

Stroud Local Plan Review

Consultation questions and replies from Harescombe Parish Council

Completed by

SECTION 1

Key issues

Question 1.0a

Have we identified the top 5 issues for you?

Answer:

Not necessarily. Our main issue is the lack of supply of smaller houses in our rural community for the young and those downsizing.

In section 1, the issue 5 heading suggests the possibility of development in our village appears to be restricted to affordable housing, which we understand is broadly 'housing is for people who are unable to rent or buy on the open market'. However, the wider meaning is possibly recognised later at section 2.3.

We believe there is also the need for potential in some rural communities to allow limited development of a smaller number of houses to buy on the open market, not just affordable housing.

Question 1.0b

Do you agree with the ways we intend to tackle these issues?

Answer:

No, because our main issue does not seem to be covered. There also seems to be undue focus on existing infrastructure rather than providing any new infrastructure. In addition, if the council wants more affordable housing we believe it needs to provide more financial incentives to those with potential sites e.g. exception sites

SECTION 2

Local economy and jobs...

Question 2.1a

Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to support the local economy and the creation of jobs?

Answer:

Generally yes, although we note the word 'continued' support of farm diversification when it is clear that Stroud DC is currently not always supporting farm diversification. This should perhaps be

amended to 'new' support. On the last point it is also not clear what is meant by 'subject to more appropriate locational and environmental criteria'. Unfortunately, the entire paper contains a number of these very vague phrases which render the statements almost impossible to interpret.

Question 2.1b

Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

Answer:

No, not as far as we are aware

Our town centres...

Question 2.2a

Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to support the District's town centres?

Answer:

Generally yes, although an additional measure would be to reduce car parking charges to encourage people to come in to town centres to shop and provide better bus services for rural communities.

Question 2.2b

Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

Answer:

As above

A local need for housing...

Question 2.3a

Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to meet local housing need?

Answer:

Yes e.g. small scale housing in rural areas in the interests of social sustainability, subject to local community support through the preparation of neighbourhood plans IF this statement can be taken at face value.

However, the later sections in the paper suggest there may be additional conditions not mentioned in section 2.3 a. e.g. page 43 states limited development might be allowed beyond settlement

development limits as set out in the emerging Strategy but then qualifies this with the additional conditions of 'satisfying detailed environmental and design criteria'.

Question 2.3b

Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

Answer:

It would be useful to have further explanation on what is a rural exception site and how this links to the restriction on building in AONB areas

Local green spaces and community facilities...

Question 2.4a

Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to protect existing or deliver new local green spaces and community facilities?

Answer:

Yes

Question 2.4b

Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

Answer:

No, not as far as we are aware

A vision for the future...

Question 3.1a

Do you agree with the vision for 2040 as drafted?

Answer:

No, because it is far too vague and the Central Government need for many additional houses does not seem addressed in this vision. We cannot see any link to the growth strategy.

Question 3.1b

Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

Answer:

See comment above

Strategic Objectives...

Question 3.2a

Do you agree with the Strategic Objectives as drafted?

Answer:

Yes

Question 3.2b

Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

Answer:

No, not as far as we are aware

The emerging growth strategy...

Question 4.2a

Do you support the broad approach of the emerging growth strategy, in terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District?

Answer:

We remain to be convinced that there is the need for new settlements at Newtown/Sharpness and Wisloe. These appear to be required as Gloucester CC has first choice on areas such as Whaddon. Given it seem to be a forgone conclusion that Whaddon will be developed, we do understand why this site cannot count towards Stroud's allocation. We are keen to understand why Gloucester CC should be handed this site and we would like to know what the overall impact is

The emerging Strategy has very little focus on rural communities which want to retain young people and to create opportunities for older people to remain.

Question 4.2b

Do you support an alternative strategy approach?

Answer:

See comments above

Question 4.2c

Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? Or do other settlements have growth potential?

Answer:

As stated above there is very little focus on rural communities which want to retain young people and to create opportunities for older people to remain. Our village is not even identified within the five tiers. Have other communities also been ignored?

Question 4.2d

Do you support our approach to addressing Gloucester's housing needs?

Answer:

No, we believe land with the Stroud Area should be given priority for Stroud DC use

Question 4.2e

Do you support an alternative approach to addressing Gloucester's housing needs?

Answer:

See comment above

Settlement hierarchy...

Question 4.3a

Are any of the settlements in the wrong tier and, if so, for what reason?

Answer:

We would like to know why our village is not included at all and how many other villages/hamlets have also been excluded

Question 4.3b

Do you support the proposed approach to managing development at small Tier 4 and 5 settlements by including them within the hierarchy and defining Settlement Development Limits? Or do you support an alternative approach of simply treating them as 'open countryside'? What are the pros and cons of either approach?

Answer:

We broadly support a settlement boundary approach but we believe that these boundaries need to be agreed with local communities first. This is certainly the case for the existing settlement boundary

for Harescombe which is currently non-sensical and we would like it be reassessed in conjunction with the parish council/ local community.

Question 4.3c

Do you support the idea that the Local Plan should seek to manage the cumulative impacts of growth on individual settlements? How should we develop a policy framework to achieve this?

Answer:

Yes, by consultation with the relevant Town or Parish Council

Settlement development limits...

Question 4.4a

Do you support the emerging Strategy's approach towards maintaining settlement development limits?

Answer:

Yes

Question 4.4b

Or do you support an alternative approach?

Answer:

No

Question 4.4c

Do you support the proposals to allow some limited development beyond settlement development limits?

Answer:

No, but see below

Question 4.4d

Or do you support an alternative approach?

Answer:

Rather than allowing development beyond settlement limits, we believe settlement boundaries should be reviewed and agreed in conjunction with local town and parish councils

Question 4.4e

Do you support the specific changes to existing settlement development limits that are set out in Appendix A? (Please clearly specify which settlement(s) your comment(s) relate to, and use the map's boundary change reference where relevant).

Answer:

We feel we are unable to comments about specific limits for other communities

Question 4.4f

Do you support any other changes to settlement development limits, not listed in Appendix A? Please specify.

Answer:

The current settlement boundary within Harescombe is meaningless and needs reviewing.

Making places: mini visions and priorities for your area...

Question 5.0a

Do you support the proposed mini-visions for your area(s)? (Please be clear and specific about which of the 8 mini-visions your comment(s) relate to).

Answer:

Gloucester fringe.

Yes

Question 5.0b

Would you like to propose alternative wording for any of the mini-visions? (Please be clear and specific about which of the 8 mini-visions your comment(s) relate to).

Answer:

No

Question 5.0c

Do you support the identified key issues and priorities for action for your area(s)? (Please be clear and specific about which of the 8 parish clusters your comment(s) relate to).

Answer:

Gloucester fringe

Yes

Question 5.0d

Are there other important issues and priorities you would like to highlight? (Please be clear and specific about which of the 8 parish clusters your comment(s) relate to).

Answer:

Gloucester fringe

- a) We would like clearer published information on what the policy is in relation to development within AONB areas, in particular infilling and use of brown field sites*
- b) The infrastructure needs of rural communities appear to have been ignored in solutions, although Appendix B contains several points would suggest this should be addressed e.g. points 27 - 29*
- c) 4.2 Neighbour Plans*

We are a little confused by the last paragraph on page P32 which states

At Tier 4 and 5 settlements, in addition to rural exception sites, the development of small sites of up to 10 dwellings outside settlement development limits will be supported in the interests of maintaining social sustainability, provided that the policy is supported by the local community through the making of a Neighbourhood Plan.

How does a community without a tier allocation fit with this statement? Are there any other conditions that will apply such as environmental constraints which are mentioned for tiers 1-3?

Making places: potential sites and alternatives...

If you would like to comment about whether we have identified the right settlements for growth, or whether other settlements have growth potential, please refer back to Question 4.2c on page 36.

Question 5.1a

Assuming some growth is desirable, have we identified the best site(s) at each town and village? (Please clearly specify which settlement(s) your comment(s) relate to, and use the site reference numbers shown on the map, where relevant). Would you like to promote an additional alternative site for consideration through the next SALA? Visit our Local Plan Review web page to find out how to submit a site.

Answer:

No further comment

Question 6.1

Are there any other specific local studies that you believe are needed to inform the Local Plan review?

Have you any advice on the scope or content of any of these studies?

Answer:

The Impact of new development on surrounding roads (traffic volume, speed of traffic and wear and tear) e.g. the impact of Hunts Grove and Whaddon developments on surrounding areas.

