

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 January 2020 23:05  
**To:** \_WEB\_Local Plan  
**Subject:** Comments on Local Plan Review

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

To The Planning Officer, Stroud District Council

From: [REDACTED]

22 January 2020

### Observations on The Draft Local Plan

#### **Area of Interest: THE BERKELEY CLUSTER: Berkeley, Sharpness and Newtown**

#### **TRANSPORT CONSIDERATIONS**

At the public consultation meetings mention was often made by members of the public about the current congestion at Junction 14 of the M5. Comments have also been made about the need to upgrade the junction of the B4066 with the A38 with Berkeley Heath. Answers provided by planners were in only general terms about consulting with Transport for England.

In the Sharpness-Natural-Neighbourhoods document [November 2019] the stated plan is to discourage the use of the car by NOT upgrading existing roads.

The document calculates that during peak work-day periods 2,000 people will eventually travel to and from Sharpness on school trips and for work. The authors of the Sharpness-Natural-Neighbourhoods document state that they "will have made sure that there is a seat available for them on a coach or train that matches where they need to go."

Such an undertaking cannot possible. Even if the developers were motivated to pursue public transport provision, it is clear they have the power only to lobby government and public transport providers.

As has been experienced elsewhere, car drivers will develop 'rat-runs' through Purton-Halmore and Ham-Stone country lanes.

It is far from clear who will bear the cost of building a new railway station at Newtown and improving the permanent way for passenger trains? In any case the development at Wisloe is likely to greatly increase pressures on passenger numbers at Cam and Dursley rail station long before Newtown station is built and the permanent way upgraded.

I predict the provision of railway services from Newton will not occur until Phase 2

I foresee a conflict of interest between scheduled train services running between Newtown and Cam and the aims of the Preservation railway to run trains to the reinstated Berkeley railway station on the same track.

It is request that clarification of all these points be contained in the pre-submission plans in autumn 2020

#### **PS33 Northwest of Berkeley**

The density [quantum] of houses is reasonable. The number is comparable to the Forest View estate to which it abuts. The PS33 map does not indicate where access will be situated. Access should not be through Howmead or Fishers Road estate. The junction of Forest View Road with Station Road is unsuitable because of parking issues on Station Road. Access to the B4066 will need traffic control measures at some point if the development goes ahead in full.

If the District Council's objective is truly to be carbon neutral by 2030 and not just a slogan, the improvement of building regulations is a vital factor. This applies across the Berkeley/Newtown/Sharpness development. To have built 2,000+ houses, and only then have tighter carbon-neutral building regulations coming into force, would make a mockery of the objective.

#### **PS34 Sharpness Docks**

This development will be the first to generate 'rat-run' traffic [both private car and commercial vans] through Hinton, Purton and Halmore – all narrow country lanes. Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Sharpness Garden Village would exacerbate the problem because drivers will seek ways to avoid the junction at Berkeley Heath.

What mitigating measures can be put into place?

### **PS35 Land at Focus School, Wanswell**

The proposal for up to 70 dwellings is much more dense than that at Frampton [PS44]. Why is that?

Incidentally,

The allocated number of dwellings at **PS44** is far too few. The number of dwellings on Ann Wicks Road between Philimore Gardens and Oatfield amounts to 26. This number would not cover even a third of the proposed development. The fact that the development is outside the SDL should not limit the number of dwellings. PS33 is outside the Berkeley boundary but is planned for 120 dwellings.

I think the PS44 dwellings total should be increased to at least 50, including 30% affordable housing.

Only 30 dwellings should be erected at Focus School, Wanswell

To demolish a school that is close to the proposed phase two [PS36] development runs counter to the Council's carbon neutral plans.

Pupils from the junior schools built during Phase 1 at PS36 will be unable to proceed to a secondary school in the locality until Phase 2. Buses taking school children to schools outside the area will continue for many years.

Will the school buses be carbon neutral?

### **PS36 New settlement at Sharpness Phase 1**

The number of dwellings planned is equivalent to PS33 development x 20 [2,400 /120 = 20]

The site will also contain 2,400 dwellings, two/three schools and their playing fields, plus a local centre including shops, allotments, farmland, and 10 ha of employment land. This is far too ambitious a density. I and others cannot understand how all this can be fitted into the area. The ambitious over-loading of the site is beyond reason. Please publish a site plan at the earliest opportunity

Anyone walking from Berkeley town centre to Sharpness would pass through only a minimum of countryside on the way. It would be stretching semantics to the limit to call the result of the proposed developments in the Berkeley/Newtown/Sharpness area anything other than a single town, even if with 'neighbourhoods'.

I understand that only after several hundred houses have been built will the Tier designation be reviewed. The proposed schools and shopping centre would only then appear. The mini-supermarkets and parking in Berkeley would not cope with the extra demand. Car journeys for shopping in Cam, Dursley and Thornbury would be commonplace for several years. This also applies to school runs to those schools having spaces available.

The proposed development should be planned over a longer construction period and the number of dwellings in PS36 should be reduced by half.

---

I raise the issue of PS44 because of the perceived difference in house densities between the Berkeley Cluster and other development areas

### **PS44 Northwest of Whitminster Lane**

The allocated dwellings at PS44 is far too few. The number of dwellings on Ann Wicks Road between Philimore Gardens and Oatfield amounts to 26. This number would cover only a third of the proposed development. The fact that the development is outside the SDL should not limit the number of dwellings. The development at PS33 is an example of this.