

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:20  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Stroud District Local Plan Review Issues and Options Paper - Minchinhampton - Page 38

Dear [Redacted]

Further to the publication of the above and in particular regarding the site reference MIN 004 'A'.

I confirm that I act for the freeholder of the land in question and that we have been working on the delivery of this site in accordance with the emerging Local Plan. That is to say to deliver a self-build scheme of mixed housing with delivery anticipated over a period of years.

The concept is to create a comprehensive development with a master plan/development brief to ensure that there is consistency in the type and form of buildings to be erected upon the land.

It is noted that my client will deliver the site as serviced plots offering a mixture of house types including 1, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings with a variety of designs including detached, semi-detached houses and bungalows.

Furthermore we are currently investigating the delivery of houses which will be affordable ever mindful that the definition as brought forward by Central Government is likely to evolve during the next Plan period. Discussions are already in hand with a well-established deliverer of self-build units. That Company has an exceptional track record of providing self-build units who in their own right are in discussions with those involved in the provision of affordable housing to bring forward social/affordable housing in compliance with any planning requirements.

I confirm that my client is keen to create a well-regarded residential development with the support of those living in Minchinhampton whereby there is unsatisfied demand from those aspiring to either get on to the housing ladder or move up the housing ladder but are restricted by the high values which are achieved within the Parish. It is also anticipated (based upon other discussions) that properties will be provided which will allow those already living within the Parish to downsize, thus freeing up larger family type houses which will further underpin the viability of the town with regard to shops, schools and recreational amenities.

Finally I confirm that my client albeit a private individual, has lived within the Stroud valleys for many years and has experience of both residential and commercial development and is enthused not only by the concept but by the reaction of those with whom we have spoken over the last year or two.

In conclusion therefore I can confirm that the site is being bought forward as a self-build scheme rather than an estate delivered by one of the larger house building companies in the country. The end result is anticipated to be a garden type village setting noting the form and style of Minchinhampton while at the same time reflecting current requirements by householders with regard to space, design and energy efficiency.

I anticipate being in a position to provide further detail in the early part of 2018. If however you require any further clarification please let me know

With kind regards

[Redacted]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:21  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[REDACTED]

**A LOCAL NEED FOR HOUSING**

Further to the current Review I would like to answer two of the questions posed?

Question 2.3a There is demand for housing in various parts of the Stroud District and these are covered elsewhere in my responses.

Question 2.3b It would be sensible to have a mix of houses which reflects the change in demographics within the district.

In answering the questions as above I have also responded to the Future Growth Strategy as described under Section 3.

As before if you have any queries please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:22  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[REDACTED]

**MINCHINHAMPTON**

In response to Page 38 I confirm that I act for the major landowner based upon Glebe Farm. I confirm that the land is under Option to a developer and that my client is supportive of the approach in bringing a residential allocation in on the south eastern side of Minchinhampton. This being in accord with the original 'Planning for Real' of some years ago. At that stage Minchinhampton Parish was in support of this concept.

I understand that the developer is also making a submission within this consultation process and as such I will leave the matter to progress in the normal way.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**  
Cornhill Chambers  
Stroud  
Glos GL5 2JT

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:23  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[REDACTED]

**BROAD LOCATIONS AND POTENTIAL SITES – STROUD**

With reference to page 42 the purpose of this email is to clarify the availability of the site known as D which is described as north of Grange View/Delmont Grove being suitable for housing and/or community use. I confirm that I have acted for the landowner for some years and have spoken to the freeholder with regard to the delivery of the site.

In particular I am pleased confirm that my client is interested in delivering a scheme focussed upon affordability however that might be defined. In particular we have noted the consultation emanating from Central Government as to the change in provision of social/affordable housing within the government initiatives for bringing forward housing to reflect their ambitions of **300,000** houses per annum. In my opinion this site is well placed to be part of that vanguard.

Further information will be tabled as the consultation with Central Government moves forward. If however you require any immediate clarification please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:24  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[Redacted]

**BROAD LOCATIONS AND POTENTIAL SITES - PAINSWICK**

This short response is related to Page 64 and centres upon Site A is PAI A Washwell fields. I confirm that I have acted for the family trust owning this field for many years and equally it can be confirmed that the site will be available within the next Local Plan period.

Thought has already been considered as to the form of development and in particular to deliver a scheme of mixed housing providing a variety of sizes in order to satisfy local need with the potential of releasing larger houses within the town and to facilitate the accepted housing need from older residents and younger residents all of whom have difficulty finding suitable property at appropriate values at the current time.

I anticipate that a further submission will be made in 2018 outlining the deliverability with particular regard to access for highways, pedestrians etc.

If however further information is required at this stage please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind regards

[Redacted]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

---

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:24  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[Redacted]

**BROAD LOCATIONS AND POTENTIAL SITES – WHITMINSTER**

In response to Page 58 it would be true to say that Whitminster is capable of taking a larger amount of residential development that might have been considered in the past. The village is well connected via the A38 plus the close proximity to Junction 13 of the M5.

The purpose of this email is to suggest that site WHI 005 and described as A, should be expanded to pick up WHI006 and for development to take place along the corridor which could be designed to be brought forward in conjunction with land to the west as part of the restoration of the Stroudwater Canal. Indeed the advantage of such a larger allocation on land well above the flood plain would seem to be a sensible consideration.

I trust that this suggestion is helpful at this stage. If however you require any further clarification please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind regards

[Redacted]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:30  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[Redacted]

**BROAD LOCATIONS AND POTENTIAL SITES – EASTINGTON**

With regard to page 44 the purpose of this email is to clarify that EAS 001 which is shown as excluded should in fact be included. I fail to understand why an allocation north and west of EAS 001 should be considered which would be an effective leapfrog of the urban setting of Eastington village. The advantage of EAS 001 is that it is adjacent to the defined boundary and therefore is in accord with previous planning policies. Moreover there is the opportunity to provide land for a new primary school and playing field which will be to the benefit of the parish regarding safety and accessibility for pupils and parents.

In the circumstances I believe that an allocation of EAS 001 is preferable to either B1 or B2. In particular both B1 and B2 are close to the M5 motorway and suffer noise pollution together with the previous employment use of B2.

I confirm that preliminary work has been carried out on EAS001 and further submission will be made during 2018.

With kind regards

[Redacted]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]



[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:31  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[Redacted]

**BROAD LOCATION POTENTIAL SITES – STROUD**

With reference to Page 42 I am writing to confirm that site A2 noted as Lodgemoor/Frome Hall Mills/Lower Wharf is highlighted as a potential site for redevelopment.

I confirm that I have instructions from the three major landowners namely [Redacted]. This represents the area of land lying between Lodgemoor Lane and Chestnut Lane. For the avoidance of doubt I confirm that it does not include the area between Lodgemoor Lane bridge and Bankfield House at Wallbridge.

Having received instructions from the three major landowners of the land in question, I can confirm that the site is capable of coming forward with a mixture of new build and restoration/refurbishment of the original Fromehall Mill. Not only can this be developed to create a high density scheme it is also an ideal location for a small marina off the restored Stroudwater Canal together with a mixture of residential and commercial buildings with live work taking advantage of the new canal side setting.

I confirm that the three major landowners are happy to work in concert in delivering a comprehensive plan which may also act as a catalyst in bringing forward one or two other sites which are adjacent to the land in question.

In carrying out this exercise I have also examined the impact for traffic to both Chestnut Lane and Lodgemoor Lane. I am pleased to say that both are capable of improvements which would overcome any queries which others may have with regard to accessibility by foot and by car plus use of the tow path for walking, cycling etc.

I expect to have further information on these possibilities early in 2018.

Should you have any immediate thoughts or queries please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind regards

[Redacted]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

**Deacon, Susan**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:33  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]k  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[REDACTED]

**BRIMSCOMBE – POTENTIAL SITES**

Page 34 identifies four sites, A, B, C and D. On the basis that I act for the freeholders of Site A which includes Brimscombe Mill I can confirm that it is likely to come forward for a mixed scheme for both residential and commercial. Discussions are already in hand with the development control department of Stroud District Council plus the Conservation Architect.

C – Dockyard Works is listed; but it should be noted that this freehold has changed hands within the last 12 months and is now subject to an extensive refurbishment programme by a local manufacturer. It is therefore unlikely that this will come forward for residential development within the next plan period.

Finally we note that Site B Brimscombe Port and Bourne Mills is included and we have no comment to make other than the obvious difficulty in delivering this to the market without support from Homes England.

Should you require any further information on any of the above please let me know.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**T:** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:42  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[REDACTED]

## **FUTURE GROWTH STRATEGIES**

### South of the District

With regard to this item (pages 26 -29) I will offer the following responses:-

Question 3.3a Further improvements to the rail network would be helpful but presumably needs to be linked to allocation of residential sites?

Question 3.3c While there is potential in Sharpness and Newtown this needs to be planned to ensure that there is a critical mass and bearing in mind the location, liaison should take place with South Gloucestershire Council with particular regard to the housing need coming from the north of Thornbury and environs. Should also be cross referenced to creating junction 13A on the M5 to serve Dursley/Cam/Sharpness?

Question 3.4 I have noted the hierarchy of settlements and in particular find that there is inconsistency in so far as Tiers 3 and 4 include areas which are regarded historically as urban. That is to say Brimscombe, Chalford Vale, North Woodchester, South Woodchester and Thrupp. Therefore leaving these areas as “villages” by implication is incorrect and indeed does not reflect (by way of a single example) the current emerging of the Minchinhampton Neighbourhood Development Plan which shows major residential development in Brimscombe albeit within Minchinhampton Parish. Accordingly there needs to be flexibility as to the definition of these areas which may historically appear to be of a village in nature but are within an urban area either for Stroud town or for one of the larger settlements such as Minchinhampton, Berkeley etc.

Accordingly I hope that I have answered your Question 3.4. If however you require further information or explanation please let me know.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**T:** [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:43  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Cc:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[Redacted]

**OUR TOWN CENTRES (pages 14-16)**

Stroud

The six bullet points provide a sensible overview as to the town centre. The one comment I would make is under Item 2 which is new housing in the town centre. The vitality and vibrancy of the town centre should not be prejudiced by incursions of residential development in the wrong location. Therefore although housing is a sensible addition it must be in support of the commercial vibrancy rather than instead of.

The potential for relaxing parking restrictions in the evening should be enlarged to the weekend and this is in accord with the report prepared by Urbed some years ago.

Nailsworth

I have concerns as to the third bullet point which is an improvement of the town square and redevelopment of retail units. Great care is required to see any redevelopment within the area which is presumed to be Old Market. Accordingly any development for retail should safeguard the existing businesses before any further redevelopment takes place especially to upper floors above retail provision. In the first instance the site of the bus station plus the neighbouring Days Mill should be explored. In the circumstances a Master plan for the whole of Old Market would be necessary with reference to a time line.

Stonehouse

I would dispute the definition of a stable food and non-food retail offer. With the removal of all banks the footfall and trade within the town has changed dramatically and as such it would be sensible to carry out a more detailed appraisal as to what the town needs to move forward in the future.

I trust this brief response to item 2.2 is helpful. If further clarification is needed please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind regards

[Redacted]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 15:44  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[REDACTED]

**LOCAL ECONOMY & JOBS (pages 11-13)**

In response to the consultation draft I would like to make the following comments:-

Question 2.1b This question covers the whole of Gloucestershire but I will answer in respect of Stroud District. There is an ongoing shortage of industrial space both old and modern. This is particularly exacerbated by the planning position for Bath Road Trading Estate, Daniels Industrial Estate, Dudbridge Industrial Estate, Ryeford Mills, Ham Mills and Brimscombe Port.

This has resulted in a shortage of seed bed accommodation which was once commonly found in Stroud but no longer. With the refurbishment of so many Listed buildings, the availability of economical space is now woeful.

Question 2.1b In view of the answer to Q 2.1a, the answer is yes. The end result is that there should be further allocations between the M5 motorway and Stonehouse following the A419. In addition there should be expansion of the Aston Down estate where there is ample land for further building and good road access to the A419.

Question 2.1c In addition to major allocations, consideration to be given to employment use adjacent to settlement boundaries so that there is convenience especially for SMEs

Question 2.1d Bearing in mind my comments with regard to pure industrial space and business space there should be a balance between those which are a straightforward B1 or B2 use and this space should not be lost in favour of others without compensating some space elsewhere. In particular warehouse development close to the M5 and presumably at Aston Down should be considered rather than shipping those jobs into others areas such as North Bristol and North Gloucestershire.

Question 2.1e Homeworking tends to arrive on ad hoc basis. Live work units have been mooted but so far not delivered although Stroud is an ideal location for such a concept. In many ways this would be a sensible concept for edge of village and town boundaries.

Question 2.1f As and when there are derelict buildings in the countryside, thought should be given to redevelopment but ever mindful that sustainability is important and therefore this could tie in with live work as in question 2.1e. Secondly there is an apparent need for holiday accommodation and presumably this would be suitable within rural buildings thought to be obsolete.

Hopefully the above comments are helpful but if you require any additional clarification especially with site specifics please do not hesitate to let me know.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 04 December 2017 16:19  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Local Plan Review (Issues & Options paper)

[REDACTED]

## OUR TOWNS & VILLAGES SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

Question 3.5a It would appear that Options 2 and 3 provide the appropriate criteria to expansion where a case can be justified.

Question 3.5b It is likely that certain settlements will have the development limits extended very much in response to your section entitled Broad Locations and Potential Sites some of which are highlighted in my other responses to your listings/clusters. Other examples include the following:-

Gunhouse Lane fields, Bowbridge  
Quarry Hill fields, Thrupp (northern section)  
Park Farm environs, Selsley

Question 3.5c In view of the canal restoration project it would seem likely that additional sites will be needed to deliver the final navigable length from Saul Junction to Brimscombe Port. Accordingly there should be a policy in the new Local Plan reflecting these possibilities including sites as follows:-

Ryeford Double Lock off Ebley Road  
47 Ebley Road  
Bowbridge Lock extension  
Canal Ironworks/Hope Mills

Other areas such as Whitminster are dealt with separately.

Equally the provision for employment allocations on the A419 towards junction 13 should be judged in conjunction with the delivery of the “missing link!”

It should also be noted that there are a number of sites which lie within the existing defined boundaries and therefore should or could come forward as windfall sites and infill as the case may be.

I trust that this simple schedule is helpful but if you require any additional information please let me know.

With kind regards

[REDACTED]

**Andrew Watton – Property Consultants**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]