

Questions and Responses for SDC Planners.

L2014

Response to the Local Plan Review: Fri. 18.1-2019
Emerging Strategy.

I am broadly in favour of most of the proposals and support the response sent by [redacted] for The Friends of New Drive Field, Painswick (Your Ref. PA1 012)

Personally I would like to stress:

Q 4.2c "...right villages for growth?"

Option 3 map suggests, on Page 29, 40 properties. For whom? and where?

Detailed map on Page 94 shows PS 41 and it mentions 20 houses. But your strategic assessment of land availability 2017 proposed 15 houses on 0.9 ha in 2024/25.

Then your Issues and Options 2017 shows (Page 64) shows PA1004 as "A" in blue, AND part of PA1007 as "B" in blue.

The 0.9 Ha area is larger than either PS 41 or "A"! Why all the confusion? Please clarify.

The Colswold Cluster, Painswick, map on Page 94 shows several areas indistinctly outlined in blue. This includes,

→ to 2.

2.

continued:

PA1 008 (The Richmond Village) including already built complex INSIDE development area and 'open' land OUTSIDE development area. Adjacent to this is PA1 007 ([redacted] land) including the 'open' land that is OUTSIDE development area, and a triangular area that is INSIDE development area. Please clarify.

A large area PA1 005 is shown; this has been soundly rejected by Painswick Parish Council.

Not shown are PA1 Nos. 003, 009, 010, 011 and 012. Why not? I am particularly interested in PA1 012 "Land East of Stammers Lane" which is near [redacted], and where I walk to-and-from Village Centre most days.

These three areas PA1 007, 008 and 012 have already been singled out, in your own SALA survey for Landscape/Heritage value as "NOT suitable for development." Why the contradiction? Have you not accepted those rejections?

Q 4.4e ... "Support changes ... to existing limits?"

Yes I support changes; it is recognised that Painswick has needs for smaller, inexpensive houses for low-paid workers, for "starter-homes" and for downsizers. It does not

→ to 3.

3.

need more £500,000 (+) houses. Many houses in Painswick have been enlarged/improved to 5 bed, 3 bathroom etc. Two only yards away are now on sale for ~~£~~ around £900,000 clearly not available to those in need. The sad joke is that when they do sell they will, in correct English, be proved to be "affordable". Not that silly term now loved by Politicians and P.C. Planners! Low cost is low cost.

These needed houses should not be built on the three, landscape important sites listed above. (PA1 007, 008 and 012) The challenge for planners, Parish councillors and landowners is to locate suitable sites for sensitive development outside the existing development area, as PS 41 is. Probably to the North of Painswick, near A 46 with discrete and safe foot-access to the village centre. All the existing open spaces that are significant parts of Painswick's true Cotswolds' style should be permanently protected.

Q 5.0b "... alternative wording...?"

Yes, since Painswick is now reduced to only TWO day-to-day shops it should not be said to have a "... strong retail role, ..." It is "weak" not "strong".

Please reverse the trend for Painswick's housing being increasingly impossible to buy by many who wish those think you.