



Stroud District Council is starting the process of reviewing the current Local Plan. This consultation is seeking views about the range of issues that the next Local Plan will need to tackle, and options for addressing them. This includes the identification of potential areas for growth and development. We ask a series of questions throughout the consultation document (each of which is numbered). Please refer to the question number and/or topic in your response, where relevant.

You can download a PDF or an editable electronic copy of this form from our website www.stroud.gov.uk/localplanreview. You will also find the main consultation document on this web page, as well as some supporting material and further reading. **Please note: there is a separate form for you to fill out if your comment relates specifically to a site submission / proposed alternative site (Local Plan Review: Call for Sites).**

The consultation closes on Tuesday 5th December 2017. Please email completed electronic responses to local.plan@stroud.gov.uk or post paper copies to **Local Plan Review, The Planning Strategy Team, Stroud District Council, Ebley Mill, Westward Road, Stroud, GL5 4UB**. Should you have any queries, the Planning Strategy Team can be contacted on 01453 754143.

Consultation response form PART A

Your details

Thank you for taking part. Please fill out your personal information in PART A. Your contact details will not be made public and won't be used for any purpose other than this consultation. We will not accept anonymous responses. Your comments may be summarised when we report the findings of this consultation.

Your name

(title): <input type="text"/>	name: <input type="text"/>
-------------------------------	----------------------------

Your company name or organisation (if applicable)

Your address (optional)

Your email address *

Your phone number (optional)

If you are acting on behalf of a client, please supply the following details:

Your client's name

(title): <input type="text"/>	name: <input type="text"/>
-------------------------------	----------------------------

Your client's company or organisation (if applicable)

Keeping you updated:

Would you like to be notified of future progress on the Local Plan review? (* we will do this via email)

- | | | | | | |
|------|--|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| i) | When the findings from this consultation are made public | Yes please | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No thanks | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) | The next formal round of public consultation | Yes please | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No thanks | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) | No further contact please | | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

Consultation response form PART B:

If you have several different comments to make, you may wish to use a separate PART B sheet for each one (although you do not have to). If you use multiple PART B sheets, please make sure you fill in your name on each of them (you only have to fill out PART A once, as long as it is clearly attached to your PART B sheets when you submit the forms to us).

Your name

Your organisation or company

Your client's name/organisation
(if applicable)

The consultation is seeking views about whether the big issues identified within this paper are the right things to focus on and what options exist for tackling them. Are there other issues, options or opportunities that have been missed? **Please note: there is a separate form for you to fill out if your comment relates specifically to a site submission / proposed alternative site (download a copy of the sites form at www.stroud.gov.uk/localplanreview).**

We ask a series of questions (highlighted in pink boxes) throughout the consultation paper. Each of the questions is numbered. Please can you reference the question number(s) and/or the topic here:

Question number: See Question Numbers as addressed below

Please use this box to set out your comments:

(Attach additional sheets of paper or expand this box if you need to)

Question 1.0a

Top five concerns: 1) Need to protect green spaces from development 2) Ensuring that future development is fully sustainable 3) Limiting environmental impact of development (including avoiding greenfield sites where possible) 4) Ensuring future development is sensibly sited within the District, close to services and adequate infrastructure 5) Ensuring involvement of local residents, including understanding where development is unsuitable and taking steps to protect those areas from speculative developers.

Question 1.0b

The new Local Plan must draw from the framework of the 2015 Plan and utilise the same principles in its application. It would also be appropriate to consider whether, where existing expansion has been identified under the 2015 Plan, there may be potential for further growth in planning for the housing need of the future. The emerging "Stonehouse West" area, for example, could be further expanded under the new Plan to provide for a substantial part of future housing need.

Question 2.1a

Stroud District Council should ensure that the new Local Plan adequately considers available employment opportunities and access to employment as a whole. Whilst identifying sites, the Council should be mindful of appropriateness in relation to employment. Nobody will want to live somewhere where there are not any jobs or where it is difficult to travel to a job because of lack of services! Stroud District Council should not be looking to compete with other locations for growth. This idea is misguided and assumes that Stroud residents want to see an increase in the population of the District. This is not the case; rather the population should be maintained close to current levels, with merely limited growth in order to ensure sustainability. The biggest challenge currently facing most parts of the District is poor access to high-speed broadband. It is vital that improving



access to broadband is make a key provision of the plan. Again, nobody wants to live where you can't use the internet! I say this as a 21 year old, and it will only become more true over time. No development should start without ensuring that there will be high speed broadband at the finished properties. The Council should be actively looking to ensure that this is the case via promoting the use of Section 106 Agreements where appropriate.

Question 2.1b

There are already a great many Business Parks in the District. I would therefore be extremely surprised if a need for further sites was identified. However, I have no objection to the expansion of existing sites. If a need were to be identified then I would consider the Stonehouse West area, very close to the M5, to be an ideal location. It is both suitable in planning terms and logical given that significant development is already planned at the site.

Question 2.1c

Locating growth adjacent to M5 junctions is the preferable option. Not only does this provide the obvious benefit of good transport links, but the area will already have the necessary infrastructure to support future growth given the planned improvements to the existing A-road leading from the junction towards the Shell Garage area. Future expansion will therefore be easier and more cost effective than expansion elsewhere. Existing sites also show no need of expansion currently.

Question 2.1d

I would support increased flexibility as encouraged by government policy. This would potentially allow employment spaces to become more vibrant and provide a sense of community. I have no strong opinion on the more detailed aspects of this.

Question 2.1e

It is clear that home working is becoming increasingly popular in the District. Supporting this trend and recognising opportunities to improve the experience of working remotely can only be a good thing. However, I cannot identify any more specific needs at this time.

Question 2.1f

There is a danger that rural development will damage our local landscape irrevocably. Farmers can already employ generous planning exemptions to conduct development and there is certainly no need whatsoever to construct the Plan in such a way as to encourage further development on farmland. I understand that many farms do now diversify but there should be no measures in the Plan to specifically promote this - existing planning principles under the National Planning Policy Framework can already be employed appropriately when considering potential diversification ventures on a case by case basis. Fears of rural dereliction are unfounded when the situation is considered objectively. Farming subsidies, formerly under the EU's Common Agricultural Programme, will still be offered after we leave the EU but will be contingent on "protecting the environment and enhancing rural life", while funding for subsidies has been committed until 2022. This appears to be a sensible approach from the government and should ensure that farms like those in our District do not lose any funding. This will, therefore, mean a situation where farms are pressured to diversify will, in fact, be very unlikely to exist.

Question 2.2

These suggestions are broadly appropriate. I agree emphatically that car parking generally is an issue (including space to park, the cost of parking and general "ease of access" concerns). I disagree that encouraging non-retail use in town centres is appropriate. We should instead be looking to promote town centres as shopping destinations where you can access local retailers, particularly independent shops. The Council should consider exercising its ability to provide discretionary rates relief to encourage businesses of this type.

Question 2.3a

As a so-called "younger person" I feel my response to this question is particularly relevant (I'm 21). I live in Horsley, where there is already ample housing supply. There is no need for further housing in my village. After



the Nupend Farm development is complete, there will be sufficient affordable housing to meet the local need and a range of new homes of other sizes which will be suitable for a range of demographics. I do not personally want any further development at all in my village, and social housing in particular is definitely not needed. The only possible exception I could conceivably support is the building of small bespoke homes as one-off plots (perhaps in the gardens of existing larger homes) which could be suitable for downsizing. I certainly would not support any development that was more than a cluster of two or three homes, and there would be no justification for any large-scale development given the extremely limited housing need and lack of access to services in the village. The road access is poor and would not support high volumes of traffic, internet speeds are very slow (unusually slow in parts) and there are very few jobs in the village. Large scale development is therefore unsustainable.

Question 2.3b

No, housing need surveys are a totally irrelevant planning consideration. This is because they invariably fail to accurately reflect actual need because of generally low response rates. The pool of opinions is therefore small and not representative of the community as a whole - and often skewed towards pro-housing because it is only people who want more housing who will bother to fill in the survey. The GRCC survey also failed to be objective, asking leading questions and guiding respondents to agree with closed questions (with an implied pro-development and pro-social housing answer, such as "identify a site which would be suitable for social housing") rather than open questions (such as "do you want more housing, and if so what type?"). All of this, as far as I am concerned, totally invalidates any data on housing need drawn from a survey such as this. It is far more appropriate to allocate social housing in accordance with general planning law and decide on the mix of homes (in terms of size and style) in the planning consultation period on a per site basis.

Question 2.3c

There is no area of my village that I consider to be suitable as a site for development. My suggestion is that required housing numbers, for the District as a whole, ought to be largely concentrated in an expansion of Stonehouse West as a sort of "garden town" - which would protect Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty like Horsley from overdevelopment.

Question 2.4a

We lack a Post Office, although my understanding is that it is extremely difficult to open new Post Offices.

Question 2.4b

Yes, absolutely. The field South of The Street in Horsley, owned by Mr Frank Parry, and identified in the 2017 Strategic Assessment of Land Availability as an area for "potential further growth" in the draft plan, is an important green space in Horsley. While Mr Parry has issued a notice preventing the site from being formally classified as a Village Green, it does in effect currently enjoy a de facto village green status and has done for my entire life (I have always lived in Horsley). As an open space appreciated by the community, this land is incredibly important to preserving the rural character of the village.

Aside from this, it also has environmental significance. It is one of the highest points in the village, is a site of Ancient Pasture and is highly visible. Any development on this land would be extremely noticeable and alter the character of the village significantly. It may look, by consulting a map, to be merely a ribbon development opportunity but this is far from the case. Horsley is not really a single homogenous village but rather a series of disparate, loosely connected hamlets. This is what gives the village its rural identity, something which I would be extremely sad to lose. The central core of the village is towards the school, but from there outwards development is very low density and Mr Parry's field provides a buffer zone - between the core of the village and the start of Nupend. The field is therefore outside the "village boundary", since it falls outside the scope of the area of the village which encompasses The Street. With significant development currently in progress at Nupend, I fear that there could be infill development along the entire South side of the road. This would, simply put, make the village feel like a huge housing estate in a suburban town. If this happened, our village as we know it would be totally gone.



Question 3.1

Option 4 is most appropriate. My understanding is that the District as a whole has been identified as having a fairly high housing need. There is no way that existing settlements can reasonably be expected to "absorb" huge numbers of homes sustainably. Therefore, the only logical option is to build a "garden town" which I think ought to go at the site of the new Stonehouse West area near the M5. This area is already seeing significant development but could accommodate more and would allow for easy access to Stroud and the motorway, thus being well situated to support jobs, and a convenient location for homes. This option would also allow for simpler expansion. There is ample space which the new town could grow into over time - but any developments integrated into existing communities can only ever be as big as the site (which would make meeting housing numbers very difficult).

Question 3.2a

I have no strong opinions on the particular sites selected. However, development should be almost exclusively near large towns in my opinion. This ensures that the site has the necessary infrastructure and access, as well as nearby employment opportunities

Question 3.2b

There is no reason why a well-executed scheme couldn't provide a "rounding off". Indeed, I think that is exactly what it should do. I believe that further "bleeding" of the border would probably occur over time, but growth would be unlikely to be sporadic as it would probably follow a gradual expansion.

Question 3.2c

No strong opinions.

Question 3.4

The current hierarchy-based approach is very a blunt instrument. The difficulty with this is that it is difficult to deal fairly with borderline settlements.

I consider Horsley to be in the wrong tier. Currently, it is in tier 3. This isn't appropriate because Horsley does not have the same level of access to public services as other tier 3 locations. Historically, we had a Post Office, independent shop and two pubs - so when the classification was originally made it may have seemed more appropriate. Now, we have a single shop without a Post Office supported by community volunteers, and although we still have both pubs they are both often struggling to attract trade. Aside from the limited services, it is also difficult to access the village as the B4058 is a very windy and, in places, quite narrow road. It cannot support large amounts of traffic. The core of the village is under 70 properties - and further development would easily damage the character of the village. It is therefore too small a settlement to be included in tier 3, and as a relatively small remote location would be much better placed in tier 4.

Question 3.5a

Option 1 - It is unsustainable and inappropriate to develop outside the settlement boundary. This kind of development has a huge impact on the environment and is unsuitable for new housing due to its distance from settlement services.

Question 3.6

I disagree strongly with the proposal to include a site in Horsley as having development potential. This is simply not wanted - the site is outside the village boundary. It is included within an AONB. It is a greenfield site on historically open farmland. To develop the site indicated, there would be huge problems with visibility and landscape visual impact. Horsley cannot support large scale development since the village is very small and has no jobs. Road access also presents issues, particularly of safety, when the winding hill is taken into account. The total lack of local jobs would mean anybody living on this hypothetical new site would be forced to commute to a job elsewhere. The site is completely unsustainable and inappropriate.