

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 December 2017 16:27
To: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: Frampton on Severn parish council response : additional comments
Attachments: Local plan review response - Frampton on Severn Parish council.docx

Our Chair of Council gave responses online by the deadline of Dec 5th. We have been advised by the planning team that we can send additional responses after our council meeting last night, since this is the first meeting since the consultation afternoon and evening at Frampton Village Hall. These responses are now attached.

Regards

[REDACTED]
Chair
Frampton on Severn Parish Council

--
The information included in this e-mail is of a confidential nature and is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, copying or distribution by you is prohibited and may be unlawful. Disclosure to any party other than the addressee, whether inadvertent or otherwise is not intended to waive privilege or confidentiality.

FRAMPTON ON SEVERN PARISH COUNCIL

www.framptononsevernpc.org.uk

Frampton on Severn Parish Council's supplementary response to local plan review

An online response to the local plan review has been made by the Chair of Frampton Parish Council by the deadline set: 5th December. However, since the initial information afternoon and evening occurred after the November parish council meeting and the December parish council meeting was after the deadline, it has been agreed that further comments would be accepted after the council met.

Our council's additional comments are:

1. On future growth strategy (3.1) We would prefer option 3: disperse development across the district. Currently development has been consistently encouraged in the Severn Vale and avoided on the escarpment AONB. We feel that this has a distorting effect on both areas. In AONB villages successive rounds of no development leaves villages without a balanced, sustainable community and in the Vale over-development of some villages has distorted their character to change them beyond recognition. The consultation document states that '*such small scale development is unlikely to sustain ailing services and facilities and would not deliver significant service or infrastructure improvements for the community*'. This statement does not recognise the radical changes taking place in service delivery, particularly using online work and communication. It also fails to recognise the informal, often unpaid community support available in villages of mixed socio-economic and age groupings which can be delivered with even small scale development. Children/ grandchildren in a village can support elderly parents to stay there. Young families taking work as cleaners/ gardeners/ decorators/ IT repairers etc supplement their income and provide necessary services for those who can no longer do these things for themselves. This is only facilitated by having affordable family housing in rural communities. Concentrating development in one or a few settlements leaves other settlements frozen in aspic with housing pressure creating ever-increasing house prices and therefore only available to older, wealthy buyers.
2. On Settlement Hierarchy: Section 3.4 We do not feel that we are the same type of settlement as the others in Tier 2 and do not have the same potential to provide increased jobs and homes as the other Tier 2 settlements listed. This is because we are severely limited by the proximity of 2 rivers and susceptibility to flooding as well as lack of investment in infrastructure. (We note that the quote from 3.1 above implies that infrastructure does follow development. However, in our Tier 2 settlement, despite approving 31 new houses in the last couple of years, we have had no allocation of an additional path connecting the Perryway development to the village, no additional children's play area, we still have lamentable mobile phone signal and fibre optic delivery and a negative response to our appeals about the A38/ Perryway junction. We have no mains gas in the village, a lot of the village uses septic tanks in an area where the water table is so close to the surface that soakaways therefore drain back into the septic tank after rainfall and we have inadequately sized foul water pipes to conduct the increased sewage created at developments in Whitminster out to the sewage treatment works on the Severn. Finally, our primary flood defence is recognised by the Environment Agency as flawed. We could not accommodate increased jobs and homes without serious investment in infrastructure and this does not appear to be tied to the designation of our parish as a tier 2 settlement. Even if we had a promise of more infrastructure, we are limited in places where further development could be placed. We feel that that we wish to be removed from Tier 2 and placed in one of the lower tiers.

3. On parish boundaries: Section 3.5a We wish to continue with the present arrangements as in Option 1. We do not have any suggestions for changing our boundary at present but are currently carrying out work for a Village Design Statement and may request a change to the boundary in the future.
4. Broad locations and potential sites: We do not feel that sites A (FRA A) or B (FRA B) are suitable for development. This is mainly because the small lanes which connect to these sites are already over-stretched with traffic, particularly with lorry and van traffic accessing Saul marina, Saul boat builders, the small employment development behind the marina and the Furniture Warehouse at Sandfield Bridge. This section of Whitminster Lane and Church Lane has no footpaths and residents of Oatfield hamlet find it hazardous to walk down the lane to the main village. If housing development were to occur at Site B, it would need to be conditioned to create a footpath/cycle way connecting it to the school at the end of Lake Lane and the doctor's surgery in Whitminster Lane. Site B also has high voltage power lines directly over the top of it.
We would be happy to see employment development at Site C, providing that this was on the north side of the B4071, though further development here would add to the already hazardous exit of the Perryway to the A38 and should trigger our request to install traffic lights or a roundabout on the junction. The south side of the B4071 is heavily susceptible to flooding (especially following the gravel extraction from this site) and any building would need to be on piles. We do not think the south side is suitable for development.