

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 January 2019 10:40
To: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: Stroud District Local Plan Review comments

Good afternoon,

Your online survey is too restrictive for the comments I wish to make so I have chosen this method instead.

My area of interest is the Berkeley Cluster and Slimbridge/Cambridge in particular.

Wisloe. I prefer to call this site the 'M5 Hard Shoulder Housing Estate' because that more accurately describes the proposal.

Does it meet the chosen five top Key issues? It completely fails to address the first four and, if built, may or may not satisfy the fifth. In other words it directly contradicts the wishes that you have been asked to satisfy.

The decision to divide the two proposals, Wisloe and Cam, seems to be an attempt to obscure what is one vast housing development either side of the motorway. I make that 2,200 houses and I imagine around 7,000 people in one area. You probably have a formula for that calculation. If this isn't a cluster, what is?

Both developments will be dormitory in nature as there is very limited employment opportunities now and likely to be insufficient in the future to meet this level of influx. Local facilities in the area are limited to a garage, a small Tesco and some small shops that struggle to survive. Local parking is limited to the Tesco car park. As planners you may not like cars but they will still be around in 2040. The dearth of employment and facilities to cope with this level of population increase will result in increased traffic at peak times on the A38 both south and north and through Cam and Dursley. Add to this the recent approval for expansion of the Wildfowl and Wetlands theme park which aims to increase visitor numbers, and therefore traffic by 30%, and you have a recipe for disastrous traffic congestion seven days a week. What plans do you have for avoiding congestion in Cam and Dursley, widening the A38 and improving the already inadequate access to the M5 at junctions 13 and 14?

Both sites directly border the most polluted corridor in Gloucestershire, the M5. Furthermore, the other sides are bordered by the A38, the main railway line and a flood plain. The level of noise and air pollution the inhabitants will be exposed to is unforgivable. I am amazed that a District Authority that prides itself on environmental awareness could even have considered this proposal viable. Would you like the M5 at the bottom of your garden? Would you want your children to play outside in the 'garden village' where they can barely hear each other and get to breathe the 'country air'?

Flood plain. The simplistic interpretation of the extent of the Environment Agency flood plain and the total lack of appreciation of the ground conditions in the selected area demonstrates a complete lack of local knowledge. Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) and Severn Trent Water (STW) have just spent around £2 million completing a complete upgrade of the surface water and sewage systems in Slimbridge and Cambridge. This was necessitated by persistent flooding of properties and sewage floating in the road. This is low-lying, high water table land. You build here at your peril and endanger not only the new inhabitants but the existing communities of Slimbridge and Cambridge.

Coaley Sewage Treatment plant has been experiencing unacceptable levels of raw sewage dumping into the River Cam. It remains to be seen whether the aforementioned work will reduce the frequency of dumping but it is clear that more sewage treatment works will be

required to satisfy this proposal. Someone has seriously underestimated the cost and environmental implications of this proposal. Have you consulted with GCC and STW?

Cam and Dursley station cannot cope with current demand. The car park is too small, despite limited attempts at expansion, and the station itself offers two bus shelters as the only protection for commuters. The station will need massive investment if the peak time traffic problem is to be partially mitigated. Has anyone consulted with the appropriate authorities to see if this is feasible?

I appreciate that the driving force behind all these proposals is to meet central government housing demands but the complete lack of consideration shown in making this proposal shows that no one at SDC level is representing the needs of the present population.

I believe a considerable amount of the land is to be purchased from the Ernest Cook Trust. The founder must be turning in his grave! He sought to preserve the English countryside and formed the Trust because the National Trust would not give him assurances as to the future use of the land. In my view the trustees are failing in their duty and any sale must require close inspection from the Charity Commission. It appears to me the Trust has become a commercial organisation intent on selling off its assets to anyone that offers enough.

For me, this proposal has all the indications of lazy planning. Choose a big chunk of land with as few owners as possible, disregard the key issues as irrelevant and take a big step towards getting central government off your back. Shame on you. You need to work much harder at meeting the desires of local people. Think about not just the short term solution, but the legacy you are leaving behind. Will people in the future thank you for what you did?

I look forward to seeing more work and imagination put into solving the housing shortage, this is not the answer.

Yours sincerely,

██████████