

## Response to Local Plan Review consultation Nov 2017

1.0a Priorities:

- 12. New development in the right place (do not override local knowledge and residents)
- 15. Improve quality of existing housing (and commercial) stock
- 16. Encourage sustainable self-building
- 17. Use all brownfield and under-used sites first
- 26. Protect the natural environment

1.0b Do not overrule local knowledge and residents. Communities can come up with their own solutions if facilitated to do so.

2.1a Make Stroud a hub for sustainable technologies and manufacturing. Build upon existing culture of alternative/green/arts creativity and work with people such as Dale Vince to deliver it. Subsidise business premises for non-polluting companies and those choosing to pay the (real) Living Wage in order to drive up standards of living in the district.

2.1b Support small-scale, local or family businesses which actively minimise their environmental impact including light pollution and travelling.

2.1c Keep polluting businesses away from homes and allow clean businesses close to residential areas (i.e. mixed in).

2.1d Impact upon local residents and countryside should be prime determining factors for sites.

2.1e Yes.

2.1f Farmland should only be used for growing food and fuel, nothing else. The UK should be self-supporting and not import food, timber, textiles and biomass than we can grow ourselves. The amount of productive farmland degraded and lost to pony paddocks is a getting out of control and the Local Plan should be amended to remove preferential treatment for equestrian planning applications.

2.2 Dursley has a pinch point at Silver Street where businesses always struggle to survive due to the traffic squeezing through making it dangerous and unpleasant for pedestrians and cyclists. Development should not give rise to any further increase in traffic volume on this side of town. You can see the damaging black pollution on the church, houses and offices.

2.3a Decent housing is completely unaffordable in the district for those on minimum wage. It is nigh impossible to get on the lowest rung of the housing ladder until earning well above the UK average wage. This puts a strain on families whose adult children cannot afford to leave home unless they go into a bedsit!

If annexes were encouraged, multi-generational households would be viable and sustainable, thus saving on social, health and child-care costs to the state.

Building plots are ridiculously expensive particularly if you would like some quiet outdoor space in return for your efforts. We have hunted for many years to try to find a suitable and affordable plot, to build a modest home of around 100m<sup>2</sup>, but have found it impossible. How will the aim to support self-building and provide plots actually be met? Will they be squashed into unattractive sites which are not aspirational enough for the bother?

VAT levied on eco-refurbishment products and re-modelling/updating old houses/bungalows makes this unaffordable too (done properly). There are bungalows sat on large plots, but the cost of the land puts them out of reach of ordinary self-builders.

Local people (not outside investors) should be supported to build in the places they grew up in, to enable families and communities to stay together.

2.3b Yes, to discourage inward migration of non-locals and investment buyers. Priority should be given to local builders, creating homes for local people.

2.3c Dursley cannot take anymore housing estates, without ruining the AONB (and its setting) and clogging up the town centre with traffic. The congestion might not be deemed critically severe compared to cities, but it still degrades the quality of everyday life for residents.

Dursley has radically changed in my lifetime, with a significant increase in people and traffic. You cannot protect the character of a relatively small Cotswold market town, whilst allowing it to get bigger and bigger. The two are simply incompatible.

If more housing is needed for our young people, then there is space towards the A38 (Cam B).

North of Ganzell Lane (Dur A) is a completely unsuitable location. If environmental/landscape protection is given due weight, this site must be permanently removed from future development options.

2.4a Allotments could be created at Highfields Playing field (off School Road), which would be within walking distance of homes south east of the town centre (Kingshill is too far).

The meadows off Shakespeare Road are a wonderful and popular site for walking and should be retained for the health benefit of so many local people.



3.1 Once brownfield and under-used sites have been completely exhausted, we should look to build new garden-towns which could be self-contained and sustainable. This would need long term planning and might be challenging to deliver, but it is the only way to retain the cohesion and character of existing settlements without overwhelming and upsetting everyone. It makes sense to plan for these new large-scale projects to be sited on the least valuable farmland and next to existing transport infrastructure (which may need upgrading) i.e. on the Severn Vale or fringe of Gloucester.

3.2a Agreed

3.2b/c Create individual Village Buffer Zones .

3.3a Public transport is often unreliable, dirty, inconvenient and over-priced. Support clean, green, subsidised transport between our towns, augmented by cycleways, secure bike parking and cycle-kit lockers.

3.3c Build closer to the A38

3.4 No. Dursley is not on a par with Stroud. They are vastly different in terms of scale, infrastructure and facilities. Stroud should be on its own in Tier 1.

Dursley should only be in Tier 2 if amalgamated with Cam (i.e. Cam can satisfy housing need).

Dursley is much closer in character and scale to Wotton and Nailsworth, than it is to Stroud.

Tier 4 and 5 villages grouped together since they are similar enough to be designated small villages.

3.5a Option 3, BUT with extreme caution. Certainly not for new housing estates or more than 2-3 units.

Moving the settlement boundaries to simply make room for more houses means loss of valuable and irreplaceable countryside, which is a dereliction of our duty as responsible humans.

Why not encourage new (organic) small scale farmers and growers back into the countryside?

3.5b No. Please retain and defend them properly!

3.6 Northwest of Eastington – yes –due to good transport access.

Stonehouse – yes – due to employment therefore less commuting and has a train station in centre of town.

Cam – yes – IF investment in more shops and facilities, since cannot rely on everyone driving into Dursley to access services all the time. With employment sites on the western side of the Dursley/Cam cluster, this is the logical place for housing, *not* to the south or east of Dursley. Cam also has the benefit of a train station (Dursley does not) and is very close to the A38 for linking to the motorway network.

Dursley - NO! Ganzell Lane is not suitable for yet more houses. If landscape, tourism, environment and sustainability are important, then this has been wrongly assessed in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment. Views from the National Cotswold Way Trail will be damaged thus in conflict with encouraging tourism. The health and well-being of people who use these meadows everyday will be adversely affected.

The site should have been assessed in the LSA more sensitively as an important part of the Cotswold Secluded Valley, right next to the AONB and needs commensurate protection. Under the NPPF and PPG, there is statutory obligation to protect not only the AONB itself, but its SETTING, i.e. the land nearby and adjacent to it. The opinion of the consultant who compiled the LSA for Dursley and the Stroud District did not give sufficient weight to the setting of this part of the AONB and the affect upon key view points. If sites D04 and D05 are unsuitable, then by exactly the same assessment criteria, D03 is unsuitable too.

Hardwicke – yes

Berkeley – yes

Newtown and Sharpness - yes, but require integrated planning for new services but location inherently viable.

Slimbridge – no. Not enough local services to prevent more car use.

Frampton – yes, but needs a roundabout at junction with A38.

Whitminster – yes

Kingswood – yes

North Nibley – no. Too much commuting already

Painswick – yes – good road links with Gloucester

4.1 The LSA for Dursley is flawed due to inconsistent appraisal of sites. Impact upon Cotswold Way, the AONB and its Setting and important wildlife habitats along the mature hedges of Ganzell Lane and within the meadows nearby. If D04 and D05 are unsuitable for more housing, then so is D03.