

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 January 2020 20:28  
**To:** \_WEB\_Local Plan  
**Subject:** Berkeley and Sharpness development

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I am writing about the collective proposals for PS33, 34, 35 and 36.

I am in total disagreement with the package of proposed development for this area. My reasons are as follows:

- 5500 new dwellings would treble the population. This would destroy the culture of the towns. There are many families who have been here for generations. They will be swamped and their history eradicated.
- A soul-less new town would be come into being, with all the problems currently being faced in Thornbury (drugs, adolescent violence, low-level crime)
- This development is not needed to cater for accommodation requirements of the local population, therefore it will be a huge influx of new residents. There is not sufficient employment in the area, indeed effort is focused on developing the attractiveness of the industrial area around Gloucester/the M5 so why would employers move into Berkeley, which is at the end of road networks (with little public transport, suitable roads etc)
- New residents would commute South to Bristol and North to Gloucester/Cheltenham. There is talk of reinstating the rail network from Sharpness station (to be rebuilt) which would go North, but would it be stopping at the employment areas (which aren't in the middle of Gloucester/Cheltenham) – new stations would have to be built there as well. It can't go South, so commuters would need to change at Cam & Dursley, onto a line which is already at capacity. This is not going to happen. People will drive for commute and they will drive for leisure (what would they do in Berkeley?)
- The roads into Berkeley are not coping with the current traffic, let alone another 10000 plus cars
- The above will increase pollution and the countryside has now been built on; concrete doesn't sequester carbon in the same way green fields and woods do
- Virtually all the development is to be on greenfield site; how does that support the 'Climate Crisis' we are already finding ourselves in
- It is laughable to suggest sustainability can be provided by building a farm...on farmland after bulldozing the existing farms!!
- We live in an area which is rich with wildlife – building this level of habitation must have an effect on the biodiversity of the area
- Flood risks will increase – I live on the edge of the flood plain in Berkeley. Dumping acres of concrete on greenfields (which get sodden currently) means that flood water has to be displaced. This will increase the flooding in areas which can't be developed. If that means my house subsequently gets flooded who incurs the 'pain' certainly not SDC.

In all, there is no rationale for the scale of this development, apart from it suits the planners to dump all their development into one site; an easy solution! Build near to employment centres, on good transport networks and with leisure facilities. Let the countryside be countryside, so people can enjoy the beauty and tranquillity, whether they live here or decide to spend their leisure time here.

[REDACTED]  
Berkeley Resident