

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 January 2019 17:31
To: WEB Local Plan
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Emerging Strategy Consultation

Categories: Consultation response

Below are my comments on your proposals:

2.3a and b- A local need for housing.

This quantifies additional housing needs as 'at least 638 per year' for a 20 year period. This does not correlate with actual population growth history within SDC. Inform Gloucestershire cite a population growth of around 7,000 in a ten year period from 2007-2017.

<https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/media/2082295/population-change-in-gloucestershire-2007-to-2017-revised.pdf>

At the quoted occupancy per household, this would equate to a demand for 3,000 new properties in a decade, or around 300 per year, significantly less than half the stock that SDC propose to build. I question why SDC is building a plan that presumes current population growth more than doubling when none of the main drivers of population growth are significantly present in the district. That is before considering whether even the current population growth is either desirable or sustainable. I appreciate these 'targets' are driven by national government but they cannot be left unquestioned. If our district is being targeted for what appears to be a huge over build based on historic data, then that needs to be challenged, if only because the implication is that there may be an 'underbuild' elsewhere in the UK. Note this comment also applies to 4.2d. It is clear these are not 'housing needs' they are 'housing targets' and there is a big difference.

4.2c I do not agree with choosing Minchinhampton as a site for development on the scale proposed, including the two large sites referred to that comprise as many as 150 new homes, not including other smaller developments and infill that is likely to happen. This is effectively increasing the population of the village by 15% or more and not only is there no evidence to support this as a need, it would change the character of the village and put intolerable pressure on the very limited road capacity into and through the village. I note the use of surveys that have been used by the council to support this but these cannot be used as a quantifiable measure. More reliable is to look at what happened to past developments. How quickly did the development on Cirencester Road sell, for example? My clear impression was not that quickly at all. This measure indicates more accurately real need and demand- or a lack of it at the level proposed. Much has been said about the desire for 'affordable homes' albeit few seem to be able to accurately define this concept. We need to consider the last affordable homes built in Minchinhampton. Did they meet a local demand? Or were they substantially occupied by people outside the parish- my understanding is the latter was around 50% of the uptake. Is that the correct purpose for affordable homes? Finally I am concerned with the involvement of the local GP surgery as a 'ratchet' for enabling development. The argument is that it needs a bigger site and that could be located on and perhaps partly funded by a new development. However almost half the surgery visits are, as I understand it, from outside the parish. I imagine this is because it is a very good surgery. But the idea of a popular surgery which attracts business from afar and is perhaps has become a victim of its success in terms of existing space, should be a part driver of new development is definitely a case of the tail wagging the dog.

4.4c and 4.3a I do not support expanding Minchinhampton beyond its settlement limits. The outer boundary of the village should remain as the cattle grids on the eastern side. The

growth proposed for Minchinhampton appears to be around 50% greater than that for Nailsworth, despite the fact the latter is a largish town with significant employment whereas Minchinhampton is basically a large village with minimal employment. This does not make any sense and will simply generate excessive levels of commuting.

