

Please see below my comments regarding the technical documents for the Stroud Local Plan. I confirm my previous submission covered all the areas I am commenting on below.

- [REDACTED]
- **Mobile** [REDACTED]
- **Email:** [REDACTED]

EB98 Transport

Station: There is no plan to improve C&D Train station until 2035. The station is already at capacity with parking issues and the fact that the station can only accommodate two carriages. If one of the arguments given that one of the main reasons for such dense development in Cam is the links to public transport then this is wrong. Developments in Wisloe, Sharpness and Berkeley all use the station as a selling point. The station, roads leading to it and the lack of parking all prevent it from serving the increase of users.

I believe that when parking charges are enforced it will lead commuters to park in the Box Road Development causing more problems. There is no mention of the aged railway bridge (A4135) it is already woefully narrow and dangerous – how will increased traffic cope?

We have had little or no improvements that were promised as part of the Littlecombe Development. E.g., traffic calming on Hopton Road, improvements to Cam (Tesco) and Cam Pitch roundabout. We were also promised a new mini roundabout as part of the Box Rd Development/A4135, which would have eased traffic flow but was abandoned. I do not believe that there are local job opportunities that are stated as part of the argument in favour of PS24 & 25. There will be increased traffic with commuters, accessing education and needed retail opportunities in surrounding towns. Public transport here in Cam is already poor; you only have to see the daily plight of locals not being able to catch buses, as they don't turn up/are not regular. The route directly to the train station has only just started again as a trial – will this even be running? Proposals submitted currently on PS25 show a cycle track to station – I cannot see how this, and other 'green' incentives will actually come about when house numbers have already increased to 315 – you cannot fit in the increase numbers and the community spaces, tree planting etc. They certainly will not be enforced and in so not support the increase in people and transport needs.

We are seeing real effects of pollution on the main roads through Cam. Levels are high, it can be tasted when walking on the pavements – this will get worse with more idling vehicles.

EB109 Transport Funding, Delivery Plan

There appears to be no credible plan for improvements of infrastructure. There is no mention of timing of any works needed to enable safe living conditions for the population of Cam and Dursley.

Who will decide what will actually be done? With the current state of our economy there will be real cuts to local government spending, therefore many works will not happen across the county and obviously it could mean none of the needed works might not happen. How would we cope with such a large increase in population?

EB10 IDP

3.2 Education

There is no provision mentioned for pre-schools. There is already a huge need for this (Inspector – please look up the number of posts on the local Facebook pages from distraught parents) New homes = new families = increase need for childcare, primary and secondary schools.

Education will be under invested due to the financial crisis we are now faced with. Even before this you will be able to see how oversubscribed the local schools are. The two nearest primary settings (Cam Hopton + Cam Everlands Schools) are oversubscribed by as many as 100 per year. How then will increase in families not exasperate this problem. Cam Hopton classrooms are already too small to accommodate 30 pupils, class sizes cannot increase. SDC does not have a plan to tackle this real problem. Originally in PS24 proposal there was a new primary school, but there has been no allocation of funding to build this so will either not happen or will have a waiting of many, many, many years which mean new families will have to travel outside of the area for schooling which will increase pressure on transport links/infrastructure and negatively impact on the cohesion of the community.

Children will not know each other; individuals will be isolated which will impact on mental health and the pressure on GPs and wider health needs. There is very poor parking around the schools that cannot accommodate the number of cars being used to drop kids off to school (families no longer live close enough to the schools now, have to commute to work) This will become increasingly worse if PS24 and 25 go ahead.

Rednock currently serves the wider catchment of the surrounding villages and small towns. The only way the school can accommodate the increase pupil numbers are by reducing the catchment area. Local children will be shipped to Quedgeley and Stroud – more negative impact on transport and community cohesion.

If you look at original PS25 proposal and the proposed number of new children needing access to school being around 69 which none of the primary schools could cope with is now essentially double that if there is a go ahead to allow 315 homes to be built in the same space.

There is no logical planning for this. Our community will collapse.

3.3.2 Flood Management & Drainage

I live on Rowley, a street where homes (including mine) back onto the River Cam. We have seen since work began on the Littlecombe estate (upstream) an increase in river height after rain etc. The runoff from what were once fields goes directly into the river. We have great concerns that if PS25 goes ahead

that this will mean that the river will burst its banks regularly and cause flooding to the homes running along the river (inc Everlands, Court House Gardens, Draycott, Box Rd). If you look at this graph that documents the river levels you will see how often the levels have been high since work started on Littlecombe. I believe none of this data has been looked at as part of this proposed development, although readily available on the Internet. Please look at this link, which illustrates the levels

<https://riverlevels.uk/river-cam-cam-.Y1fZiezMLdQ>

When monitoring started years ago the average height was between .58m and .87m. In the last 12 months it has been between 0.86m and 0.99m. It has been between these levels for at least 152 days in the past year. This simply illustrates the changes that need to be taken into consideration if any new

building work is done near the river – if fields are taken away the runoff will go directly into the tiny river thus causing flooding to current residents. There are also 5 known springs in the fields proposed for PS25 – what is the impact when they are tarmaced over? Where will the water go? What effect will this

Have?

The recommendations in Planning Policy Statement Practice Guide 25 (Taking Flood Risk Into Account In The Planning Process) have not been followed. I do not believe that the PS25 proposal will keep any of the site drainage proposals, planting etc, especially now with increased house numbers (180-315). Who would enforce these works? It will be a disaster that

would affect both housing along the river line and the many local businesses including Tesco and The Draycott Industrial Estate. Sewage in the River Cam is now a real problem and is documented from the

Dursley – Station Road point by the River Trust who have documented that in 2021 this sewer storm overflow spilled 6 times for a total of 5 hours, discharging straight into the River Cam. This will only increase with more

building as pipes cannot cope with increase in number of homes.

3.5.5 Open Green Spaces, Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

As a resident who walks and experiences the rich biodiversity in Cam, I can inform the inspector that we have an incredibly rich diversity of wildlife both in the fields and within the dark corridor of the river – including otters, kingfishers, bats and deer. SFRA highlighted the abundance of wildlife and how it would be sensitive to any development. The PS25 proposal does not state how they can protect our incredible environment/biodiversity. 315 homes with street lighting would stop any form of dark corridor for our wildlife. Taking away the incredibly biodiverse rich hedgerows (with the unusual wildlife corridor within the middle of the hedges used by many animals including deer) will never be replaced. The depth of hedging has been nurtured over centuries – these should not be ripped out as per PS24 & PS25 proposals.

In CPC Neighbourhood Plan stated that Cam's green infrastructure and distinctiveness supported NPPF (paragraph 170) and adds to Stroud Policy ES8, which seeks to enhance and expand the district's tree and woodland resource. PS24 and 25 will not adhere to this. Taking away Cam's green spaces will also negatively impact on the health and wellbeing of residents. I believe that the proposed Greenway/cycle route will never properly happen as it relies on private parcel landowners selling the pieces of land. Developers could use the land they want to build on, but this would reduce number of homes and therefore profit. Also, if the small parcels of land are used it will destroy the habitats and biodiversity even more for our flora and fauna. I appeal to SDC, GCC to read the details sited in Cam's Neighbourhood Plan and read for themselves the Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity of this area.

3.3.4 Health & Social Care

I have not read any compelling information that there will be improvements to the already stretched Health and Social Care in Cam. Cam and Uley surgery has no space to expand the building to serve the growing population, never mind actual staff – why is there not a plan for new GP surgery? The local dentist is not taking NHS patients and is now owned by BUPA. Where will an NHS dentist be situated?

How will the stretched social care cope with such an increase in population? Post-surgery support e.g., physios? Midwives? District nurses? And the wider Social Prescribing Team, mental health? It is just not viable, especially as budgets will be cut by Government. It was stated that housing developments should be done in small pockets to prevent over burdening of particular towns/communities. This is being ignored. Cam Neighbourhood Plan and responses from CPC on the proposals are being completely ignored by SDC. Requirements for housing should be

achieved by dispersal and not by the mass development of Wisloe, Cam and Sharpness resulting in 80% of SDC's proposed housing requirement.

Alternative sites closer to the larger town of Stroud and the City of Gloucester should be considered as these have the infrastructure to sustain this type of development.

EB111

This report is huge and very difficult for a normal resident like me to fully understand. I have though pulled out the following, which I believe is not being followed by developers or SDC with proposed developments in PS24 and 25.

2.58 National policy has moved on in this area. The Environment Act received Royal Assent in November 2021 and mandates that new developments must deliver an overall increase in biodiversity. The requirement is that developers ensure habitats for wildlife are enhanced and left in a measurably better state than they were pre-development. They must assess the type of habitat and its condition before submitting plans, and then demonstrate how they are improving biodiversity – such as through the creation of green corridors, planting more trees or forming local nature spaces.

EB111a

Is SDC following the agreed viability assessment procedure with these proposals?

EB112 SALA Accessibility Scoring Note & EB112a 2020

I do not believe that there has been realistic reporting on local job opportunities in Cam. Although there are local employers such as Cam Mills (As stated in report) it employees 40-60 workers. There tends not to be much movement in workforce, so rarely positions are advertised. Most work available are minimum wages and without much prospect of moving up the ladder to better wages.

In PS25 proposal it states Cam Hopton School listed as closest school for new housing estate but already it is oversubscribed by 100+ applications. The catchment for the school is so small even people living in the nearby new estate of Littlecombe do not automatically get a place.

In the Box Road proposal there was inclusion of a new small industrial unit that would provide new jobs. This has not been built and doesn't look to ever be built.