

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 October 2017 16:49  
**To:** \_WEB\_Local Plan  
**Subject:** Comment on local plan

Comments and responses as follows:

1.0a - 2,3,12,17,26

1.0b - utilise existing brownfield sites and disused premises for redevelopment rather than taking more agricultural land and greenfield sites.

2.1b - there appear to be many many derelict disused retail and commercial premises in the area, why not try and fill/utilise those first. This is an area which SDC can address directly by setting sensible business rates and smoothing planning applications for these purposes. Also, in the case of retail premises my wife and I were previously living near a small town on the outskirts of Bristol. A combination of high rates and excessive car parking charges turned what was a vibrant shopping area into what looked like a deprived inner city area.

2.1c - growth adjacent to the M5 should be supported to reduce traffic on local roads, however this must not impact heavily on existing small villages (proposed land at Eastington for instance looks horrific).

2.1d - yes, there should increased flexibility on employment sites.

2.1f - yes, farm diversification should be encouraged as long as this is amenable within a rural environment.

2.3a - in my area (Coaley) there is a current planning application to build 24 houses including 14 "affordable" houses despite much local opposition and concerns regarding infrastructure, traffic increase and other issues. This development falls within the boundary of identified land suitable for housing in the local plan. This application more than satisfies the local (Coaley) requirement. Notwithstanding local opposition I think it is highly likely that this will be approved. I also believe that we must get away from the idea that people should be able to live exactly where they wish at a price they can afford. My wife and I could not do this and I do not see why others should be effectively subsidised to do so.

3.1 - option 1 is in my mind the only way to go if we wish to maintain rural environments and green field spaces between large towns and cities. Developments in villages seldom result in an aesthetic improvement and I do not believe they add economically to the villages themselves. They do however increase traffic/noise levels.

3.2a - these are the type of areas where development should take place i.e. on the fringe of existing recent developments.

3.2b - this will result in sporadic growth and will not form a firm boundary but I think this is preferable to spoiling many small villages. This type of development could also encompass suitable infrastructure provision which is not always the case with village development.

3.2c - green community areas, trees and well spaced housing with adequate parking.

3.3d - on the face of it, the Sharpness/Newton area looks ideal but the extent of the area on the local plan is far too big relative to the existing villages and the current road infrastructure is in my opinion inadequate.

3.4 - I believe the scale of possible development in some areas to be totally unreasonable given the current size of the villages, I would refer to Eastington and Sharpness/Newtown specifically (Please note I do not live in either of these areas). These places would no longer be villages and would change into small satellite towns serving Bristol and Gloucester/Cheltenham with consequent increase in travelling to employment. Another reason for siting developments close to or on the edge of existing towns/cities.

3.5a - option 1 in the case of villages.

3.6 - I do not agree, for reasons mentioned above.

If I can further comment on the current application for Betworthy Farm in Coaley. It is a development of 24 houses consisting of 10 open market houses and 14 "affordable" houses. I understand that "affordable" means up to 80% of market rent - not that affordable really and as far as I am aware there is no proven need for this number in Coaley nor for the open market houses. This is a village with no means of public transport for commuting and only has an irregular bus service although there is a railway station close by. However due to inadequate parking at the station there are usually many cars dangerously parked on the road outside. This means that all commuting will be by car as there is no employment in Coaley. We do have a village shop but I would imagine someone who uses a car will probably shop at a supermarket where items are cheaper. I would also take issue with the comment that Coaley has "A good range of local community services and facilities". I mention these points as they are applicable to many (currently) small villages.

Having said all of the above, I have found the plan very interesting and agree with much of what has been written. I would just ask that consideration is given to the effect of large developments on small villages.

