



Stroud District Council is starting the process of reviewing the current Local Plan. This consultation is seeking views about the range of issues that the next Local Plan will need to tackle, and options for addressing them. This includes the identification of potential areas for growth and development. We ask a series of questions throughout the consultation document (each of which is numbered). Please refer to the question number and/or topic in your response, where relevant.

You can download a PDF or an editable electronic copy of this form from our website www.stroud.gov.uk/localplanreview. You will also find the main consultation document on this web page, as well as some supporting material and further reading. **Please note: there is a separate form for you to fill out if your comment relates specifically to a site submission / proposed alternative site (Local Plan Review: Call for Sites).**

The consultation closes on Tuesday 5th December 2017. Please email completed electronic responses to local.plan@stroud.gov.uk or post paper copies to **Local Plan Review, The Planning Strategy Team, Stroud District Council, Ebley Mill, Westward Road, Stroud, GL5 4UB**. Should you have any queries, the Planning Strategy Team can be contacted on 01453 754143.

Consultation response form PART A

Your details

Thank you for taking part. Please fill out your personal information in PART A. Your contact details will not be made public and won't be used for any purpose other than this consultation. We will not accept anonymous responses. Your comments may be summarised when we report the findings of this consultation.

Your name

(title): <input type="text"/>	name: <input type="text"/>
-------------------------------	----------------------------

Your company name or organisation (if applicable)

Bill Strachan Planning Ltd

Your address (optional)

<input type="text"/>

Your email address *

<input type="text"/>

Your phone number (optional)

<input type="text"/>

If you are acting on behalf of a client, please supply the following details:

Your client's name

(title): <input type="text"/>	name: <input type="text"/>
-------------------------------	----------------------------

Your client's company or organisation (if applicable)

Colethrop Farms Ltd.

Keeping you updated:

Would you like to be notified of future progress on the Local Plan review? (* we will do this via email)

- | | | | | | |
|------|--|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| i) | When the findings from this consultation are made public | Yes please | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No thanks | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) | The next formal round of public consultation | Yes please | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No thanks | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) | No further contact please | | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

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).**

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:

Please use this box to set out your comments:

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

See Attached Paper

Stroud District Local Plan Review: Issues and Options Consultation

Submissions on behalf of Colethrop Farms Limited

1. Introduction

- 1.1 These submissions are made on behalf of Colethrop Farms Ltd (CFL) which has substantial land interests on and near to junction 12 of the M5 Motorway including Hunts Grove, the largest allocated site in the adopted Stroud Local Plan. In conjunction with nationally recognized developers, CFL is vigorously progressing the construction of 2500 dwellings together with substantial supporting community, education and social services and facilities at this major growth point in the District.
- 1.2 CFL has also made submissions on the SALA process in 2016 and has submitted sites for consideration at Quedgeley East (employment) and Haresfield (housing). The Council's response to the SALA process supported the principle of an extended employment development at Quedgeley East and left the issue of further housing development at Haresfield for future consideration.
- 1.3 These submissions at this early stage of Local Plan preparation seek to advance and emphasise the suitability of land at these two locations for appropriate forms of development. We also confirm our willingness to work with the Council in bringing forward the sites in question through the Local Plan process. Each of the sites in question can make a major contribution to a soundly based growth strategy for the District both at the strategic and local levels.
- 1.4 These submissions are structured to follow the format of the Consultation Document and therefore the numbered sections below deal with first, Section 2. relating to Needs and second, to Section 3. Future Growth Strategy. Many of the questions set out in the Consultation Document are also addressed below. A separate Consultation Response Form is also completed.

2. Needs

Employment

- 2.1 In relation to **Question 2.1b**, there is definitely a need to allocate more land for employment purposes as the Local Plan is rolled forward. It is noted that the LEP support the M5 Corridor as the growth focus and this is also supported by CFL. Such a strategy is in our view entirely consistent with the achievement of sustainable development.
- 2.2 We agree totally with the proposition put forward in **Question 2.1c** that further development at the M5 junctions should be supported. In this respect, the existing Local Plan allocation at Quedgeley East fits exactly with this approach and scope exists to extend the present site in a logical and substantial manner. This has already been recognised by the Council in its response to the SALA study. We deal further with this point later in these representations.
- 2.3 There is a particular need to provide for a broad range of employment uses across the whole Class B spectrum. The land available for further allocation at Quedgeley East can do just that. It is appropriate for B1 use with close proximity to Gloucester but

specifically to the large residential growth area at Hunts Grove just on the other side of the motorway. Commuting journeys can therefore be minimized and there will soon be a major new district centre at this location providing community and retail support facilities thus making Quedgeley East a really attractive location for future B1 use.

- 2.4 Similarly, Quedgeley East is also a hugely attractive site for B8 uses. The ready motorway access makes the site suitable for large scale distribution warehouses which in their most recent high tech. form can often reach employment densities approaching B1 standards and at the same time provide quality jobs.
- 2.5 The further allocation of land at Quedgeley East ,as part of this Review,will facilitate the long term and comprehensive planning of the entire Gloucester Fringe growth area. It will enable both housing and employment uses to move forward together and assist in the planning of infrastructure that is essential to the long term objectives for the area.

Housing

- 2.6 Turning to housing issues, in response to **Question 2.3a**, we believe that there is a significant need for additional affordable housing in the District as was highlighted through the Examination of the now adopted Local Plan. Large allocated sites will obviously help satisfy some of the future need through legal agreements. However, there are more dispersed and rural needs which will not be addressed by this approach. Only by allocating sites in some of the smaller villages will local needs at least be partially addressed. This particularly applies to the needs of the elderly and for those starting out on the housing market.
- 2.7 Responding directly to **Question 2.3c**, land is available and is identified in the SALA submissions made by CFL in relation to Haresfield which is suitable and available for relatively modest scale residential development. This could bring forward a mixed market/affordable housing scheme which would help meet localized needs that would not necessarily be met by provision elsewhere to the south of Gloucester. This will help stabilize the village population, support local services and possibly add to the facilities that already exist.

3. Future Growth Strategy

- 3.1 In general terms, the strategy of concentrating new development at major settlements or at transport nodes is supported. It is the strongest strategic approach in seeking sustainable development . However, there should be scope for some more dispersed development, still related to existing settlements, but of smaller size and suitable for small or medium sized housing sites. Our response to **Question 3.1** therefore is that a modified Option 1 approach would be the most effective means of meeting the District's future needs.
- 3.2 Clearly with this approach, the selection of those villages for limited development needs careful consideration. Those villages that are rural but are well related to larger settlements with extensive facilities will present themselves as suitable candidates where there are particular needs and where there is already satisfactory physical and social infrastructure or where this can be provided as part of the development planned.
- 3.3 In response to **Question 3.4**, it is therefore our view that Haresfield is a village which falls into the above category. It should therefore be assigned a higher level of

significance than the Settlement Hierarchy set out in section 3.4 allows. Haresfield should be assigned to category 4 at least, if not category 3. This would enable the village to play a full role in providing for specific local housing needs and also supporting and improving local services. We therefore formally request that the Council considers carefully the role that Haresfield can play in the Local Plan, particularly when it appears that some of the smaller settlements in the District have not yet been given full and proper investigation.

3.4 Turning back to **Question 3.2 a**, we generally support the indication of planned future expansion of Quedgeley East both to the east of the current Local plan allocation and also south of Mount Lane. In our view, land at this location is both suitable and available and CFL will continue to promote and support this site through the Review process. We have no views at this stage on the other strategic allocations.

3.5 In relation to **Question 3.2c**, we believe, as we have set out above, that there is scope for moderate development at Haresfield. The village would be suitable for a mixed housing scheme ranging from higher end market housing to lower cost affordable and possibly special needs housing. Such a scheme could also help fund improvement to existing facilities. Essentially, it would be complementary to Hunts Grove and look to that area for higher order services but it could also provide for the needs of the wider rural community.

3.6 As noted in section 3.4 of the Consultation Document, “ some smaller settlements have more options for growth” because they are not constrained by environmental policy considerations. Haresfield in our view is one such village being outside Green Belt and with little by way of physical restriction to inhibit moderate levels of development.

4. Summary

4.1 There has been and will continue to be a strong focus on the area to the south of Gloucester during the course of Local Plan preparation. It is therefore important that the whole area is looked at comprehensively. The identification of Hunts Grove and Quedgeley East in the previous Plan sets an important precedent for continuing housing and economic development in a relatively unconstrained area. The area is also entirely consistent with the views of the LEP as noted earlier and in accordance with NPPF (in particular para. 152) which addresses the promotion of sustainable development.

4.2 It will also be necessary for public authorities to support continuing infrastructure improvements in this area to assist in the effective integration of new allocations with what has been recently built and already in the pipeline. The Review will play an important role in assisting in this process.

4.3 CFL also intends to play a positive and constructive role in the Local Plan process and would welcome the opportunity to discuss with the Council the sites in which we are involved and to provide additional detail for our proposals as the Plan progresses.