

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2020 16:34
To: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: Berkeley Cluster & PS36 New Settlement at Sharpness

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please find my response to the proposed plan:

Summary

- It is very concerning that the spokesperson for the planning/development company stated this proposal was 100% larger than anything else they have done before.
- We do not know if the proposal is a sound professional offering because the company concerned seems to have not reviewed the success of their previous offerings.
- Grave impact on the environment putting a massive development in the green belt on low lying land adjacent to a flood risk area.
- Currently minimal employment in the area. Gloucestershire's current plan is locating industry around Cheltenham & Gloucester forcing people to commute.
- Plan needs to be viewed in conjunction with other developments such as Buckover. J14 of the motorway is already overburdened and with 12000+ additional homes planned traffic chaos is a certainty.
- Predicted local traffic problems without development of roads feeding the proposed houses.
- Safety concerns with inadequate roads sharing use with high numbers of cyclists & horse riders.
- Increased pollution with the rocketing number of commuting journeys to get to & from work.
- No guaranteed public transport provision. No direct access to Bristol via rail & will Network Rail be prepared to make the investment to allow more trains on the Bristol line via Cam & Dursley?
- Massive increase in population number without senior school provision until late in the plan. Current schools already at or close to capacity. This forces commuting with Rednock necessitating a daily 24.4 miles & KLB 38.4.
- Unrealistic impractical thinking by the planning consultants. People using Segways to get around the development! At some £6000 each I do not see this happening and people will fall back on the use of cars.
- Too much of the plan is interdependent. One pillar collapses such as a rail link, and the whole thing just becomes yet another urban sprawl.

Detailed Review:

1. Firstly I would state I am not a NIMBY and appreciate the need for some form of development. For reasons of guarantee, safety & treating the environment in a responsible manner I would suggest the development should not exceed a size that the current infrastructure can comfortably deal with.
2. My wife and I were shocked at a couple of admissions made by the planning/development company:

- a. The company has never been involved with a development of this magnitude, their largest to date being some 50% of this proposal. What confidence does this give that their proposal is tried & tested and guaranteed to work?
 - b. We asked the representative of the company if he knew the proposal would work and had he visited small towns developed to their previous proposals. The answer was that he had not visited their former work in places such as Aylesbury. How can this individual be confident their proposals work if he has not even visited previous developments. As a lifelong designer & former Technical Director of a large design consultancy, Fellow of the Royal Aeronautical Society & former Fellow of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers I feel well qualified to comment on this point. How anyone operating in a professional capacity can fail to review previous work I find staggering. The essence of good design is to review previous designs & possibly mistakes so that improvements can be made to future designs. Is this planning company trying to say they provide perfect solutions that never need improvement? We are not dealing with short lead time items here that can be destroyed after a short period of time to be replaced by something new. A design on this scale will no doubt be expected to last for generations.
3. Break up community spirit- Excellent community spirit with regular 'village' events that would be swamped by a mass housing development of this type.
 - a. The developer seems to have no handle on the area or its community. They have set aside an area for a 'farm'. I guess they have not noticed we already have quite a few of them the majority of which they intend to cover in concrete & tarmac.
 4. Destroy outlook from property devaluing my recent investment
 5. Will make my property difficult to sell being effectively at the centre of a building site with plans currently showing development on 3 of the properties 4 sides.
 6. Do not want to live in the middle of a long term building site with noise & dust
 7. Wanted country location – did planning checks = nothing shown. Why have I wasted money on such checks to have this 'new' idea dropped on me.
 8. Why are we building yet again in the green belt when there are various brown field sites that would be more suitable and not ravage our countryside?
 9. There appear no plans to develop the access roads into this huge development, the most major road being 'B' class. I do not see how the volume of traffic can:
 - a. Safely use the area given the amount of horses & cyclists that regularly use these roads
 - b. Use the roads in an efficient manner. Traffic jams are a certainty with consequent increased pollution.
 - c. Noise and annoyance for the houses built close to what is currently lightly used roads.
10. Train halt
 - a. Is there a guaranteed provider? If not what is the guarantee that this form of transport will materialise. Without it the resultant traffic increase will greatly increase danger on the inadequate roads for both commuters & current local users of other forms of transport such as horse & bicycle.
 - b. Cam Dursley to Bristol already at capacity

- i. Digitisation, currently analogue control/signalling, allows more trains by running them closer together according to developer. Is there a guarantee this work will be done? If not increased train services to Bristol cannot take place.

11. Where will people work?

- a. Companies will not relocate to area unless the specific skills they want are known to be available.
 - i. If they do not work within the development they will have to travel outside
 - 1. Will public transport be available?
 - 2. Will use own transport putting additional strain on already overcrowded roads
 - 3. Increasing carbon footprint
 - ii. If they work within the development what will come first the houses/people or the jobs.
 - iii. If houses first then transport will be required for outflow – we have already established that there are no plans to improve access roads. Is it safe for 'B' class or below to carry this amount of traffic?
 - iv. If jobs first then transport will be required for inflow– we have already established that there are no plans to improve access roads, 'B' class or below' to enter the development
- b. The major industrial/office developments for Gloucestershire I believe are located in the Gloucester/Cheltenham vicinity. Surely it makes more sense to locate housing adjacent:
 - i. Cheaper infrastructure
 - ii. Removes the risk of increased/long distance car use if major infrastructure improvements do not take place.

12. There are currently numerous industrial units in the area vacant, it seems 'job creators' already find the area unattractive.

13. I was told by the developer it is anticipated internal transport within the development will be by electric scooter or Segway to get to the station & bus hub. Is this a serious proposition???

- a. Basic (Cheapest) Segway price £5595 – how many households will have the disposable income to invest in such devices.
- b. Are older citizens expected to have the balance abilities to drive a Segway in safety?
- c. Currently such devices are not allowed on public rights of way.
- d. This is a typical example of how the plan has not been thought through in a practical & realistic manner. It contains far too much 'blue sky thinking'.

14. Public transport in the area is practically nonexistent . I am sure people would use it if there was a good service. The service currently is so poor it acts as a discouragement to potential users. I am sure a provider would move in if there was an established need BUT what would happen in the interim period? Clogged roads full of cars.

15. The plan seems a house of cards. It is assumed by the developer that the enterprise will be self contained with people living & working locally. If & it is a very big if the jobs come before the houses local roads will become choked by commuters. If as is much more likely the houses come first then again the roads become choked by

commuters travelling to places like Stroud, Gloucester & Bristol. A whole host of events would have to take place such as health services, schools, roads, public transport etc. almost simultaneously if the area is not simply yet another dormitory town pouring commuters into the inadequate local and further afield infrastructure.

16. Can this development be viewed in isolation?

- a. Commuters travelling north will have to use the A38 to access Gloucester/Stroud or the M5 at junction 13. If they wish to go to Bristol again the A38 will have to be used to access the M5 at junction 14.
 - i. Junction 14 is already above capacity as I am sure you are aware & the ensuing traffic chaos caused by the junction traffic lights that after installation had to be turned off at peak times. 6000 homes at Berkeley. Buckover is likely to get the go-ahead with about 5000 homes. Other developments probably account for an additional 1000.
 - ii. Let us assume 50% of Berkeley, 75% of Buckover & 50% of the other developments go through J14 . This would add something like 7250 additional cars 'flowing' through this already choked junction at each rush hour. IMPOSSIBLE.

17. The area is very low lying and vast swathes of tarmac & concrete are likely to increase the likelihood of flooding. The Canonbury rise development seems to have had an impact on 3 of the fields below in that it now seems to be covered by lakes. The area is already on the margins of the risk area. I know from bitter experience from a previous property that things go wrong because developers are always looking for the cheapest way of erecting housing paying no heed to the potential consequences. I owned a house at the bottom of a hillside. When a development company proposed building a small number of houses at the top of the hill the existing residents complained about the potential flood risk. The development went ahead & lo & behold the first substantial rainfall resulted in the houses at the bottom of the hill being flooded. Developers seldom if ever care about existing residents or costly infrastructure. This is starkly illustrated by the development at Canonbury rise which does not appear to be selling well. I have been told that houses are being discounted and there are problems with structural integrity.

18. To make the plan work a unified approach will be required. Expansion or additional motorway junctions, improvement to existing roads, building of a station/halt, provision of trains on this dead end branch line, provision of public transport both to the external transport infrastructure or internal, provision of jobs, schools etc. If there is no master plan and these are not delivered in a near simultaneous manner then commuting for work, shopping & other services will become a necessity clogging inadequate roads and providing a soaring carbon footprint. The UK's record on providing holistic developments is dire just look at the third runway at Heathrow, cross rail or HS2.

Yours Faithfully

██████████