



PAINSWICK PARISH COUNCIL

TOWN HALL PAINSWICK GLOUCESTERSHIRE GL6 6QA
01452 812722 clerk@painswick-pc.gov.uk

<http://www.painswick-pc.gov.uk/>



Local Plan Review Team
Stroud District Council
Ebley Mill
Stroud
GL5 4UB

16th July 2021

Local Plan Review – Pre-Submission – Draft Local Plan – Regulation 19 Consultation May 2021

Painswick Parish Council is dismayed, appalled and angry that they have been ignored, misled, and manipulated with regards to the process of the review of the Local Plan.

Painswick Parish Council was under the false impression that their views were being listened too, mattered, and taken into consideration. It is now apparent that the time spent studying the documentation, attending forums, and meeting face-to-face with the Local Plan Review team was a complete farce! A recent quote from ██████████ of The Mirror newspaper sums it up completely: - “The word consultation means – We are going to do something really nasty. But first we’ll ask a few people if it’s OK – and then go ahead anyway”.

With Reference to the Retail Centre

The Local Plan Review team acknowledged that the map of the boundaries for the Retail Centre were incorrectly drawn in the original plan and ‘promised’ that this would be rectified in the review. This Council spent time speaking with the Local Review team and submitted a copy of where the boundary should be. In the face-to-face meeting with ██████████ held on Friday 14th February 2020, ██████████ confirmed it was imperative to get this right. This Council is dismayed to now learn that the Review Team is now stating no changes will be made. This Council wrote to the Review Team several times for updates, so why didn’t the Review Team have the decency to communicate this with Painswick Parish Council before now?

Painswick has already suffered many losses of retail businesses, since 2015, as the original boundary map was incorrect and that the Planning Officers could not apply Policy CP12, to those applications. Painswick is a small but vibrant tourist location which will only remain that way, if the remaining businesses are supported by not permitting the loss of further retail and hospitality premises to convert to residential. The conversion of such premises is of course a profitable temptation for those landowners but at the detriment to the continued viability of the rest of the Painswick.

Page 219 states – *The settlement has an important but vulnerable local retail role, with a small range of local shops to serve the day-to-day needs of surrounding*

villages and hamlets. It remains vulnerable because this review has not amended the boundary map as promised and continues to undermine the efforts of the Parish Council to ensure its viability.

With Reference to the Change of Tier

██████████ and the Review Team ‘sold’ the need for the Tier change to further enhance the protection of the Retail Centre – it is apparent this was blatant manipulation for the Review Team to get this Council to support the change. This Council did ask for evidence to prove that the Tier change from 3 to 2 is justified – no such evidence has been provided. Therefore, this Council does not support the need for a Tier change and feels that whilst the Council is not against appropriate development, *no viable sites have been established.

Page 23 states: - *2.3.8 In order to meet wider development needs and to support and improve existing services and facilities at smaller towns and larger villages, **modest levels of growth will be delivered** at the local service centres of Berkeley, Minchinhampton, Nailsworth and Painswick.*

Page 35 states:- *2.5.8 **Modest housing allocations** will also be delivered at the local service centres of Berkeley, Minchinhampton, Nailsworth and Painswick and lesser levels of housing will be allocated at the Tier 3a villages of Brimscombe and Thrupp, Frampton-on-Severn, Kings Stanley, Kingswood, Leonard Stanley and Whitminster.*

These statements are completely misleading, as the site allocations that follow on Page 53 bear no relation to the statements above! It is this Council’s belief that these misleading statements will then be used to justify inappropriate development sites at a later stage.

PS41 Washwell Fields

*This Council does not believe this potential site should be included in the Revised Plan until the access and drainage issues can be satisfactorily resolved and the site is proved viable.

In summary, the trust and faith this Council had in this process has been completely broken. This Council does not support the Tier Change, nor the inclusion of PS41 as a viable development site and without the re-drawing of the Retail Centre boundary, feels completely let down.

Yours sincerely

██████████
Clerk

Copy to: District Councillors Jason Bullingham, Julie Job and Keith Pearson
Chief Executive – Kathy O’Leary
Stroud Member of Parliament – Siobhan Baillie