

[REDACTED]

From: The Clerk - Bisley-With-Lypiatt Parish Council [admin@bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk]
Sent: 04 December 2017 11:12
To: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: local plan review
Attachments: 9b Bisley Ward Stroud District Local Plan Review.doc; 9b Eastcombe Local Plan review stuff.docx; 9b Oakridge Local Plan response 2017.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Consultation response

I have attached responses from the three individual Wards within Bisley-With-Lypiatt Parish Council as requested.

The full Parish Council will consider each of these at our meeting on Wednesday 6th December and I will forward any amendments following that meeting.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Clerk Bisley-With-Lypiatt Parish Council

[REDACTED]

admin@bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk

Oakridge Local Plan Response.

We would like to understand what you believe to be the key issues relating to places in the District and future land use needs. Are they broadly the same as those identified in the current Local Plan? Or are there new issues emerging that we need to take account of in preparing the new Local Plan?

Question 1.0a

What are your priorities for Stroud District? Can you list your top 5 issues, challenges or concerns for the next Local Plan? You could pick five from [our list of 40...](#) Or tell us if we have missed something.

Question 1.0b

Do you have ideas and suggestions for how the Local Plan might tackle particular issues?

Local economy, housing and local security in the face of change.
Planning must address the rebuilding of local community and address resilience and local security in the face of change – what ever may cause the change, is is coming.

Question 2.1b

Do you think there is a need for further employment land allocations? If yes what types of premises are required and where should they be located?

Not really. Stop allowing brown field sites for housing, allow more flexibility of use change of existing sites.

Question 2.1c

Do you think locating growth adjacent to M5 junctions should be supported; or would continuing expansion of employment land at existing settlements/sites be preferable?

Opportunities in and around existing settlements would be best. This will rebuild community and add security.

Question 2.1d

Should there be increased flexibility to allow other job generating uses on all employment sites or would this limit the options for those companies operating in the B classes?

Should increased flexibility be allowed only on some sites? Please specify any sites where a more flexible approach could be taken.

Alternatively, a percentage threshold, in terms of units or site floorspace, could be identified for non B class employment uses, which might help to provide services to other businesses?

Yes – I agree.

Question 2.1e

Should the Local Plan look to promote further home working, encourage development of live- work units and co working facilities? Is there a specific need in your area?

It exists anyway – take a more flexible approach to dealing with it.

Question 2.1f

Should the Local Plan look to promote further farm diversification to reflect changing farming practices and to avoid rural dereliction, or does the pattern of rural development need more control to avoid further adverse impacts on the countryside, landscape and local communities?

Yes definitely

Question 2.3a

Tell us about housing needs and opportunities in your area:

Does your neighbourhood provide opportunities for local people to access the housing market, bearing in mind the growing gap between local incomes and house prices?

Are there opportunities in your area for households to rent reasonably-priced properties?

Are younger people in your neighbourhood able to access housing without moving elsewhere?

If older people in your neighbourhood wished to downsize to smaller, more suitable properties in the area, are these opportunities likely to exist?

Would individuals or small groups be able to locate suitable land for self-build projects in the neighbourhood?

Do you know of other unmet housing needs in your neighbourhood?

THE ANSWER TO ALL THESE IS A STRONG NO!

Question 2.3b

Do you think that local housing need surveys should also be used to influence the housing mix on local for-sale housing sites?

NO

Question 2.3c

Do you know of any suitable land for development to meet the housing needs of your neighbourhood, or do you have suggestions about how or where these needs might be met?

YES

Question 3.1

How should we meet future development needs?

Option 1: Continue to concentrate housing and employment development at a few large sites located adjacent to the main towns in the district

Option 2: Take a more dispersed approach with some medium sized housing and employment sites on the edge of the larger villages, as well as towns

Option 3: Disperse development across the district with most villages including at least one small to medium site allocated to meet local needs

Option 4: Identify a growth point in the district to include significant growth, either as an expansion of an existing settlement, or to create a new settlement

Option 5: Do you have an alternative strategy option that you would like us to consider?

Do you have a preferred option? Or would some combination of these approaches be the best way to meet our future needs? Please explain why.

1. NO
2. YES
3. YES
4. NO
5. YES

Consider housing that meets the needs of the people not the profit needs of developers. Consider alms houses, consider smaller house, dividing larger houses especially where two or more have been knocked into one. Smaller houses and terraced houses make environmental sense in energy use and community rebuilding.

Question 3.4

Do you agree with the current hierarchy-based approach towards identifying settlements suitable for different levels of development? Is there a different approach you would prefer?

Do you agree with the different tiers identified in the current Local Plan and the scale of development proposed for each tier?

Are any of the settlements in the wrong tier and, if so, for what reason?

Basically agree but the issue for many villages is housing size, eg. Oakridge Lynch has no 1 bed, a couple of 2 bed and a few 3 bed houses, it has no requirement for 4 bed and larger houses.

Question 3.5a

How should development proposals on the edges of our towns and villages be managed?

Option 1: Continue with existing settlement development limits amended as necessary

Option 2: Assess proposals on a case by case basis using broader criteria (e.g. landscape impact; form of settlement, proximity to services, etc.)

Option 3: Continue with settlement development limits but expand the types of development that are allowed beyond them in the countryside

Option 4: Do you have an alternative approach that you would like us to consider?

1. NO
2. YES
3. YES
4. Include economic criteria, whether the village can support the houses, are the residents locally employed or will they add to climate change issues, does the type of house add to the community or are they just housing numbers and developer profit.

Question 3.5b

Are there any changes to existing settlement development limits that you would like to suggest?

In Oakridge Lynch the northern boundary could be moved but this must not be moved to just accommodate more larger house incomers to the benefit of the developer, it must be done with the requirements of what the locals and the community need. No dwelling more than two bedrooms, must be garden and communal space.

Page 37 – The Manor Village addition will move to link Chalford and Eastcombe settlements taking away the green space separation and the clear distinction of the different villages.

Page 62 – We need to secure the Allotment Field as Green Space. Not sure about the other proposed place.

Page 63 – clearly indicates the village cannot support more houses! Other than that the response is as above.