

The planning Strategy Team
Stroud District Council

Stroud District Council
Received
17 JAN 2020
Development Services



I write in response to the proposed development named Wislow Green Garden Village.

Whilst I realise that the provision of new housing is required to cover the needs of a growing population and that government targets have to be met; the council also has a responsibility to provide housing that is sustainable without degrading the facilities of the existing local population. The proposal to build a minimum of fifteen hundred houses on the only remaining green field site left between Dursley and Slimbridge is totally disproportionate to the needs of the local community and far in excess of the government requirement. It will also overwhelm the current struggling infrastructure of sewers and roads as well as putting undue pressure on the available sparse medical facilities. This proposed so-called village will only encourage people from Gloucester and Bristol to move out into what will become a Dorma town to Dursley only to commute back to those centres because of the lack of employment in the local area thus over whelming the already crowded and appallingly maintained road network and overcrowded train services. For every house built you can count on at least one additional vehicle and in many cases two additional vehicles being added the already congested road network increasing detrimental air pollution and environmental noise. The idea that a foot bridge over the motorway to the station will provide an answer is completely flawed, the first time it rains the residents will get into their cars and drive the short distance to the station where they will clog up the already congested Box Road because of inadequate parking at the station. The recent large housing development on Box Road has already increased pressure on the station parking and the proposed development of the old railway sidings will only exacerbate the problem.

Stroud District Council is committed to the environment and takes responsibility for environmental improvement.

The above statement was taken from Stroud district council's website and yet your proposal makes a complete mockery of the sentiments expressed by engulfing the ancient rural village of Cambridge with a density of housing considerably larger than the existing village. By building such a huge quantity of houses on the last remaining green belt you are joining it to Cam which has already become another suburb of Dursley which totally contradicts the above statement about improving the environment. The council has a responsibility to ensure that any future development improves or at least maintains the quality of life for the ratepayers who's interests they are supposed to represent and just paying lip service to the aspirations of coalescence is not good enough. A more modest development would be tolerable provided that sufficient upgrading of sewers, roads and other amenities were provided and flood plains were not destroyed in the process.

Dumping this huge development on Cambridge may be the easy option for the council because it only requires one planning decision rather than the ethical way of dispersing the required housing needs to lessen the impact on any one location shows just how little consideration the council gives to the needs of its ratepayers.

It would appear that Stroud District Council have selected their preferred sites for ease of planning and has biased its findings to support its case in conjunction with the developer who's only concern is profit and has now paid for a highly suspect report downgrading the categorisation of good agricultural land in order to reinforce their case for acceptance.

An additional major concern is that part of the proposed development is to be constructed on a known flood plain immediately adjacent to the river Cam and bounded by the elevated M5 motorway which would form a barrier or dam causing the run off from the development to go straight into the river Cam. In the event of extreme rainfall which is becoming a regular and increasing occurrence with the advent of climate change Cambridge would be inundated because the sewers already struggle to cope as it is. The developer will not concern themselves with providing sufficient safeguards from the threat of flooding and the consequential impact that they will make on local residents. Destroying the flood plain that protects the village of Cambridge and Slimbridge would be catastrophic when, rather than if, an extreme weather event occurs in the future. For the council to condone let alone promote building on a known flood plain is irresponsible in the extreme and shows scant regard for the safety of the residents who will be inundated when the next incident of extreme weather occurs in our area. The agricultural land adjacent to Cam is a natural sponge taking up excess rainwater and releasing it slowly thus preventing local flooding, once lost under tarmac and concrete neither the council nor the developer will render any assistance to the new and existing local population to clear up the mess that THEY have created if this proposal goes ahead in its present form.

The huge impact of this development will manifest its self in many ways, from destroying the identity of an ancient village to overwhelming the sewers, flood defences, roads and other scant amenities as well as creating an unbroken urban sprawl from Stinchcombe Hill to Slimbridge, that is quite some legacy that you the planners intend to leave for future generations; I hope you can live with your conscience, assuming of course that you have one. We are not being NIMBY, however it has been noted that none of the members of the planning committee or Stroud councillors actually live in the area to be blighted, perhaps that's why they feel justified in their destructive decision because it doesn't affect them!

