

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 January 2020 22:00
To: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: Draft local plan consultation 22.01.20

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To whom it may concern.

In response to proposals reference PS 33-36.

1. PS 33 edge of Berkeley - I understand that houses need to be built somewhere so as a least worst option despite it expecting to have a significant negative effect of flooding and efficient land use.
2. PS 35 Wanswell - I am concerned that there is a need for a secondary school in the area so do question whether it makes more sense for the County Council to buy back the school rather than build houses on it
3. PS 34 at the docks - no objection if the building of the houses can complement the area as a working dock, as a least worst option with it expecting to have a significant negative impact on biodiversity, air quality and flooding.
4. PS 36 the area between Berkeley and Sharpness.- I strongly object to the plans to build a town on greenfields at PS 36 for the following reasons:
 - It can not be congruent with feedback previously given to SDC, with those consulted favouring a dispersal option, that the plan for 2 growth points in the south of SDC be a logical option. Choosing this site (PS36) to build 60% of the houses required by SDC, is not logical given the evidence currently available with regard to its location: its effect on landscape, flooding, efficient land use, or the SDC policy to mitigate against climate change.
 - I do not understand why SDC has chosen to extend the period of the plan to 2050 from 2040 and apply the same building rates as defined in 2020. This is a particularly difficult to comprehend given that no one can possibly know what the demand for housing will be in that decade, especially as the population of the UK is declining as stated by the Office for National Statistics.
 - This settlement PS36 uses a vastly significant area of greenfields required by our planet to absorb CO2 , allow water drainage, offer habitat to wildlife and birds. It does not seem congruent with the updated priority issues identified by SDC to conserve and enhance Stroud District's countryside and biodiversity. Nor is it maximising the potential of brownfield sites to contribute to housing supply. I do not see how this fits with SDC policies to protect biodiversity, landscapes/townscapes, our historic environment , air quality, or efficient land use.
 - If this plan is agreed, as local residents we are likely to suffer 25 years of building so unlike the green fields, it is not likely to impact positively on the mental health of local residents.
 - I also believe that the light and noise pollution that this town would generate can not be mitigated against with regard to the potential damage to local wildlife and birds flying to Slimbridge WWF.
 - It does not seem congruent with the updated priority issues identified by SDC to ensure new housing development is located in the right place and is supported by the right services and infrastructure. This settlement is far too large for the infrastructure and facilities available in Berkeley, rated poor, and Sharpness, rated very poor, in previous SDC documentation. With its current population it already requires a secondary school, leisure facilities, better roads and public transport, medical and emergency services.
 - The developers say that they have no plans to improve the roads locally. Any traffic essential to the building of such a large scale development will seriously compromise the already poor roads. The infrastructure should surely be improved before SDC can make an informed viability assessment

regarding building more houses, given that Berkeley and Sharpness already suffer congested roads, links to the motorways, and have little in the way of public transport.

- People commonly commute to work in Bristol to which there is no easy rail link, nor is it likely to be, according to information from Network rail. Junction 14 of the M5 and beyond are already tested on a daily basis with commuters from current housing stock. Going north by road is equally difficult with junction 13 and 12 of the M5 being congested to standstill at times. I understand that the developers say they may build a station or improve the roads after they receive income from building houses. There is no guarantee that this will happen. Despite this, the Sustainability assessment on which this plan is based states that there will be a station and improvements to the roads. Unless this is guaranteed by the District council on behalf of the county council or is guaranteed by GCC this can not be safe context on which to make the Sustainability assessment.
- I understand that the developers say that those living in the new town will work from home or on 10 ha of the site. The residents will be very restricted as to what work they can undertake from home, e.g. they will not be able to work for the fire service, police service, as teachers or nurses.
- I am not convinced that allowing 10ha of land for employment in any way guarantees that employers will want to come to the land between Berkeley and Sharpness. SDC in their own documentation say that this locality has failed to attract employers for a period of 30 years as it is too remote. Also, history has shown that having vast warehouses at Sharpness has not provide more than a handful of jobs for locals despite what was promised at the time the warehouses sought planning permission. What they have provided however is a constant supply of large lorries adding to demands on the local highways.
- I do not understand how building a new town with a supermarket will rejuvenate Berkeley. I think it will detract from Berkeley as an historic centre and from the few businesses currently there.
- There are no plans to build a secondary school until 2040-50 despite the fact that the area already needs one in the face of KLB and Rednock being oversubscribed by houses being built in the locality.
- The Sustainability assessment states that the former Berkeley Power station site is being promoted for training and employment opportunities. I do not understand how this is a sensible option when your own SA states it could have significant negative effect on biodiversity/geodiversity and our historic environment and that it would have an uncertain effect in relation to SA objective 8: landscape/townscape. You say it could have a negative effect on air quality and climate change as it is in a remote location but you discount this concern based on what you think could be. I think your assessment should focus on what is, rather than what might be, e.g. you say that the site would be at risk of flooding events. The site is already being made use of for training, so in my opinion you can not credit this plan with efficient use of land there. You can not guarantee there will be a gain to economic and employment opportunities, not given the low uptake to date.
- Even with an allocation of affordable housing, which the developers have said would be at 6 % if they have to make a contribution to infrastructure, building a new town would not guarantee that low income households could afford to buy them. Therefore I do not see how this development would sufficiently meet the objective to provide affordable housing.

I am e mailing in response to the consultation on the SDC draft local plan. I believe it makes sense to build housing close to decent road links, facilities and services. Given that the future economic development is expected to be placed in Cheltenham and Gloucester it makes sense to build houses close to these locations. Therefore, I support building on the sites at Whaddon and Hardwicke.

Please can you make these comments available to the Inspector in due course

Kind regards [REDACTED]