

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 January 2019 23:26
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: Objection of Sharpness plans

I object to the proposed plans for building between Sharpness and Berkeley.

The current proposed plans do not adequately reflect the wishes expressed in last years consultation, fail to meet the needs and aspirations of residents and threaten the precious communities, landscape, infrastructure, towns and villages that make our district such an attractive place to live and work.

The proposed strategy suggests locating 80% of housing to the south of the district in a few large allocations whilst surrendering the north around Hardwicke and Whaddon for Gloucester City Council to offload their responsibilities into our District. This unbalanced approach is unnecessary. It could harm community cohesion and have a catastrophic impact on infrastructure. Whilst planners appear to favour creating urban estates the opportunity for smaller, rural communities to remain sustainable and create affordable homes for new and young people is shunned.

The proposals for a new town at Sharpness is completely not to any form of scale and the planners are not listening to the views and feedback from local residents. Instead they keep resubmitting a plan to build small villages into some kind of super town. However they are failing to consider that the current infrastructure is inadequate. There is only one doctors surgery catering for both the residents of Sharpness and Berkeley and this currently struggles to meet demand. The road network is not suitable to cope with the additional traffic especially with the current development in Berkeley and the hgv use for the docks. There are also only 2 small primary schools which would not be able to cater for these plans and although a new school is planned this would put too much strain on the current education facilities and secondary school catchment area.

The proposed plans also build over a wildlife haven which has deer, newts, slow worms, bats some of which are endangered species and would have their habitats removed.

There is also extremely limited employment opportunities within the area so this would create a commuter town which would see an increase in traffic as well as taking away a sense of local community.

The sense of community in our district is a distinct and, perhaps, quirky but valued local characteristic. This unique feel is born from generations of gentle change and organic growth. It is threatened by some proposals contained in the Emerging Strategy. People said they favoured dispersal but a refusal to consider where development can help communities remain sustainable is compounded by an apparent ideological planning dogma that big is always beautiful. Dispersed small scale growth combined with sensible, balanced and accepted concentration has been sacrificed in favour of carving up high grade, pristine, protected, and productive land. In a changing world where food miles count and national self-sufficiency is an increasing priority, development needs should respond by targeting lower grade and brownfield sites. Communities should be empowered to remain sustainable and, where concentrated, strategic growth is proposed, developers must be compelled to provide appropriate infrastructure, community engagement and investment.

I agree with these views of the local conservatives group and urge you to reconsider the current plans. I also find it unacceptable that you tried to quietly hold a public consultation meeting over the Christmas period thus not providing the majority of local residents a platform to voice their opinions. As it wasn't adequately advertised many people knew nothing about the meeting and or the plans.

I hope common sense prevails, they is currently already a development under way in Berkeley and surely you would want to see how this develops as part of the community and to what proportion these houses actually sell to local people.

Regards,



Sent from my iPhone