

Stroud District Local Plan Review: Additional housing options October 2020

Spatial Options: additional housing land.

Submission by Hardwicke Parish Council

Response to Questionnaire

HPC is not comfortable with the possibility of the land identified as tier 1 for the use for Gloucester City to develop which would potentially be developed in a way to meet their needs, density and layout. This would significantly be at odds to that which HPC and SDC would expect as part of a semi-rural development and it is hoped that results of this consultation will take this real concern of HPC into account when considering what land is to be included within their local plan.

Would you support or object to Option A - "Intensify", if additional housing land is required?

Support

Object **OBJECT**

Please explain your answer

Hardwicke Parish Council recognises that land has been potentially allocated for development within the reduced parish and whilst it acknowledges that some development may take place it will not support the intensification of the site designated Tier 1.

- Access in the area is seriously constrained and will not improve when the Hunts Grove proposals become a reality in the near future.
- This would give developers 'carte blanche' to redesign a scheme which had already been honed and consulted on with local residents and acceptance by the planning authority. Intensification may lack the same level of scrutiny.
- Intensification of housing on the tier 1 site identified in these proposals will only increase current and planned traffic numbers to the point where they will be beyond sensible limits. That limit, at times during the day on the B4008 and surrounding feeder Lanes has almost been reached and given the adjacent developments proposed at Hunts Grove, will not improve, even with the planned highway mitigation works planned as part of that development.
- Despite assurances that may be made this type of development will have almost certainly impact on the ability of the site to accommodate the Environmental and Ecological issues identified in HNBP and that a less dense proposal would be more able to.
- We are sure that the local character could not be retained on a site that by definition would contain a different flavour of development to that which already exists in Hardwicke and proposed within its NDP.

Qu.1b Would you support or object to Option B - "Towns and villages", if additional housing land is required?

Support Yes for Towns

Object No for Villages

Please explain your answer

The following observations are made with the overriding comment that development should not be approved if that development removes valuable open green space and would require the support of local communities.

- Whilst not every area could support, or would want to support development, a greater dispersal will give those that wish some development in their area the opportunity for it to take place.
- It is recognised that this approach would probably not trigger significant developer infrastructure improvements.
- Not everyone would want development in their area
- Villages will tend to be more rural in nature which needs to be preserved.
- They will have less infrastructure to support additional housing. Very small sites of up to say 15 could be supported as long as the development blends in with the existing environment and housing types.
- Smaller properties could be provided to enable young people to remain in a village.

Qu.1c Would you support or object to Option C - "Additional growth point", if additional housing land is required?

YES along A38 and A 419

Please explain your answer

There will however be significant impact on road structure which will need to be addressed

Qu.1d Would you support or object to Option D - "Wider dispersal", if additional housing land is required?

OBJECT

This would lead to a scattergun approach used in a less controlled and less strategic manner. It is more a reaction to short-term need rather than long-term vision with no potential for improving local infrastructure to allow for future developments to be bolted on afterwards

Please explain your answer

Qu.1e Would you support or object to a hybrid or combination of options?

Support (Please answer Qu. 2 to explain which hybrid/combination of options you would support)

Object

OBJECT Same reason as 1d

Qu.1f Can you suggest another strategy / spatial option for the identification of additional housing land?

No

Please describe it

Qu. 2 If you answered yes to Q1e above, please select which of the spatial options (A-D) you would like to see combined in a hybrid strategy?

N/A

Option B - Towns and villages

Option D - Wider dispersal

Please explain why

These options support the views stated in Q1 and also take into account any supporting infrastructure and may meet local needs identified by those parish and town council through their NDPs and or Parish Plans

Spatial Options: a reserve housing supply

Qu.3 Do you support the approach of identifying a reserve site or sites, if housing development on the sites that will be allocated in the Local Plan should fail to come forward as envisaged?

Yes would give qualified support (see below) provided that this is widely published and agreed, but you should also start and immediate review of the plan

- Less popular brownfield sites could be identified as potential areas for development. Because these sites are not favoured by developers because of additional costs in realising the land for development this would be a way of encouraging development on these sites.

Qu.4a Question 4 Which strategy option(s) would you support, if a reserve site (or sites) is required?

Note: Option A – Intensify cannot be used as a means of identifying an additional reserve site. Q

Qu.4b Would you support or object to Option B - "Towns and villages", if a reserve site (or sites) is required?

(please note, Option A - "Intensify" cannot be used as a means of identifying an additional reserve site).

Support

Object OBJECT

Please explain your answer Please see above 4a

Qu.4c Would you support or object to Option C - "Additional growth point", if a reserve site (or sites) is required?

(please note, Option A - "Intensify" cannot be used as a means of identifying an additional reserve site).

Support

Object OBJECT

Please explain your answer Please see above 4a

Qu.4d Would you support or object to Option D - "Wider dispersal", if a reserve site (or sites) is required?

(please note, Option A - "Intensify" cannot be used as a means of identifying an additional reserve site).

Support

Object OBJECT

Please explain your answer

Please see 4a above

Qu.4e Would you support or object to a hybrid or combination of options in order to identify an additional reserve site (or sites)?

Support (Please answer Qu. 5 to explain which hybrid/combination of options you would support)
Object OBJECT

Please explain your answer
Please see 4a above

Qu.4f Can you suggest another strategy / spatial option for the identification of a reserve site/sites?

Yes YES
No

Please describe it
Focus on Brownfield Sites

Qu. 5 If you answered yes to Q4e above, please explain which of the spatial options (B-D) you would like to see combined in a hybrid strategy, and why?

N/A

Option A – Intensify
Option B - Towns and villages
Option C - Additional growth point
Option D - Wider dispersal
No, I would support another option (Please specify below)

Qu.6 What should trigger a reserve site (or sites) coming forward?

A delay in an allocated Local Plan site receiving planning permission?
Failure to deliver housing at the build rates set out in the Local Plan?
Another trigger (please specify below)

Please explain your reasons
Failure to deliver housing at the build rates set out in the Local Plan with no opportunity to recover in subsequent years, therefore giving rise to other unauthorised developments being proposed
There **should not** be an automatic trigger for a reserved site if one should be provided and a brownfield site would focus the developer's attention on delivery of the planned sites

Additional housing options - Potential sites

**Qu.7a Do you support or object to the development of a site identified at:
(BER016) Hook Street Farm, Lynch Road, Berkeley?**

Support

Please explain. This would be supported if it aligns with the local community and local councils and any NDP or parish plan that the community has developed.

**Qu.7b Do you support or object to the development of a site identified at:
(BER017) Bevans Hill Farm, Lynch Road, Berkeley?**

Support

Please explain.

This would be supported if it aligns with the local community and local councils and any NDP or parish plan that the community has developed.

**Qu.7c Do you support or object to the development of a site identified at:
(HAR017) Land at Sellars road, Hardwicke?**

Support

Please Explain

This would be supported if it aligns with the needs of the local community and developed in line with the Hardwicke NDP

**Qu.7d Do you support or object to the development of a site identified at:
(STR065) Beeches Green Health Centre, Stroud?**

Support

Please explain.

This would be supported if it aligns with the local community and local councils and any NDP or parish plan that the community has developed.

**Qu.7c Do you support or object to the development of a site identified at:
(WHI012) Land south of Hyde Lane, Whitminster?**

Support

Please explain.

This would be supported if it aligns with the local community and local councils and any NDP or parish plan that the community has developed.

Qu.8 Are there any other sites that you would like to be considered for future housing development?

We would support the Development of Brownfield sites if such aligns with the local community and local councils and any NDP or parish plan that the community has developed.

Yes, I would like to suggest a site. Please describe the location and/or identify it on a map and explain your reasons. (Maps / files can be uploaded via this online questionnaire, after answering this question). Although we are keen to identify any sites with future potential, the Council has limited scope to pursue sites that are not actively promoted to us by a landowner or developer.

Yes, I am a landowner / agent / developer and I would like to submit a new site. If you would like to promote an alternative site that has not previously been considered as part of the Local Plan Review or Strategic Assessment of Land Availability (SALA), please also fill in the Site Submission Form that can be found at www.stroud.gov.uk/localplanreview - the form can be uploaded here or you can send it to us separately. (Please clearly identify in any accompanying email or letter that you have also responded via this online questionnaire, so that we can easily link the responses up).

Comments:

Potential growth points

Qu.9a Do you support or object to the development of Potential Growth Point 1 (PGP1) - Land at Grove End Farm, Whitminster. Including SALA sites WHI007 and WHI014.

Potential for up to 2,250 dwellings, 13 hectares employment, local centre, primary school, community facilities and open space

Please explain why you support or object to the development of this broad location. If your comments relate to a specific site within the broad growth point area, please reference the SALA site number(s).

Support

Object

This would be supported if it aligns with the local community and local councils and any NDP or parish plan that the community has developed. We are however concerned about the impact on local highway network.

Qu.9b Do you support or object to the development of Potential Growth Point 2 (PGP2) - Broad location at Moreton Valence / Hardwicke. Including SALA sites HAR015, HAR016, HAR006, HAR007, HAR008 and HAR009.

Potential for up to 1,500 dwellings, employment land, local centre, primary school, community facilities and open space.

Please explain why you support or object to the development of this broad location. If your comments relate to a specific site within the broad growth point area, please reference the SALA site number(s).

OBJECT

But, would be supported if it aligns with the local community and local council's and any NDP or parish plan that the community has developed. It is noted that a development at this location will have significant impact on the local highway network the A 38 and the M5 junction 12 The traffic movements at these locations already have a detrimental impact on the local lanes in Hardwicke and the Cross Keys Roundabout in spite of the 'improvements' and before the changes to the area to accommodate Hunts Grove access onto B4008 and A38

Qu.10 Are there any other sites that you would like to be considered as a future growth point?

Yes, I would like to suggest a location that I think you should consider. Please describe the location and/or identify it on a map and explain your reasons. (maps / files can be uploaded via this online questionnaire, after answering this question). Although we are keen to identify any sites with future potential, the Council has limited scope to pursue sites that are not actively promoted to us by a landowner or developer.

Yes, I am a landowner / agent / developer and I would like to submit a new site. If you would like to promote an alternative site that has not previously been considered as part of the Local Plan Review or Strategic Assessment of Land Availability (SALA), please state the name of the site below and fill in the Site Submission Form that can be found at www.stroud.gov.uk/localplanreview - the form can be uploaded here or you can send it to us separately. (Please clearly identify in any accompanying email or letter that you have also responded via this online questionnaire, so that we can easily link the responses up).

Comments

Sustainability Appraisal

Qu. 11 Please use the space below to provide comments on the Sustainability Appraisal that accompanies this consultation document?

Hardwicke Parish Council's NDP sets out the environmental and ecological needs of its area which supports in the main the SDC strategy