

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 January 2020 09:20
To: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: Response to SDC local plan review closing 22 January 2020 Sites survey

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am responding to object to published plans for areas P34 and P36.

My key concerns which need to be addressed are still the scale and density of the developments which is far too large for the location. There is an overwhelming impact on the local population, its character and history, this is not sufficiently covered in the Natural Neighbourhood concept and needs to be supported by SDC in the same way as the Stroud Valleys, canals and mills or the AONB, SDC must consider how to provide this support whether or not any development occurs.

Whilst it may be accepted that some development is inevitable this should be more reflective of the current size of the village, P34 alone represents close to 50% increase in number of houses, the village has already seen grown by 13% since 2011 (i) which is higher than most villages of similar category. By discounting the dispersal option for development SDC is missing the opportunity to address the need to get a balanced demographic in its villages and an equitable distribution of the burden of required development. There is potential to provide its district with a truly integrated travel network, it should surely work to achieve village sizes which ensure more connected viable transport options which mean people would actually want to use the services and this would have a greater impact on carbon footprint. This also modernises but retains the character of the district.

The Special Protection Area along the Severn is potentially inadequate for climate change management. The Natural Neighbourhood concept at Sharpness is actually the opposite of its description since it is entirely covering open green belt land and which prior to this round of planning has always been considered as remote due to its distance from Motorway junctions. This is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework due to the loss of this unique estuarine environment and actually means development over many public rights of way and cycle routes (41), green corridors built through housing in no way compensate for green field and estuary views such as this (ii)



Which would be entirely build on (ii), a permanent loss to the district and county.

SDC needs to live up to its climate change commitments and recognise that these fields should be regarded as useful for more future local food provision, a proper market garden village, sustainable energy and act as a carbon capture solution. The direction off build and placement of employment/retail development should be reconsidered to protect the current village character which has already been affected by warehousing and house building. How and why have SDC already apparently accepted this design?

Significant amenities would be required by such a large number of houses. The former local hospital is redeveloped and the secondary school closed to local users so that even if employment or home working is part of the Neighbourhood concept there would still be many journeys required for medical needs and more sophisticated shopping and leisure activities. This places still more pressure on motorway junctions and local roads which are not fit for such high volume traffic. It is a naive concept that the Natural Neighbourhood inhabitants would not be using cars and should be reconsidered.

SDC must be certain of the providers costs and its viability to provide the amount of infrastructure required. Greensquare has built around 12000 homes so this represents a major increase to their portfolio. It provides estate management, i.e. acts as a Registered Social landlord. How will residents be charged for these services? If profits are used for social housing it may be some time before there is balanced demographic mix at this development.

How have prior responses to Emerging Strategy been incorporated into this current draft of the Local Plan, it is not apparent? The update and renaming of the Sharpness promotor material seems like an cynical attempt to over-ride concerns raised in those responses through their consultant document.

(i) **Stroud District Settlement Role and Function Update 2018** (May 2019)

(ii) Sharpness Vale: Natural Neighbourhoods

