	-
	South Woodchester	-
	Stinchcombe	-
	Stone	-
	Please explain why you consider any of these settlements to have growth potential.	
	4.2d Do you support our approach to addressing Gloucester's housing needs?	No
	4.2e Do you support an alternative approach to addressing Gloucester's housing needs?	Yes
	4.2e Comments:	My comments in terms of transport infrastructure, proximity to higher employment density areas and the increased environmental issues created by higher vehicle movements can also be cited here. This adds to the argument for a more dispersed increase in housing provision with a bias towards the proximity of employment whilst accepting that there does need to be some (proportionate) share taken throughout the district.
4.3 Settlement hierarchy	4.3a Are any settlements in the wrong tier?	Yes - Please explain which settlement and reasons why below
	4.3a comments	Berkeley; your recognition that this is the smallest settlement within Tier 2 merely draws attention to the fact that it is wrongly classified. The retail provision is extremely small and the employment provision to which you refer is 'puzzling' as Berkeley, much like Sharpness, is a commuter dormitory town in the main, serving Gloucester, Bristol, Avonmouth and beyond, as stated previously and without wishing to become repetitive. This is borne out by the traffic congestion out/into the town each morning and evening respectively. This is set to increase with the recent building activity known as Canonbury Rise well underway. Berkeley should be Tier 3. Sharpness; for many of the same reasons as the Berkeley scenario, Sharpness is wrongly classified. Another dormitory village by your own admission. Local services are poor and transport infrastructure similar. It could be argued that the one village retail shop precludes this settlement from falling into Tier 5, but acknowledging that provision it should nonetheless it should be reclassified. Sharpness should be in Tier 4.
	4.3b Do you support the proposed approach to managing development at small Tier 4 and 5 settlements by including them within the hierarchy and defining Settlement Development Limits?	No
	If no, do you support an alternative approach of simply treating them as 'open countryside' or is there another alternative?	Each settlement should be treated autonomously, I have mentioned earlier that the district is richly diverse with distinct identity owned by each settlement. This should be maintained at all cost. To 'grey' the edges or change communities by large scale development should be avoided at all cost. A dispersal principle will not only maintain those identities, but will share the burden and needs to address, that the district inevitably faces.
	4.3c Do you support the idea that the Local Plan should seek to manage the cumulative impacts of growth on individual settlements?	Yes
	If yes, how should we develop a policy framework to achieve this?	This is not a tacit agreement to the current plan. As indicated, the plan needs careful consideration in relation to 'proportionate' as you indicate within you Section 4.3. It seems that despite making these references frequently the proposal for Sharpness/Berkeley appears to contradict your own strategy. Proportionate, capacity and character, based on sustainability, and relative constraints... words taken from your own statement. Therefore please adhere to them!
	If no, do you support an alternative approach?	See above. In summary - Dispersal across the district, not large scale development in limited areas.
	Comments on settlement hierarchy	
	Please choose a section you would like to go to next. Please click 'next page' once you have selected your choice.	4.4 - Settlement boundaries
	4.4a Do you support the emerging Strategy approach towards maintaining settlement development limits?	Yes

	Comments:	Provided these are strictly adhered to in relation to exoansion. As stated earlier, the identity of settlements is an important current and historical ethos, and should remain so. Whilst I can see a need for constant evaluation of this, wherever possible continuity should prevail. In relation to the proposal for Sharpness/Berkeley, the current proposal for 5000+ new homes will change the demographic irreversibly and the sense of community(ies) lost. Any currenty in place limits for development should remain in place and NOT be removed, subject to constant review, and proportionality principles being applied. The current suggestion for expansion is not in line with proportionality nor dispersal, which I heavily support.	
	4.4b Do you support an alternative approach?	Yes	
	Comments:	See above in relation to Sharpness/Berkeley. To reiterate - proportionality and dispersal across the district is preferred.	
	4.4c Do you support the proposals to allow some limited development beyond development limits as set out on page 32 of the emerging Strategy?		
	Do you support the approach proposed for settlements in tiers 1-3?	Yes	
	Do you support the approach proposed for settlements in tiers 4 and 5?	No	
	Comments:	Limited development only. On the basis as outlined. Proportionate and along the dispersal principle.	
	4.4d Do you support an alternative approach?	Yes	
	Comments:	As stated above. Proportionate and in line with dispersal principles. Any restrictions should remain IN PLACE but constantly reviewed. This DOES NOT mean I support a total lifting of limits to release planning restriction for large scale development of the magnitude suggested for Sharpness/Berkeley.	
4.4 Settlement boundaries	4.4e Do you support the specific changes to existing settlement development limits?		
	SDL - BER01 at Lynch Road	Yes	
	SDL - CAM01 at Strawberry Field / Elstub Lane	Yes	
	SDL-CBR01 at Narles Road / Barton Field	Yes	
	SDL-CBR02 at Ryalls Court	Yes	
	SDL-DUR01 at Shearing Close, Littlecombe	Yes	
	SDL-EAS01 at Swallowcroft	Yes	
	SDL-EAS02 at Alkerton Farm, rear of Bath Road	Yes	
	SDL-HAR01 at Sellars Road	Yes	
	SDL-HIL01 at no.s 1-3 Alderley Road	Yes	
	SDL-HOR01 at Sealey Wood Lane / Nupend Farm	Yes	
	SDL-HOR02 at The Chooks / Willow Barn	Yes	
	SDL-HOR03 north of The Street;	Yes	
	SDL-HOR04 at The Priory	Yes	
	SDL-KST01 at Dyehouse Field / off Woodside Lane	Yes	
	SDL-LEO01 at Lyndon Morgan Way / Marsh L	Yes	
	SDL-MID01 at Coldwell Close	Yes	
	SDL-MIS01: an entirely new settlement development limit	Yes	
	SDL-NEW01 at Cromwell Close / south of Gloucester Road	Yes	
	SDL-STN01 at Vale Orchard	Yes	
	SDL-STO01 at Brunel Way / Oldends Lane	Yes	
	SDL-STR02 at Bowbridge Wharf	Yes	
	SDL-ULY01 at Goldingham Close	Yes	
	SDL-WHI01 at Schoolfield Close	Yes	
	SDL-WHI02 at Upton's Garden	Yes	
	SDL-WHI03 at Wheatenhurst Cottage, Hyde Lane	Yes	
	Please clearly specify which settlement(s) your comment(s) relate to	Any limited development in line with dispersal principles is welcomed. Large scale development such as that suggested for Sharpness/Berkeley is not.	
	4.4f Do you support any other changes to settlement development limits, not listed in Appendix A?	No	
	Please specify	-	
	5.0 Making Places	5.0a Do you support the proposed mini-vision for your area (s)?	
		The Stroud Valleys	
		The Stonehouse Cluster	
		Cam & Dursley	
The Gloucester Fringe			
The Berkeley Cluster		No - Please answer Qu. 5.0b	
The Severn Cluster			
The Wotton Cluster			
The Cotswold Cluster			
5.0b Would you like to propose alternative wording? (Please be clear and specific about which of the 8 mini-visions your comment(s) relate to).		The Berkeley Cluster/Newtown and Sharpness. In line with my previous comments in relation to the Tier classification I comment as follows; ... Berkeley. Berkeley has a modest retail role, not a strong retail role. Reason, limited shopping, small, although convenience stores, limited choice. It has a good, diverse range of local community services and facilities. Change from very good. Reason, pressured community services such as GP, and 'strategic' facilities are limited, small and infrequent. Newtown and Sharpness. Newtown and Sharpness has a very basic local retail role, not a basic retail role, similarly a basic level of community services and facilities. Reason, limited access to facilities often meaning a journey to Berkeley or beyond, also classed as Poor. Access to key services and facilities is poor. Reason, same as above, journeys required in the majority of cases to access services and facilities.	
5.0c Do you support the identified key issues and priorities for action for your area(s)?			
Stroud Valleys			
Stonehouse cluster			
Cam & Dursley			
Gloucester Fringe			
Berkeley Cluster		No	
Severn Vale			
Wotton Cluster			
Cotswold cluster			

	<p>5.0d Are there other important issues and priorities you would like to highlight?</p>	<p>At the risk of becoming repetitive. The proposal for the Berkeley cluster, specifically, Sharpness and Berkeley in terms of housing is hugely disproportionate and out of context with current development and infrastructure. It does not take into account much of the previously stated planning strategies or objectives and is in contradiction to some of the many themes within this document. Whilst I support some development, this should be applied using a dispersal principle, should be proportionate and should respect present community boundaries and identities.</p>
<p>6.0 Background studies</p>	<p>Please choose which section you would like to go to now. Please click 'next page' once you have selected your choice.</p>	<p>-</p>
	<p>6.1 Are there any other specific local studies that you believe are needed to inform the Local Plan Review?</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>Have you any advice on the scope or content of any of these studies?</p>	<p>None.</p>
	<p>If you have any additional studies or data that you would like to submit, they can be uploaded here (maximum of 3)</p>	<p>-</p>