

Q2. Your company or organisation	Eastington Parish Council
Q3. Your email address	planning@eastington-pc.gov.uk
Q4. Client's name (if applicable)	-
Q5. Client's company or organisation (if applicable)	-
Q6. Which cluster do you identify yourself with (i.e. live, work, visit)?	Stonehouse (Parishes of Stonehouse, Standish, Eastington, Frocester, Leonard Stanley, Kings Stanley)
Q7. The Stroud Valleys - Brimscombe and Thrupp PS01 - Brimscombe Mill	Support
Comments and suggested changes:	Support regeneration of the site. Concern that green field site allocations such as PS20 will delay this regeneration.
Q8. PS02 Brimscombe Port	Support
Comments and suggested changes:	Support regeneration of the site. Concern that green field site allocations such as PS20 will delay this regeneration.
Q10. The Stroud Valleys - Nailsworth PS06 The New Lawn, Nailsworth	Object
Comments and suggested changes:	The loss of the New Lawn site to housing will detract from the significant leisure and tourism role the Town is proud of and cause harm to the vitality and viability of Nailsworth. At the time of making these comments the result of the Call-in request to SoS DCLG is outstanding in respect of S.19/1418/OUT and it is hoped that the planning applications for the new Stadium at M5 J13 will be considered at Planning Inquiry before the plan progresses. It is noted that PS07 North of Nympsfield Road is directly opposite FGR New Lawn Stadium. Site PS07 is in the AONB and could be used to support the retention of FGR on the adjacent site, for the right price (and significantly cheaper than developing out S.19/1418/OUT). Potential uses could be park and ride/coach parking near the ground such that better use could be made of the existing site for catering and visitor seating capacity. The site at the rear appears to be a waste transfer station and this too could be better relocated.
Q11. PS07 North of Nympsfield Road	Object
Comments and suggested changes:	It is noted that this site is in the AONB and could be used to support the retention of FGR on the adjacent site, for the right price. Potential uses could be park and ride/coach parking near the ground such that better use could be made of the existing site for catering and visitor seating capacity.
The Stroud Valleys - Stroud Q15. PS13 Central river / canal corridor:	Support, subject to changes listed below
Comments and suggested changes:	Support regeneration of the site. Concern that green field site allocations such as PS20 will delay this regeneration. It is hoped that the existing unused sports ground can be brought back into operational use.
The Stonehouse Cluster - Stonehouse PS17 Magpies site, Oldends Lane	Support, subject to changes listed below
Comments and suggested changes:	The railway line is a serious barrier to use of and as such the development of Stonehouse Town Centre by residents and users of the West of Stonehouse (WOS) strategic allocation Nov 2015 and further development is now proposed as allocation PS19a and PS20 close to WOS. Improvements need to be made to how easily the public can sustainably access Stonehouse as a priority given the Climate Emergency. This site on its own appears too small to facilitate a possible future pedestrian bridge as well as ten dwellings/flats. The safeguarded land for a bridge should be allocated on the draft plan and must also be allocated on the other side of the railway line. It is anticipated that significant contributions would come from PS19a and PS20, should it be pursued, in the developers S.106 to facilitate the development.
Q19. PS19 Northwest of Stonehouse	Support, subject to changes listed below

Comments and suggested changes:	<p>The busy railway line is a serious barrier to use of this site's primary Town Centre. This will encourage car use to travel a more tedious route via the A419 to Stonehouse or indeed once in the car to further afield. It would not be well connected to Stonehouse unless significant improvements are made to how easily the public can sustainably access Stonehouse, particularly given the Climate Emergency. A more reliable and direct means of access must be established which does not require pedestrians and cyclists having to wait for trains to come past on a regular basis.</p> <p>A gentle sloping, cycle friendly bridge at the railway crossing close to the Magpies Football Club appears to be necessary. The safeguarded land for both sides of a bridge should be allocated on the draft plan and PS19 policy should require this specifically. It is noted that the eastern most potential access point would be likely to require significant works that may affect a watercourse, Green Infrastructure and a public footpath across the railway line.</p>
Q20. PS20 M5 Junction 13	Object
Comments and suggested changes:	<p>There is no objectively assessed need to demonstrate that a stadium is required and that this is the most sustainable site which could be allocated for such a stadium (particularly given the wording in DCP1 of this draft plan). Insufficient evidence is given as to what scale and capacity the harms should be tested. Insufficient evidence is provided to demonstrate that a more sustainable site cannot be allocated.</p> <p>The refused application for a stadium (S.16/0043/OUT) and the current resubmission application (S.19/1418/OUT) for outline permission only considered the impacts related to a 5000 capacity crowd and it is considered that the site is not likely to be able to flexibly adapt, without further harmful impacts on local and strategic road network impacts (M5/A419) and noise and disturbance to neighbours in particular. Once approved the pressure on the M5 junction due to traffic could be severe or unknown at certain times, given the variation of visiting teams and there is negligible scope to mitigate or manage traffic issues outside of the proposed heavily developed site. Increase in capacity from the 5000 seats to 10,000 or more should be tested as part of the plan review to establish that the site is sustainable in the long term.</p> <p>If need is assessed for a land allocation for an FGR stadium consideration should be given to securing its plan allocation by FGR or another team from Stroud District.</p>
Q35. PS37 New settlement at Wisloe	-
Comments and suggested changes:	<p>5Ha of employment land for 1500 dwellings does not appear to be balanced. Possible cycle links on the road to Eastington/Stonehouse are poor as on the A38 or narrow back lanes.</p>
Q40. PS47 Land west of Renishaw New Mills	-
Comments and suggested changes:	<p>Reservations that a further 9Ha should be developed adjacent to the existing Renishaw site in open Countryside. They should be encouraged to inhabit the valleys or more accessible and sustainable sites such as those closer to larger settlements at Dursley/Cam or into Sharpness strategic allocation. Other businesses may then be attracted to the same areas, bringing wealth and skilled jobs to the new employment areas.</p>

Q2. Your company or organisation	Eastington Parish Council
Q3. Your email address	planning@eastington-pc.gov.uk
Q4. Client's name (if applicable)	-
Q5. Client's company or organisation (if applicable)	-
Q6. Which cluster do you identify yourself with (i.e. live, work, visit)?	Stonehouse (Parishes of Stonehouse, Standish, Eastington, Frocester, Leonard Stanley, Kings Stanley)
Q7. NEW Core Policy DCP1 - Delivering Carbon Neutral by 2030	Support
Comments and suggested changes:	<p>Eastington support this aspiration but believe that it conflicts with PS20 at Junction 13 of the M5 for a stadium and employment uses in an unsustainable location where private car is the most likely form of commuting to the site.</p> <p>It is unclear if the list of requirements are all to be achieved. It would be more clear if the list of requirements ended with '; and' rather than just ';'.</p>
Q8. Core Policy CP2 - Strategic growth and development locations	Object
Comments and suggested changes:	<p>Use of 'Eco Park' trade name is inappropriate - your allocation would be better described as lowland pastures on Stroud side of M5 J13. The Eastington allocation which you term Stonehouse is just a proposed employment/business use at present and using the trade name is advertising for the proposer.</p> <p>The allocation should be separated into its constituent parts for easier comment.</p> <p>Eastington Parish support the maintenance and reconstruction of the canal and limited appropriate canal based facilities in the context of the made Eastington NDP policy EP3. This does not extend to the urbanisation of the green corridor into Stroud which would visibly harm the landscape and heritage setting of the area, cause unsustainable traffic patterns, noise and disturbance to residents. Reference is made to the numerous Parish Council objections to S.16/0043/OUT and S.19/1418/OUT</p> <p>Allocation of PS20 will deter developers/business from seeking out and redeveloping brown field sites - whether from the stock of currently vacant/available units or land, or proposed in this plan as a new allocation.</p>
Q9. Core Policy CP3 - A hierarchy for growth and development across the District's settlements	Support, subject to changes listed below
Comments and suggested changes:	Tourism/leisure development adjoining the Settlement Development (SDL) should be at a scale appropriate to the related settlement. Policy does not explain what criteria the Tourism/leisure development would be subject to.
Q10. Core Policy CP4 - Place Making	Support, subject to changes listed below
Comments and suggested changes:	<p>It is unclear if the list of requirements are all to be achieved. It would be more clear if the list of requirements ended with '; and' rather than just ';'.</p> <p>PS20 contains many parts and on the whole does not integrate or place shape or enhance a sense of place. Only the finalising of the canal network with limited canal related development as set out in the Eastington NDP would be achieved by this policy. General employment uses and stadium are in the wrong place and would be unsustainable in the long term due to their location.</p>
Q11. Core Policy CP5 - Environmental development principles for strategic sites	-
Comments and suggested changes:	It is unclear if the list of requirements are all to be achieved. It would be more clear if the list of requirements ended with '; and' rather than just ';'.

Q2. Your company or organisation	Eastington Parish Council
Q3. Your email address	planning@eastington-pc.gov.uk
Q4. Client's name (if applicable)	-
Q5. Client's company or organisation (if applicable)	-
Q6. Which cluster do you identify yourself with (i.e. live, work, visit)?	Stonehouse (Parishes of Stonehouse, Standish, Eastington, Frocester, Leonard Stanley, Kings Stanley)
Q7. The Stroud Valleys - Brimscombe and Thrupp PS01 - Brimscombe Mill	Support
Comments and suggested changes:	Support regeneration of the site. Concern that green field site allocations such as PS20 will delay this regeneration.
Q8. PS02 Brimscombe Port	Support
Comments and suggested changes:	Support regeneration of the site. Concern that green field site allocations such as PS20 will delay this regeneration.
Q10. The Stroud Valleys - Nailsworth PS06 The New Lawn, Nailsworth	Object
Comments and suggested changes:	<p>The loss of the New Lawn site to housing will detract from the significant leisure and tourism role the Town is proud of and cause harm to the vitality and viability of Nailsworth. At the time of making these comments the result of the Call-in request to SoS DCLG is outstanding in respect of S.19/1418/OUT and it is hoped that the planning applications for the new Stadium at M5 J13 will be considered at Planning Inquiry before the plan progresses.</p> <p>It is noted that PS07 North of Nympsfield Road is directly opposite FGR New Lawn Stadium. Site PS07 is in the AONB and could be used to support the retention of FGR on the adjacent site, for the right price (and significantly cheaper than developing out S.19/1418/OUT). Potential uses could be park and ride/coach parking near the ground such that better use could be made of the existing site for catering and visitor seating capacity. The site at the rear appears to be a waste transfer station and this too could be better relocated.</p>
Q11. PS07 North of Nympsfield Road	Object
Comments and suggested changes:	It is noted that this site is in the AONB and could be used to support the retention of FGR on the adjacent site, for the right price. Potential uses could be park and ride/coach parking near the ground such that better use could be made of the existing site for catering and visitor seating capacity.
The Stroud Valleys - Stroud Q15. PS13 Central river / canal corridor:	Support, subject to changes listed below
Comments and suggested changes:	Support regeneration of the site. Concern that green field site allocations such as PS20 will delay this regeneration. It is hoped that the existing unused sports ground can be brought back into operational use.
The Stonehouse Cluster - Stonehouse PS17 Magpies site, Oldends Lane	Support, subject to changes listed below

<p>Comments and suggested changes:</p>	<p>The railway line is a serious barrier to use of and as such the development of Stonehouse Town Centre by residents and users of the West of Stonehouse (WOS) strategic allocation Nov 2015 and further development is now proposed as allocation PS19a and PS20 close to WOS. Improvements need to be made to how easily the public can sustainably access Stonehouse as a priority given the Climate Emergency. This site on its own appears too small to facilitate a possible future pedestrian bridge as well as ten dwellings/flats. The safeguarded land for a bridge should be allocated on the draft plan and must also be allocated on the other side of the railway line. It is anticipated that significant contributions would come from PS19a and PS20, should it be pursued, in the developers S.106 to facilitate the development.</p>
<p>Q19. PS19 Northwest of Stonehouse</p>	<p>Support, subject to changes listed below</p>
<p>Comments and suggested changes:</p>	<p>The busy railway line is a serious barrier to use of this site's primary Town Centre. This will encourage car use to travel a more tedious route via the A419 to Stonehouse or indeed once in the car to further afield. It would not be well connected to Stonehouse unless significant improvements are made to how easily the public can sustainably access Stonehouse, particularly given the Climate Emergency. A more reliable and direct means of access must be established which does not require pedestrians and cyclists having to wait for trains to come past on a regular basis.</p> <p>A gentle sloping, cycle friendly bridge at the railway crossing close to the Magpies Football Club appears to be necessary. The safeguarded land for both sides of a bridge should be allocated on the draft plan and PS19 policy should require this specifically.</p> <p>It is noted that the eastern most potential access point would be likely to require significant works that may affect a watercourse, Green Infrastructure and a public footpath across the railway line.</p>
<p>Q20. PS20 M5 Junction 13</p>	<p>Object</p>

<p>Comments and suggested changes:</p>	<p>There is no objectively assessed need to demonstrate that a stadium is required and that this is the most sustainable site which could be allocated for such a stadium (particularly given the wording in DCP1 of this draft plan). Insufficient evidence is given as to what scale and capacity the harms should be tested. Insufficient evidence is provided to demonstrate that a more sustainable site cannot be allocated.</p> <p>The refused application for a stadium (S.16/0043/OUT) and the current resubmission application (S.19/1418/OUT) for outline permission only considered the impacts related to a 5000 capacity crowd and it is considered that the site is not likely to be able to flexibly adapt, without further harmful impacts on local and strategic road network impacts (M5/A419) and noise and disturbance to neighbours in particular. Once approved the pressure on the M5 junction due to traffic could be severe or unknown at certain times, given the variation of visiting teams and there is negligible scope to mitigate or manage traffic issues outside of the proposed heavily developed site. Increase in capacity from the 5000 seats to 10,000 or more should be tested as part of the plan review to establish that the site is sustainable in the long term.</p> <p>If need is assessed for a land allocation for an FGR stadium consideration should be given to securing its plan allocation by FGR or another team from Stroud District.</p>
<p>Q35. PS37 New settlement at Wisloe</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Comments and suggested changes:</p>	<p>5Ha of employment land for 1500 dwellings does not appear to be balanced. Possible cycle links on the road to Eastington/Stonehouse are poor as on the A38 or narrow back lanes.</p>
<p>Q40. PS47 Land west of Renishaw New Mills</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Comments and suggested changes:</p>	<p>Reservations that a further 9Ha should be developed adjacent to the existing Renishaw site in open Countryside. They should be encouraged to inhabit the valleys or more accessible and sustainable sites such as those closer to larger settlements at Dursley/Cam or into Sharpness strategic allocation. Other businesses may then be attracted to the same areas, bringing wealth and skilled jobs to the new employment areas.</p>