

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.

Again my dismay of the SDC ignoring my previous representations and all the past relevant points presented too it has/is not been addressed. Namely the following:-

The coalescence of Slimbridge, Cam, Cambridge, Gossington, Dursley, joining these rural communities, all of which pride themselves in their own identity, creating one urban sprawling mass, which will in itself create further problems.

The destruction of the local bird and wildlife population, which is famed for in this area.

The creation of more flooding in an area which already cannot cope with the current level of surface water as it is. The designated area for the increase in housing is on land which acts as a natural sponge, thus alleviating much of the flood alert in this area. By building on this land you will be increasing the risk of flooding in this area. I live on the road, that is actually running with water, in times in days of rain. At these times, the ditches and the Cam are full.

SDC have totally ignored the fact that this land is NOT and never has been Grade 3b. The ALC was seriously flawed and has been proven in evidence supplied by the farmers. SDC were purported to be working to a plan to be carbon neutral in 9 years time, their building plans contradict this.

The gas line running thro this land will present a very worrying risk to any of the residents in the area, even IF the developers do stick with the 100mt ruling either side of it. It's a disaster in waiting.

The noise and air pollution levels would increase considerably as proven by sites already in existence. Eastington which is acoustically a better site already has acoustic sheds installed in gardens. Schools and Drs surgeries etc are already struggling to cope. Why have SDC chosen a large greenfield site instead of more appropriate smaller developments and consider Whitminster and Morton Valance which appear to be more sustainable than PS37

Our views in and out of the AONB will be destroyed and yet it was SDC policy to ensure these were protected.

I fail to see the logic of the SDC continuing on with the current plan when there are alternatives at their fingertips as they don't appear to have done direct comparisons, and are totally ignoring the NPPF

(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.

By removing the PS37 from the SDC local plan

(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:

27.06.2021