

**Stroud District Local Plan Review – Draft Plan Additional Housing Options
Dursley Town Council Response
Agreed 15th December 2020**

1.1 Spatial Options additional housing land:

Question 1

Which strategy option(s) would you support, if additional housing land is required?

Q 1a Option A – Intensify

No.

As reflected in our responses to the Local Plan consultations and our Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Dursley and Cam area has itself reached a maximum in terms of development capacity and infrastructure provision.

To adopt 'Intensify' as a strategy option would only result in overcrowded developments, further loss of green space and amenity (at a time when the importance of having green space to grow and play has come into sharp focus during the pandemic), excessive pressure on infrastructure and loss of identity and local character. Overall, it has a degenerative, negative impact on an area.

Q 1b Option B – Towns and villages

No. As reflected in our responses to the Local Plan consultations and our Neighbourhood Development Plan, the Dursley and Cam area has itself reached a maximum in terms of development capacity and infrastructure provision.

Q 1c Option C – Additional growth point

Yes but as part of Option E, a hybrid combination option. (Please see below for reasons)

Q 1d Option D – Wider dispersal

Yes but as part of Option E, a hybrid combination option. (Please see below for reasons)

Q 1e Option E – Would you support a hybrid / combination option?

Yes. Combining Option C and D, with greater emphasis on Option C (explained below).

Option C, a new growth point located on the A38 in Gloucester's rural fringe would be more likely to support the development of the facilities and services required, to provide more affordable homes and would benefit from good transportation links and easy access to major employment centres.

The land within the A419 and A4135 corridors is already built upon, has environmental constraints and has already been assessed so is unsuitable.

We object to the development of PGP1 Land at Grove End Farm, Whitminster. Including SALA sites WHI007 and WHI014. Development here would be considered harmful to the landscape and would not compliment the existing development of the area in terms of the canal project, its rural setting and enhancing tourism opportunities in support of the local economy.

We do not object to the development of PGP2 Broad location at Moreton Valence / Hardwicke. Including SALA sites HAR015, HAR016, HAR006, HAR007, HAR008 and HAR009. Development here would benefit from good transportation links to the major employment centres of Gloucester and Cheltenham, with junction 12 close by and easy access to established services and facilities.

Option D, wider dispersal of new housing to include small sites at Tier 4 as well as additional sites at tier 2 and 3 settlements, should be secondary to Option C and be limited, focusing on the small sites at Tier 4 villages. Although the scope of any particular site in a Tier 4 village is likely to be small this should not be discounted in the context of village development and the avoidance of the local population being priced out of living where they 'grew up' or the loss of the local shop for example. This option should be given strong consideration with the thought that such developments will be carried out by smaller and more diverse builders.

Q 1f Option F – Can you suggest another strategy / spatial option for the identification of additional housing land?

No

Question 2

If you answered yes to Q1e above, please explain which of the spatial options (A- D) you would like to see combined in a hybrid strategy, and why?

Option C and D, with a greater emphasis on Option C for the reasons given under Question 1 above.

1.2 Spatial Options | a reserve housing supply:

Question 3

Do you support the approach of identifying a reserve site or sites, if housing development on the sites that will be allocated in the Local Plan should fail to come forward as envisaged?

Yes.

Question 4

Which strategy option(s) would you support, if a reserve site (or sites) is required?

Our answer is the same answer as question 1 and 2 above.

Note: Option A – Intensify cannot be used as a means of identifying an additional reserve site.

Q 4b Option B – Towns and villages yes/no? please explain your reasons

Q 4c Option C – Additional growth point yes/no? please explain your reasons

Q 4d Option D – Wider dispersal yes/no? please explain your reasons

Q 4e Option E – Would you support a hybrid / combination option? (see Q5)

Q 4f Option F – Can you suggest another strategy / spatial option for the identification of a reserve site / sites? Please describe it

Question 5

If you answered yes to Q4e above, please explain which of the spatial options (B- D) you would like to see combined in a hybrid strategy, and why?

Options C and D as per our answers for questions 1 and 2 above.

Question 6

If a site in the Local Plan does not come forward for development as expected, then a reserve site(s) may be required. However, the “trigger” for allowing a reserve site or sites to receive planning permission needs to be clearly set out in the Plan, to avoid doubt or uncertainty. There could be a variety of triggers / reasons for bringing a reserve site into play. What should trigger a reserve site (or sites) coming forward?

A delay in an allocated Local Plan site receiving planning permission?

No

Failure to deliver housing at the build rates set out in the Local Plan?

Yes, if on a given site there is very good reason, backed by strong robust evidence, that the original number of houses planned cannot be met.

Another trigger (please specify)

-

Please explain your reasons

-

2.1 New housing sites:

Question 7

Do you support or object to the development of the sites identified?

7a BER016 Hook Street Farm, Berkeley

No strong view either way.

7b BER017 Bevans Hill Farm, Berkeley

No strong view either way.

7c HAR017 Land at Sellars Road, Hardwicke

No strong view either way.

7d STR065 Beeches Green Health Centre

Support. This site is identified in the Stroud Neighbourhood Development Plan.

7e WHI012 South of Hyde Lane, Whitminster

No strong view either way.

Please explain why you support or object to the development of each.

Question 8

Are there any other sites that you would like to be considered for future housing development?

No.

2.2 Potential growth points:

Question 9

Do you support or object to the development of the potential growth points identified, or any sites therein?

9a PGP1 Land at Grove End Farm, Whitminster. Including SALA sites WHI007 and WHI014.

Object. Development here would be considered harmful to the landscape and would not compliment existing development of the area in terms of the canal project, its rural setting and enhancing tourism opportunities in support of the local economy. (See answer to question 1 above).

9b PGP2 Broad location at Moreton Valence / Hardwicke. Including SALA sites HAR015, HAR016, HAR006, HAR007, HAR008 and HAR009.

We do not object to development here as it has good transportation links to the major employment centres of Gloucester and Cheltenham, with junction 12 close by and easy access to established services and facilities. (See answer to question 1 above)

Please explain why you support or object to the development of these broad locations. If your comments relate to a specific site within the broad growth point area, please reference the SALA site number(s).

Question 10

Are there any other sites that you would like to be considered as a future growth point?

No.

3. Sustainability Appraisal (SA):

Question 11

Do you have any comments to make about the Sustainability Appraisal that accompanies this consultation document?

The Sustainability Appraisal is very thorough and focuses on the environmental, economic and social impacts.

Within the report summary and conclusions, it is *'recommended that the Council continues with a hybrid approach to the spatial strategy. Using elements of Option A would achieve benefits associated with higher densities of development and more efficient land use'*. We do not agree with using elements of Option A within a hybrid strategy for the reasons outlined in our response to question 1 above.