



Stroud District Council is starting the process of reviewing the current Local Plan. This consultation is seeking views about the range of issues that the next Local Plan will need to tackle, and options for addressing them. This includes the identification of potential areas for growth and development. We ask a series of questions throughout the consultation document (each of which is numbered). Please refer to the question number and/or topic in your response, where relevant.

You can download a PDF or an editable electronic copy of this form from our website www.stroud.gov.uk/localplanreview. You will also find the main consultation document on this web page, as well as some supporting material and further reading. **Please note: there is a separate form for you to fill out if your comment relates specifically to a site submission / proposed alternative site (Local Plan Review: Call for Sites).**

The consultation closes on Tuesday 5th December 2017. Please email completed electronic responses to local.plan@stroud.gov.uk or post paper copies to **Local Plan Review, The Planning Strategy Team, Stroud District Council, Ebley Mill, Westward Road, Stroud, GL5 4UB**. Should you have any queries, the Planning Strategy Team can be contacted on 01453 754143.

Consultation response form PART A

Your details

Thank you for taking part. Please fill out your personal information in PART A. Your contact details will not be made public and won't be used for any purpose other than this consultation. We will not accept anonymous responses. Your comments may be summarised when we report the findings of this consultation.

Your name

(title): <input type="text"/>	name: <input type="text"/>
-------------------------------	----------------------------

Your company name or organisation (if applicable)

Your address (optional)

Your email address *

Your phone number (optional)

If you are acting on behalf of a client, please supply the following details:

Your client's name

(title): <input type="text"/>	name: <input type="text"/>
-------------------------------	----------------------------

Your client's company or organisation (if applicable)

Keeping you updated:

Would you like to be notified of future progress on the Local Plan review? (* we will do this via email)

- i) When the findings from this consultation are made public Yes please No thanks
- ii) The next formal round of public consultation Yes please No thanks
- iii) No further contact please

Consultation response form PART B:

If you have several different comments to make, you may wish to use a separate PART B sheet for each one (although you do not have to). If you use multiple PART B sheets, please make sure you fill in your name on each of them (you only have to fill out PART A once, as long as it is clearly attached to your PART B sheets when you submit the forms to us).

Your name

Your organisation or company

Your client's name/organisation
(if applicable)

The consultation is seeking views about whether the big issues identified within this paper are the right things to focus on and what options exist for tackling them. Are there other issues, options or opportunities that have been missed? **Please note: there is a separate form for you to fill out if your comment relates specifically to a site submission / proposed alternative site (download a copy of the sites form at www.stroud.gov.uk/localplanreview).**

We ask a series of questions (highlighted in pink boxes) throughout the consultation paper. Each of the questions is numbered. Please can you reference the question number(s) and/or the topic here:

Question number: 3.4

Please use this box to set out your comments:

(Attach additional sheets of paper or expand this box if you need to)

Please see sheet sent by separate attachment

Stroud District Local Plan Review: Issues and options 2017

Consultation Response by [REDACTED]

Question 3.4

“Settlement hierarchy: Are any of the settlements in the wrong tier and, if so, for what reason?”

1. Frampton on Severn (FoS) is listed in tier 2 but should appear in tier 3, for the following reasons.
2. Even based only on the 2014 Settlement Role and Function Study, it is surprising that FoS has been placed into tier 2. The following points seem particularly relevant.
3. Size of settlement:
 - a. FoS is in only the ‘medium’ category.
 - b. The other tier 2 settlements are substantially larger – all are more than double the size, except Berkeley, which is still more than 40% larger.
 - c. Even in the case of tier 3 settlements, nearly 40% of these are larger than FoS.
4. Employment opportunities:
 - a. As stated on page 70, FoS is “not one of the District’s big employment bases”. In fact the number of jobs is well below the tier 2 average.
 - b. By contrast to all other tier 2 settlements, there is no town centre within CP12.
 - c. Unlike many other tier 2 settlements, there is no ‘other locally significant employment’.
5. Travel to work: the proportion of residents who work within 5km is substantially lower than all other tier 2 settlements.
6. Retail and community services:
 - a. By contrast to the pattern of other tier 2 settlements, FoS offers no strategic retail.
 - b. Local retail and strategic community services are ‘Basic’ only. Since the closure of the village shop and post office the position has worsened, despite the opening of a combined replacement.
 - c. Accessibility to key services is ‘Very poor’. In fact in this respect FoS is the second worst in the whole district, above only Oakridge Lynch.
 - d. In all these respects FoS is much more comparable to other tier 3 settlements.

- e. This is presumably, in part, because the public transport facilities in FoS are very poor. Bus services in particular are very limited.
7. Notwithstanding the conclusions of the 2014 Study and the points made above, there are other reasons why FoS is less suitable to accommodate growth than the other tier 2 settlements, and should be placed into tier 3. These are as follows.
8. Historic character: much of FoS is subject to Conservation Area designation. There are many listed buildings and other historic assets. These, and their settings, comprise much of the village and act as a substantial constraint on development.
9. Flood risk: much of FoS is within Zone 3 on the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning. This severely curtails the potential for development.
10. Accessibility by motor vehicle: this is a problem in FoS for three reasons.
 - a. The main access to the village is the B4071 Perry Way. This is a narrow road that is heavily used by cars and HGVs. It has no pavements or cycleways. It is increasingly dangerous both for drivers and for cyclists.
 - b. The junction between the Perry Way and the A38 is congested at peak times, with vehicles queueing on both roads. This causes travel delays and is dangerous.
 - c. There is very limited off-street parking in the village for residents, delivery vehicles or the large number of visitors that come, for example, to walk in the surrounding countryside. This means that the areas around the primary school, the community hall, the churches and the pubs, are increasingly congested. The same is true of The Street, which is very narrow. This represents (i) a risk to safety, and (ii) harm to the historic character (see above). It also means that the village green and the other green spaces that make such an important contribution to the character of the village are being gradually eroded.
11. Primary school: this appears to be at or near capacity. There is no secondary school.
12. Other environmental constraints: there is an unusual concentration of other environmental designations surrounding FoS, including SSSIs, an SAC, SPA and Ramsar. These indicate that the area is sensitive to human activity and represent a further reason to limit growth.
13. Character: finally, FoS is a settlement of very different character to the other tier 2 settlements. These are all towns with substantial and well-defined centres characterised by retail and other commercial activity, with good public transport links. They look and feel like busy, thriving towns. By contrast, Frampton is a village with a quiet, rural character, very limited non-residential activity outside the industrial estate, and very limited public transport links. In this respect it contrasts

starkly with the other tier 2 settlements. To anyone familiar with the various settlements in tier 2, FoS's inclusion in this category appears entirely anomalous.

14. For these reasons, FoS should be taken out of tier 2 and placed into tier 3.