

Date: 15 January 2019
 Our ref:
 Your ref:

Property Consultants

Olympus House, Olympus Park
 Quedgeley, Gloucester GL2 4NF
 T 01452 880000
 E paul.barton@brutonknowles.co.uk
 W brutonknowles.co.uk
 @brutonknowles

Stroud District Council,
 Ebley Mill
 Ebley Wharf
 Stroud
 GL5 4UB

Dear Sir or Madam,

**Stroud District Council Local Plan Review (LPR).
 CAM 11 Land to the east of Woodend Lane**

This representation supports the draft LPR insofar that it describes Cam as a Tier 1 settlement. However it is not clear why CAM11 has been removed as a proposed allocation for residential use, when it was considered appropriate in the 2017 Issues and Options Paper (page 48). It is suggested CAM11 is reinstated within the emerging plan and we make the following comments.

CAM 11 is located in close proximity to Cam’s town centre, adjacent to the settlement boundary and bordered by Woodend Lane. It is therefore surprising given Cam has been identified as settlement where growth ought to be directed, that such a well-positioned site has been removed from the emerging plan. In addition to the site’s sustainable location, CAM11 provides a natural ‘rounding off’ of the settlement, to the east of Woodend Lane. Woodend land provides a natural boundary for development and it is not clear why this obvious settlement boundary marker, which was used in the Issues and Options Paper, is now discounted.

The proposed growth of Cam towards the Railway Station, rather than the centre of Cam, has some logic, as it provides future occupiers with an immediate choice of sustainable transport. However, there are concerns that the railway will not provide the choice of destinations which residents of Cam require, and there are other locations closer to Cam’s town centre which would better ensure the vitality and viability of the town centre are maintained.

Some parts of the proposed allocations in Cam (adjacent to the railway station) are circa 2 kilometres from Cam’s town centre. Our client’s land (CAM11) is circa 400m from the services and facilities in the centre. It is considered that the drive to provide development close to public transport nodes is being achieved at the expense of better locations within Cam. This can easily be redressed by the inclusion of our client’s land in order a greater amount of development is provided to serve Cam rather than serve the railway station.

It is considered the majority of trips will be local to the facilities and services within Cam, and the wider rural environment, rather than be limited to those towns located on the railway. Therefore whilst allocations around the railway station have a certain degree of logic, in practice it is unlikely that the railway will reduce the reliance on the motor car. The revised NPPF recognises sustainable



Question 2.1b Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

Growth around Cam need not be so concentrated around the railway. A dispersed pattern of smaller allocations would be far better rather than large expansions which are detached from the town.

Question 2.2a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to support the District's town centres?

The proposed growth around the railway station will inadvertently detract from the development of Cam. Development is too far from the Town Centre, circa 2km in places to encourage walking to Cam, and will have the compounded effect of taking footfall outside of the district, to locations such as Gloucester.

Question 2.2b Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

An alternative would be to direct development closer to the town centre, which is the obvious and natural starting point for growth of any town.

Question 2.3a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to meet local housing need?

Towns are best supported by housing growth which is in close proximity to the town centre. Equally housing growth is best located where it is close to the facilities and services which a town centres offers. It is therefore logical to provide residential development close to centres such as Cam and a greater amount of residential development could be provided around the town.

Question 2.3b Do you support an alternative approach? Or have we missed anything?

We support the redistribution of housing allocations in order a greater amount is closer to Cam than is presently proposed. This was demonstrated far better within the Issues and Options Paper (2017) and it is unclear why there has been a departure from this.

Question 4.2a Do you support the broad approach of the emerging growth strategy, in terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District?

We agree with this in part noting our comments above. There need not be so much emphasis on growth around Cam Railway Station for the reasons set out above.

Question 4.2b Do you support an alternative strategy approach?

Question 5.0a Do you support the proposed mini-visions for your area(s)? (Please be clear and specific about which of the 8 mini-visions your comment(s) relate to).

The minivision of Cam “...*Growth and prosperity: revitalising the towns of Dursley and Cam to make an accessible, attractive focus for rural communities in the south*” is laudable and correct, but will not be best achieved by the pattern of growth currently proposed. The rural community will not benefit from the location of growth adjacent to the railway station and Cam will not be revitalised by locating housing so far away from the centre.

Question 5.1a Assuming some growth is desirable, have we identified the best site(s) at each town and village? (Please clearly specify which settlement(s) your comment(s) relate to, and use the site reference numbers shown on the map, where relevant).

CAM11 should be reinstated into the emerging LPR for the reasons set out above.

We trust the above is of assistance, however should you have any queries please let me know.

Yours sincerely