

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph	<input type="text"/>	Policy	<input type="text" value="Please see below Representation"/>	Policies Map	<input type="text"/>
-----------	----------------------	--------	--------------------------------------------------------------	--------------	----------------------

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text" value="X"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>	No	<input type="text"/>

Please tick as appropriate

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We consider that some policies within the pre-submission publication are unsound. We have responded to this where appropriate in response to question 6.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Promoting additional or alternative site(s):

Site name: Land to the west of New Road, North Nibley

Reason for site promotion:

We consider that the land to the west of New Road, North Nibley would be an appropriate location for new housing development within North Nibley. The 0.76ha site could accommodate 16 new homes, including green infrastructure (such as planting and landscaping) using a design and layout which has been driven by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, having regard to the AONB designation to the east of North Nibley. The location of the site is shown below:



The site is positioned at the western side of New Road, immediately south of the village. As outlined within the Site appraisal document for North Nibley (2018) that is produced by GRCC and Stroud District Council. The council have accepted and relied upon this report previously. Within the report, the site is situated on land which is considered the best possible location for development within the village being close to the services and facilities. The site appraisal identifies that the site would be suitable for a rural exception scheme. Land Development and Estates have submitted plans to Stroud for a rural exception scheme of 16 homes in December 2020 which are currently being determined by the council at the time of writing.

The landscape-led proposals have been designed to incorporate the gradual incline of the hill, with homes set into the bank. The proposals also include the retention of a wildlife corridor to the north of the site to preserve biodiversity.

We consider that it is clear that new sites will be required to accommodate unmet housing need in Stroud District, together with the need to incorporate flexibility into the emerging plan.

Burgeoning house prices in places like North Nibley will only serve to exclude more and more people from home ownership and in light of the Covid pandemic this is likely to worsen over the coming years.

The land at New Road, situated to the south of North Nibley, has been proposed as an alternative site when development opportunities were being considered by the policy team throughout the plan making process. We consider that the land at New Road, North Nibley is deliverable, and it is available now, with no major technical constraints to development that could not be subject to appropriate mitigation. It would therefore provide a positive and much-needed contribution to housing choice for the District and the town within the first 5 years of the new plan period.

General observations/comments on policies:

We have set out as follows the policies which we consider are unsound and have suggested amendments where appropriate.

- 2.5.3 – 630 homes per year to address housing needs.

Annualized target – may be more appropriate.

Core Policy DCP1:

We are broadly supportive of this policy, but if the Council is to become over reliant on brownfield sites, this will become an issue from a viability perspective. Therefore, whilst the policy should apply to all development, a flexible approach may be required for these sites.

This policy should refer to overall grid capacity, such as the provision of battery developments and a presumption in favour of developments that would increase grid capacity.

Policy CP3

We are broadly supportive of this policy, but we see no reason why there should not be site allocations in tier 3b settlements. This is because rural exception sites are an inevitability, so the plan should positively reflect this need by allocating sites from the beginning of the plan process, rather than waiting for the need to

be exacerbated by a lack of deliverability. Especially since smaller settlements are likely to be most unaffordable.

We consider that a moderate scale housing development within North Nibley would be appropriate ensure the continued viability of North Nibley C of E Primary School.

Policy CP5

The strategic site principles are far too nebulous and there is a missed opportunity to set precise expectations. Whilst we are supportive of appropriate densities, there is no definition as to what this might be.

Chapter 3 Making Places: Shaping the future of Stroud District

3.6 Wotton-under-Edge

North Nibley – Page 208, we note in the reasoned justification that the preferred direction of housing growth is to the northeast, north of Innocks Estate. It further continues to state that there is no preferred direction of employment growth, why?

Whilst we are broadly supportive of the general policy, the reasoned justification makes a contradictory statement in relation to landscape impact. If the Council was so concerned about the location of development, it should have made an allocation.

Chapter 4 Housing Delivery

CP7 Inclusive Communities

Whilst this policy contains laudable aims and objectives, we consider that it would be incredibly difficult to implement through the development management process. A specific and measurable set of aims should be provided, which could be implemented particularly on larger sites. For example, a minimum provision of, perhaps 10% for older people and/or lifetime homes. Other than in relation to housing for older people which we agree is covered under Policy DCP2, this policy is too nebulously worded and vague in relation to other groups.

A specific set of targets should be provided to ensure that this can be implemented, whilst making it clearer for applicants to understand what will be required as part of their applications. A presumption in favor of developments which meet the needs of the groups identified would be supported. Adult social care providers face specific challenges as there are no direct allocations for this use, and have to retrofit existing buildings as a result.

CP8 New Housing Development

Again, whilst laudable in its aims, this policy will be difficult to implement. In particular, points 4 and 5 should be read against a backdrop of a statement which states that development will be considered more favourably than those which do not.

It is unclear how this policy relates to the Biodiversity Net Gain agenda. Should there be further policies in this regard, they should be signposted.

CP9 Affordable Housing

This plan is unambitious in its approach to tackling the burgeoning affordable housing needs, and will not address the shortfall that has built up. The provision of affordable housing could be raised to 40% and it is unclear why 30% was selected. The Council will not begin to address its affordable housing needs until it raises its ambitions.

DHC2

We do not consider that point 3 is appropriate as it polices housing delivery. We have direct experiences of appeals being won were Parish Councils object to development. This is because those in housing need often do not take part in the planning process, and those who have no need tend to be those who object and sit within Parish Councils. Further justification is required in terms of the 10% upper limit, because it is obvious that in many cases allocations are already leading to expansions of greater than 10%.

HC4

We are supportive of this policy although have the following comments -

Point 3 – This is very difficult to define, given that edge of settlement locations (including allocated sites) will invariably have difficulty with complying with this policy given their location.

Point 5 – It would not result in biodiversity net loss, would be preferable

Point 7 – There should be a reference here to an SPD or specific design standards.

CP13

There needs to be recognition in this policy that rural sites, and in particular exception sites or where there is a proven unmet need, may not be able to fulfil all of these aims as a result of their rural location. This is in accordance with paragraph 84 of the Framework.

ES2

Point (d) is difficult to implement and it may be difficult to identify that there is a direct benefit to local communities. Often, the benefit is to the wider grid capacity and national targets, and these developments have national significance. There is a missed opportunity to directly reference grid capacity and energy storage.

DES3

We agree with the principle of this policy but object to the wording as district heating is only viable on large strategic sites. This policy would require almost all small and medium housebuilders to demonstrate the viability issues created by this policy.

ES8

Whilst supportive of the approach to protecting trees and hedgerows, at present the policy prevents development which results in the loss of locally valued trees. This should be instead restricted to protected trees only, as there is no justification as to what might constitute a locally valued tree. This provides the potential to become a veto to development, without any justification.

ES10

This policy requires the submission of a programme of archaeological works, but does not adequately define where this would be required. This would appear an overly onerous validation requirement, given that the programme of works is often negotiated with archaeology officers.

7.0 Delivery and Monitoring

We are supportive of the high predicted delivery rates at the start of the plan period and consider that our site should also be allocated to provide further security to delivery rates so that the Council can meet its needs without being reliant on windfall sites which are predicted to more than double in quantum after the first 5 years. Whilst windfall sites clearly need consideration, they are an unreliable source for meeting the Council's 5-year housing land supply.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

It is necessary to participate at the hearing sessions to ensure that the views of our client are represented.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

