

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph Policy Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is:

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>	No	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input checked="" type="text" value="X"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>	No	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>

Please tick as appropriate

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We consider that some policies within the pre-submission publication are unsound. We have responded to this where appropriate in response to question 6.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

We have set out as follows the policies which we consider are unsound and have suggested amendments where appropriate:

Proposed Site Allocations: Safeguarded Land PS06a (Minchinhampton)

We consider that rather than safeguarding land, sites need to be brought forward in multiple locations to proactively deal with the identified affordability issues now.

Promoting an Alternate Site:

Site Name: Land at the Knapp, Minchinhampton

Site Address: Land Adjoining High Dale, The Knapp, Besbury, Minchinhampton



The site is approximately 2.02ha and could accommodate 35 new homes, together with a substantial area of green infrastructure including allotments, SuDs, open space and landscaping. The layout has been driven by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), in recognition of the site's location within the AONB, a designation which washes over Minchinhampton.

An existing development - 'The Tynings' - to the south east of the site has resulted in a rather hard urban edge, and the plans show how an additional development could address this through the provision of extensive planting and thoughtful design. This would deliver landscape improvements, particularly in relation to medium and long range views, where the hard urban edge of the settlement is particularly apparent.

The landscape-led proposals have been designed to retain key views through the site, with strategically placed open space. The planting proposed against the western boundary of the site is substantive and will ensure that the development is softened. The site also proposed a considerable amount of planting within it too, providing a variety of new habitats. Finally, community allotments would improve social cohesion as well as positive physical and mental health and educational impacts of growing food.

A planning application has been submitted (Ref: S.20/2667/FUL) which has demonstrated that the site is deliverable with no constraints to development. The main point of contention now is the impact on the AONB, but this is a constraint shared by any site within the settlement.



General observations/comments on policies:

We have set out as follows the policies which we consider are unsound and have suggested amendments where appropriate.

- 2.5.3 – 630 homes per year to address housing needs.

Annualized target – may be more appropriate.

Core Policy DCP1:

We are broadly supportive of this policy, but if the Council is to become over reliant on brownfield sites, this will become an issue from a viability perspective. Therefore, whilst the policy should apply to all development, a flexible approach may be required for these sites and this should be made clear.

This policy should refer to overall grid capacity, such as the provision of battery developments and a presumption in favour of developments that would increase grid capacity.

Policy CP2

This policy infers a ceiling or cap through the use of the phrase “cumulative total”, which we consider should be removed to ensure that the plan remains flexible. This is as per paragraph 11(a) of the Framework which states “plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change” (emphasis added). The ‘cap’ inferred here would run contrary to Framework in this regard.

Policy CP3

We are broadly supportive of this policy, but we see no reason why there should not be site allocations in tier 3b settlements. This is because rural exception sites are an inevitability, so the plan should positively reflect this need by allocating sites from the beginning of the plan process, rather than waiting for the need to be exacerbated by a lack of deliverability. Especially since smaller settlements are likely to be most unaffordable.

Policy CP5

The strategic site principles are far too nebulous and there is a missed opportunity to set precise expectations. Whilst we are supportive of appropriate densities, there is no definition as to what this might be.

Chapter 3 Making Places: Shaping the future of Stroud District

3.1 The Stroud Valleys – Minchinhampton

The strategy discusses the availability of infill development, but the settlement is significantly constrained by a number of footnote 6 designations, has very few infill opportunities and is one of the most expensive towns within Stroud. Those local to

the area, particularly young people, find themselves locked out the housing market for good. It is therefore essential that allocations to Minchinhampton radically deal with the burgeoning lack of affordability, which is disproportionate to other settlements.

As such, we consider it pertinent to allocate more sites within Minchinhampton and have already expressed our concern in relation to the Safeguarded Land allocation (PS06a) and consider it preferable for additional sites to come forward now to tackle the affordability problems locally.

Chapter 4 Housing Delivery

Policy CP7

Whilst this policy contains laudable aims and objectives, we consider that it would be incredibly difficult to implement through the development management process. A specific and measurable set of aims should be provided, which could be implemented particularly on larger sites. For example, a minimum provision of, perhaps 10% for older people and/or lifetime homes. Other than in relation to housing for older people which we agree is covered under Policy DCP2, this policy is too nebulously worded and vague in relation to other groups.

A specific set of targets should be provided to ensure that this can be implemented, whilst making it clearer for applicants to understand what will be required as part of their applications. A presumption in favour of developments which meet the needs of the groups identified would be supported. Adult social care providers face specific challenges as there are no direct allocations for this use and have to retrofit existing buildings as a result.

Policy CP8

Again, whilst laudable in its aims, this policy will be difficult to implement. In particular, points 4 and 5 should be read against a backdrop of a statement which sets out that that development that fulfils these aims will be considered more favourably than those which do not.

It is unclear how this policy relates to the Biodiversity Net Gain agenda. Should there be further policies in this regard, they should be signposted here.

Policy CP9

This plan is unambitious in its approach to tackling the burgeoning affordable housing needs and will not address the shortfall that has built up. The provision of affordable housing could be raised to 40% and it is unclear why 30% was selected. The Council will not begin to address its affordable housing needs until it raises its ambitions.

Policy DHC2

We do not consider that point 3 is appropriate as it politicises housing delivery. We have direct experiences of appeals being won where Parish Councils object to

development and this could be used as a veto. This is because those in housing need often do not take part in the planning process, and those who have no need tend to be those who object. Further justification is required in terms of the 10% upper limit, because it is obvious that in many cases allocations are already leading to expansions of greater than 10%.

Policy HC4

We are supportive of this policy although have the following comments -

Point 3 – This is very difficult to define, given that edge of settlement locations (including allocated sites) will invariably have difficulty with complying with this policy given their location.

Point 5 – It would not result in biodiversity net loss, would be preferable

Point 7 – There should be a reference here to an SPD or specific design standards.

Policy CP13

There needs to be recognition in this policy that rural sites, and in particular exception sites or where there is a proven unmet need, may not be able to fulfil all of these aims as a result of their rural location. This is to bring the policy in accordance with paragraph 84 of the Framework.

Policy ES2

Point (d) would be difficult to implement, as it is extremely difficult to identify that there is a direct benefit to local communities. Often, the benefit is to the wider grid capacity and national targets, and these developments have national significance. There is a missed opportunity to directly reference grid capacity and energy storage.

Policy DES3

We agree with the principle of this policy but object to the wording as district heating is only viable on large strategic sites. This policy would require almost all small and medium housebuilders to demonstrate the viability issues created by this policy; thereby creating unnecessary delays.

Policy ES8

Whilst supportive of the approach to protecting trees and hedgerows, at present the policy prevents development which results in the loss of “locally valued trees”. This should be instead restricted to protected trees only, as there is no justification (or definition in the explanatory text) as to what might constitute a locally valued tree. This provides the potential to become a veto to development, without any real justification.

Policy ES10

This policy requires the submission of a programme of archaeological works, but does not adequately define in what circumstance this would be required, giving the impression that this would be required on every site in all circumstances. This would appear an overly onerous validation requirement, given that a programme of works is often negotiated with archaeology officers and only where there is cause to do so.

7.0 Delivery and Monitoring

We are supportive of the high predicted delivery rates at the start of the plan period and consider that our site should also be allocated to provide further security to delivery rates so that the Council can meet its needs without being reliant on windfall sites which are predicted to more than double in quantum after the first 5 years. Whilst windfall sites clearly need consideration, they are an unreliable source for meeting the Council's 5-year housing land supply.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Please note In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

It is necessary to participate at the hearing sessions to ensure that the views of our client are represented.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

9. Signature:

[REDACTED]

Date:

20/07/2021