

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 December 2017 11:47  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Attachments:** Upton St Leonards comments on the Local Plan Review.docx

Good morning

Firstly thanks for coming along on Monday to our Parish Council Meeting.

Attached are the Parish Council's comments on the Local Plan Review.

Regards

[REDACTED]  
*Chair Upton PC*

Upton St Leonards comments on the Local Plan Review.

First of all we would like to thank Conrad and Mark for agreeing to meet with the Parish Council as an extra meeting to those already planned.

The Parish Council feels that at this early stage it is more relevant to comment on the overall Strategy for development within the District that detailed comments about possible individual development sites. Although having said that we would wish to reiterate our comments already made in connection with site identified as S006 (G3) on page 25 of the review document. We firmly believe that this site is wholly inappropriate for housing development by virtue of its extreme proximity to the M5 Motorway. Development here will only increase the number of residents having to live with effects of the unacceptable extreme noise and pollution as already experienced in this area. If however at any point this site is seriously considered noise mitigation must be of the utmost priority, the whole site would require bunding to separate it from the motorway, pure mitigation in house design will not be enough.

Regarding the possible development of sites in proximity to the M5 the Parish Council draws attention to the points raised concerning site UPT 006. The principles raised here should apply to all sites in proximity to the motorway. In particular the Parish asks that the District Council actively promotes via planning policy and direct lobbying the following initiatives:

- (a ) The extension and improvement of existing acoustic barriers in sensitive areas
- (b ) A policy to renew low noise surfaces when noise reduction ceases to be effective (rather than when it becomes unsafe)
- (c ) The introduction of a motorway speed limit through the Gloucester/ Cheltenham urban area to reduce noise and air pollution

These initiatives would have the benefit of improving conditions in existing residential areas, as well as enabling development on some sites adjacent to the motorway

We would now like to comment on the preferable District Strategy.

The Council favour the LPA continuing to following the strategy of developing a small number of larger strategic sites around main towns as previously, indeed it would indeed be well worth considering a completely new very large settlement and feel that there is scope for this in the south west of the District around the Sharpness area in Berkeley Vale. This could also accommodate industrial/business development as well.

The alternative Strategy is of course that of dispersal across a wider area. Development of many smaller sites across the District within rural villages. If this were the case the rural community ethos of these villages, should be kept at all costs. Any planned developments should take account of the current demographics that show many young and older people who desire to stay within the community they have been brought up in and for many , lived in, all their lives. Many older people are now living in large properties alone, perhaps through bereavement or still as a couple, with a great desire to downsize, but desperate to stay within the community they know. Therefore any development planned should be sympathetic to that desire. Planners should ensure that the size and style of homes planned take account of this issue. Community should be at the heart of any of these developments, which may include recreational areas etc.

With regard to A1 and A2, a detailed response to issues raised here should await selection of a district wide strategy. However the Parish Council points out that both are sensitive edge of village sites with an environmental sensitivity relating to the village setting at the foot of the AONB protected scarp edge. The District Council (and Sec of State) has recognised this in the past with a long history of refusal to grant planning consent on both sites, upheld at appeal. The Parish Council also considers it appropriate to point out that whilst consistently opposing the outward spread of the village towards the scarp edge, it has nevertheless supported development elsewhere within the north of the Parish on a substantial scale (development is still being undertaken in this area )