

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 December 2017 13:09  
**To:** \_WEB\_Local Plan  
**Subject:** Comments on the Local Plan review  
**Attachments:** Local plan review comment001.pdf

To Local Plan Team

Please find attached comments of the Painswick Valleys Conservation Society. I understand you will be able to accept them though I missed the deadline.

Many thanks

[REDACTED]



# 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](http://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: 3.6

Please use this box to set out your comments:

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

Allocation of potential housing sites in Painswick.

PA1A Washwell Fields

The SALA identified this as a potential site (PA1004). The impact summary identifies a number of constraints. We would like to comment as follows:

The site is adjacent to a working farm at the present time. It is indicated that the site might become available circa 2020-25. We would presume that this is anticipation of the farm ceasing operations on that site, otherwise the proximity of cattle housing would not make this an appropriate development site because of potential noise and air pollution.

There is no viable access at present. The frontage to the A46 is minimal and is currently domestic garden; the site boundary on Lower Washwell is on a corner and there is a steep gradient. It would be assumed therefore that any access in the future would be via Washwell Farm.

The proximity of Washwell House (grade 2) to the site boundary must raise the issue of impact on the setting of a listed building, especially at the density of development as proposed.

The site is steeply contoured and it would be very difficult to carry out a satisfactory development of the proposed density. It would be out of keepin with the surroundings, where houses are typically set in spacious plots.

PA1B Land at Stamages



This site was considered earlier this year as a planning application for 9 houses. This was turned down because of its impact on the AONB. The adjacent open land, part of Richmond was specifically required to be left free of development because of its elevated location and visibility in the AONB.

The suggested housing capacity of 4 houses would enable the development to be of lesser impact, if located near to Stamages Lane.

There should be no vehicle access off the track to the north of Stamages, as this is a pedestrian link between the A46 and Painswick (Kemps Lane).

**STR D**

This is an elevated site and development in this area has an impact on the AONB and views from local footpaths. We are pleased to see that development up the Painswick Valley has been rejected.