

Stroud District Council  
Eberly Mill  
Stroud  
Glos.  
FAO The planning Dept.

03 01 19

Dear Sirs,

**Stroud District Local Plan Review Dec 2018**

**Comments and Objections**

I viewed the 'SDC Road Show' on the 11<sup>th</sup> Dec. 2018 which presented the Local Plan for the District, I was particularly interested in the Dursley Area. It was noted that certain areas within the Local were noted for potential development. The plot annotated PS29 was particularly highlighted for me. As a resident adjacent to this Plot and having seen it previously offered for Development I found it disappointing to see it included in this document. I would make the following observations.

1. Part of this plot was offered for a 100 house development in 2014/15. (S.14/09666/OUT). This was **rejected** by SDC Planning ref REFUSAL OF OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION dated 19 12 2014.

The reason for rejection was twofold based on the fact the development would erode the important landscape characteristics against the objectives of the Adopted Stroud District Local Plan Nov.2005 and the Policy ES7 of the Draft Local Plan Dec 2013. The benefits of such a development would be better achieved sustainably elsewhere in the Cam and Dursley area.

Secondly the effects of such a development could have adverse effects on the local ecology contrary to Policies ES6 of the Draft Local Plan Dec 2013 and para 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. This decision was appealed against by the Developer and also **rejected** by the Planning Inspectorate ref APP/C1625.W/15/3007972. Based on the SDC reasons.

**I therefore believe that the above reasons are still relevant today and SDC should have maintained their stance adopted in 2014/15.**

## What is different today in 2018/19.

### 1. The Site.

The fields in question are a **GREEN FIELD SITE**. During the period between 2015 and today they have been used for agricultural purposes (stock grazing, cutting for fodder etc.). Turning this over to housing would permanently lose these fields as a productive asset and as the Country is looking to more self- sufficiency this again reflects the situation of 2015.

The Dursley Neighbourhood Plan of 2018, which has been accepted by the Residents of Dursley, shows this site and states that 'The AONB and green setting of Dursley is a strong characteristic of the town which must be retained.'

**The above strengthens the 2015 status for no further Development.**

### 2. The Environment

The fields and hedgerows support a varied number of wild life species e.g. crested newts, badgers, deer and various birds, and there is a water course running through the site. Loss of this proposed site would result in significant damage to the flora and fauna in this area.

Building in this area would remove a 'buffer zone' between the Urban boundary and the ANOB in the seclude Uley/Dursley Valley and the wooded escarpment.

Public footpaths criss-cross these fields and these would go removing the 'good feel' factor from those who regularly use them.

Loosing these 'amenities' would also affect the Tourist Industry in the area. The Cotswold Way which overlooks this location and its loss would change the ambience of the area.

The Dursley Neighbourhood Plan of 2018 also states the importance of this area to the environment indicating that any future developments could adversely affect this area hence strengthening the argument for retention of it as a Green Field Site supporting the Flora and Fauna of the area

**The above strengthens the 2015 status for no further Development.**

### 3. Dursley Infrastructure

#### • Roads

If this area were developed it would mean an increase in the volume of traffic through the Town as the main road links are to the west of Dursley. Currently Silver Street acts as a bottle neck and becomes congested at various times of the day and is therefore dangerous to both pedestrians and vehicles.

Access to this 'Green Field Site' would be via existing estates with a high 'vehicle population'.

During the period between 2015/19 there have been further housing developments throughout Dursley and Cam (Lister's Old Site/ Box Road) which has increased the vehicle population and has worsened the traffic situation through the Town. Additional housing to the East of Dursley would further exasperate the current situation through Town. In addition to the increased traffic flow through the adjacent Residential Estates.

It has been recently noticed that the quality of the air in town has been more polluted with exhaust fumes during the 'Rush Periods' and this which would no doubt worsen even more with further developments around the district.

Dursley has not been 'designed' for today's volume of traffic.

**So, worse than the 2015 status strengthens argument for no further Development**

**Drainage**

The estates to the east of the town were built in the late 1930s or early 1960s and the drainage systems both domestic and road were designed to cope for the population expected. If new developments take place their systems will have to 'plug into' these older pipe works. When the development, which was rejected behind Shakespeare Road, it was proposed to be incorporated into that estate or Highfields pipe works both of which have suffered over the years from blocked drains etc. Therefore the practicality of such development is questionable.

With the possibility of more housing/roads being built on Green Fields the natural drainage would be affected as 'surface water' would be channelled into the local rivers resulting in an increase in flow and possible flooding risk and pollution of the water courses.

**So no change from the 2015 status but still argues against further Development.**

- **Support Services**

Support Services, by this I mean Doctors, Schools, transport, waste/recycling etc. In the past years Dursley and its surrounding district have been growing with an increase population. We are seeing it more difficult to get appointments with the local GPs and Medical services.

With new families coming into the area would local schools be able to support the increasing need.

Further 'large developments' have occurred which have worsen the current situation in the past few years for all of these services and this will have an effect on the general welfare of the town as a whole.

Employment, in the local area, is much reduced, although small industrial estates are planned. This would mean that Dursley would become more of a 'Commuter Community' requiring better commuting routes (road/rail) but as previously mentioned Dursley is not designed for this eventuality.

The current level of Support Services are, in my opinion, at their limit today.

**So, worse than the 2015 status strengthens argument for no further Development**

- **Future Development**



Dursley has over the past years under gone major increases in new housing development. Littlecombe, near to completion, the BiMack Factory development and the Maudsley Factory Development. Plus the numerous opportunistic builds of single houses in large gardens etc. There are still 'Brown Field' sites around town that could be used to increase the housing numbers, which have been highlighted in the Local Plan. These would affect the infrastructure of the Town but not to the significant levels new Green Field Sites would have on worsening the Infrastructure of the Town.

It is considered that Dursley has contributed considerably the District's housing needs.

The Dursley Neighbourhood Plan 2018,as previously stated has been accepted by the Residents of Dursley, also indicates there is not the need to develop outside the existing urban boundary especially on Green Field Sites which are shown to be ecologically, environmentally and landscape sensitive as housing could be placed in less sensitive areas.

It is considered then Dursley should only be considered for the opportunistic one off/two off builds and available 'Brown Field' sites. Development applications outside the existing Urban Boundaries should not be supported such as the proposal for the **PS29 site to the east of Shakespeare Road.**

**So, worse than the 2015 status strengthens argument for no further Development**

#### 4. Conclusions

**Based on the above arguments it is concluded that the proposed development PS29 would not benefit the District it would have a negative effect on Dursley's Infrastructure, Ecology and Natural Environment.**

**SDC are therefore requested to remove this proposal from the District Plan for Dursley and not support further Development in this area.**

Yours faithfully



