

## 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  Policy  Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

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

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.

- 1 Wisloe represents a large scale development in the countryside which is unacceptable under normal planning constraints
- 2 Glossy brochures with trees and greenery ignores the fact that the development would destroy the open countryside and good quality Grade 2 agricultural land.
- 3 The link and proximity with the villages of Slimbridge, Cambridge and Gossington means that they would lose their identity and merge with the larger development.
- 4 The already planned expansion of Cam up to the M5 boundary added to the proposed development would create a continuous string of built-up area from the Cotswold escarpment, through Dursley and on into the Severn Valley extending

4.5 miles! This conurbation flies against the rural aims of the Councils planning policies.

5 The Ernest Cook Trust's credentials must be questioned as their objectives as an educational charity are to 'help children and young people nurture a lifelong journey of learning, appreciation, and respect for the countryside. Concreting over the natural landscape is not the way to achieve this.

6 Whilst the development is unacceptable for the above reasons, there are practical issues that make the development inadvisable including:-

- Development of this scale will compound local sewage and stormwater drainage problems.

- Housing directly adjacent to the busy M5 Motorway will not be satisfactory due to air and noise pollution and no practical and economic remedies are available to overcome this. The resultant development, if allowed, would be a far cry from the Developers 'aspirations' of a green and pleasant community and it is hard to imagine a less suitable site or place to live.

- The impact on the transport infrastructure cannot be underestimated and inevitably a huge amount of traffic will be generated from this proposed development alone. With no major employment in the area peak traffic will migrate either north or south along the A38 to the motorway junctions. On a very conservative estimate this will create an additional 750 to 1000 vehicle movements twice daily, thus adding misery to the villages lining the route (Cambridge / Stone/ Falfield) let alone the impact on local traffic. Viewed alone this is not acceptable but add the traffic generated from another 2500 homes planned in adjoining Cam there are no grounds upon which this development can be seen as sustainable.

7 Finally I would confirm opposition to this development.

It is a step too far in terms of damage to the countryside and the east side of the M5 Motorway should be the natural boundary of the Dursley / Cam conurbation.

The development has no merit despite 'dressing it up' as a garden community. This works well on city brown land sites but not when taking over High Quality Agricultural Land.

As well as the inherent problems with this site and the impact on the landscape and adjoining villages, it is not required to service a local housing need. The site is not in an area where employment is readily available and clearly the conclusion must be that this development is in the wrong place.

I would suggest to the Council that this site does not satisfactorily serve their or Gloucestershire residents interests and should seek to designate sites that have less impact on the environment. There are more sustainable and better placed sites (PGP1 and PGP2) close to Junction 13 of the M5 that would have significantly less impact on the surroundings as well as providing better access to employment areas of Gloucester/ Cheltenham / Stroud/ Bristol.

(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.

Proposals to develop this land PS37 (Wisloe) should be withdrawn.

To proceed would cause demonstrable harm to the landscape, the loss of good quality agricultural land, intrude into the rural nature of the Severn Valley and intrude unacceptably into adjoining villages.

No modification to the proposals could make them acceptable.

The proposals go against this Council's own planning aims and strategies in the protection of the countryside. Nor does it appear to have any overview as to the resulting impact of the continuous swathe of development causing a scar across the complete width of the Seven Valley.

Finally the location of this site bordering the Motorway makes it unsuitable for housing due to noise and air pollution.

(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:

---

**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.

9. Signature:

Date: