

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 January 2019 09:52
To: [REDACTED]; _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: Re: Potential development of the Berkeley ward area (by 2040)

Categories: Consultation response

Dear [REDACTED]

After further review of the available consultation documentation, I have some detailed questions to the consultation:

1. 2011 – 2000 housing proposal rejected due to infrastructure, flood risk, landscape impact
Area Tier 3 area, lesser development 2017 version area was considered that access to various facilities as poor; now rated as good on the current plan. so what has changed to make this new rating?
2. Shortage of Doctors: How will we attract doctors to the area if we can't do this currently? (GC, chairman of PPG for Berkeley. CCG has brought in a new group, based Tewkesbury; they recognise that getting GPs is a challenge; part-time role pattern; locum doctors currently in place; no full contact; when contact awarded, new group will bring in new doctors)
3. Will existing primary schools close? (Rednock school is already at capacity; need indicator the infrastructure that can be brought forward Roads are at capacity/broadband is creaking – currently an issue let alone when new development; Schooling)
4. Shops: How will existing local shops be impacted?
5. Emergency services: How will the impact of the extra housing be covered?
6. How do you stop this becoming a commuter town?
7. Why are the consultation comments for this not visible on Stroud Council Website?
8. Traffic issues in Bristol due to removal of Severn Crossing; this could be an additional strain if these Thornbury/Falfield/Sharpness. What authority stakeholder impact links addressed to share in the decision making?
9. Are developers legally obliged to listen to objections? Phasing of infrastructure will be fought, as they need profile from housing to build?
10. What SSI development within a 5km of an area, needs to full impact review. What has been conducted and where can I find this document?

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

On Thursday, 17 January 2019, 18:01:43 GMT, [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

1. It has only just come to my attention the subject proposal. Although housing is needed to support local people the numbers of the garden development (circa >5000) is clearly unsustainable without improvement of:
 - a. Local infrastructure.

- b. New Schooling.
- c. A bold, revamp public transport (inc. new rail links).
- d. Assurance of a vast number of local employment.
- e. New, and increased medical services.
- f. Flood risks. Not currently a major problem but with the proposals it could be.

2. Most employment opportunities for local residents are supported by Bristol and Gloucester. There has been a slight growth in job numbers at the new college at the old power station but no where near the numbers employed there when the facility was operational.

3. Without the assurances for close by employment, much improved M5 links (junction 14 is currently struggling with peak traffic), people support services where the ward can cope with and a balanced economy for Berkeley high street traders (if a supermarket is placed nearby). The numbers of 1000+ between Berkeley town and the old power station is hardly proportionate and needs serious review (Berkeley towns's current population circa 2034 from the last 2011 ONS statistics report).

4. Further to a recent residents meeting, it is clear that Stroud officials need to engage with local officials / residents in a more timely manor for deeper consultation and listen to alternative suggestions. There should be a more sympathetic approach to housing numbers so the area can remain relatively crime free and sustainable to past housing created over the last 40 years.

5. In conclusion I would support a proportionate argument in housing development for the Berkeley ward area but nowhere near the current aspirations.

Yours Sincerely,



