	Democratica	00500
	Representor Type	00586 Individual
	Method	E-mail
	1.0a Have we identified the top 5 issues for you?	No
1. Key Issues	Comments:	Firstly, due to the complexity and length of time required to complete this online survey these responses are to be taken as the consolidated but individual views of the FOUR persons named hereon. Those are Mr B Price, Mrs A Price, Mr M Price and Miss A Huish. Any acknowledgement of receipt or further correspondence can and should be directed to any of these parties via the email address shown, that is bernie.price@btinternet.com. Thank You. So, to begin, you have failed to recognise the poor infrastructure and sustainability of the area this response refers to (KI 1). Furthermore you have elected to concentrate builds on mostly greenfield sites in contravention of your Stroud District statement (KI 2). I refer and add to my KI 1 comment that you are failing to utilise brownfield sites and instead are allocating builds to mainly greenfield sites without taking into account currently poor infrastructure, particularly transoort links and logistics (KI 3). Again, I refer to my comment to enhance open space and wildlife habitats (KI 4). The proposals appear to recognise som affordable housing but the majority will be high cost, unlikely to be afforded by those in need (locally) therefore the whole dynamic of the area will change given that most will be newcomers to the area and not 'downsizers' or rent to buy type schemes.
	1.0b Do you agree with the ways we intend to tackle them? Comments:	No As per my responses above. Little thought has been applied to adhering to your own planning statements. This will mean a free for all building programme with little thought to the impact on environment, current community dynamics and pressures on already pressured public services. Road networks, schooling, emergency and Doctors access to name but a few are extremely poor, as you previously recognised, but have since reassessed as good and yet no improvements have taken place. This seems merely a thpographical change to massage to plan to suit. Indeed this questionnaire is so cumbersome it makes the consultation process difficult and time consuming, why?
2. 1 Local economy and jobs	 2.1a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to support the local economy and the creation of jobs? 2.1b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything? 	No There is little in the way of provision for employment. The proposal for the number of houses suggested is disproportionate to what MAY be created in terms of employment opportunity. Indeed the majority of the centres (not just the ones represented by this response) are dornitory centres serving the larger conurbations of Gloucester, Bristol, Avonmouth and beyond. There is little here to suggest that the proposals will do anything but merely compound that situation. To this end, rather than large scale development such as that proposed, a dispersal alternative should be investigated (more so than up to now) and pursued so that the proximity principle (live close to your work) may be applied, rather than a dump of a large scale development such as that here, likely to cause further migration issues within currently highly pressured infrastructures and transport routes as commuters nevertheless continue to find the most attractive employment outside the Stroud area and thus continue to travel.
	2.2a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to support the District's town centres? Stroud Nailsworth Dursley	Yes Yes Yes
2.2 Our town centres	Stonehouse Wotton under Edge Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	Yes Yes Yes With regard to all the above towns, their charm and character is a key ingredient to attracting both people wishing to live and work, or visit, so planning and change should sensitively manage this in partnership, and in consultation with those living, working and caring for those communities. Never assume, ask!
2.3 A Local need for housing	2.3a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to meet local housing need? 2.3b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	No No. Simply, your explanation of a need for a further 5700 homes to meet demand over the next 20 years suggests that the proposal for in excess of 5000 homes in the Sharpness/Berkeley are disproportionate and that the majority of new housing seems destined, if plans are approved, to be assigned to just one area, and, on mostly greenfield sites. All of my previous comments in earlier Sections could be repeated here, but I refer especially to your comment regarding young people and older people having their needs met. I see this proposal as failing to address this, with little by way of addressing affordability, as despite the good intention, developers will undoubtedly seek to maximise return by building the bare minimum of affordable properties (often done by variation to original pre-planning once formal planning is obtained) versus the optimum high value numbers. The dispersal of the number of properties suggested also appears to be a more attractive proposition so that the dynamic of current centres is not changed wholesale and irreversibly as will be the case here. Local people are proud of their current identity and diversity and wish to retain that whilst accepting that some change is inevitable, this shoul be shared across the district as a whole.
	2.4a Do you agree with the ways in which the emerging Strategy intends to protect existing or deliver new local green spaces and community facilities?	No

2.4 Local green spaces and community	2.4b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	I have already commented on the poor infrastructure, particularly in respect of community services. Where new developments are to go ahead this MUST be planned and addressed either prior, or simultaneously, with any those developments. That way at least there is some potential for actually delivering improvements to these essential services and easing already pressed areas. GP surgeries, Schools and transport links are key. Furthermore, any impact on currently designated nature areas, AONB's, SSSI's, RAMSAR, SAC, SPA, or other green spaces must be carefully monitored and managed. These need to be at the top of the priority list and any development likely to affect them must be carefully considered, and, if necessary vehemently objected to.
	3.1a Do you agree with the vision for 2040 as drafted?	Νο
	3.1b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	You have suggested (for the area this respnse refers to) up to 5000+ new houses and ancilliary employment opportunity. Although this is commendable in terms of the long term commitment for the number of homes required over the next 20 years you have failed to recognise that the environmental impact, particulatly CO2, that the homes themselves (despite current building requirements) and their associated owners vehicles will have on this area. It is doubtful many will secure employment locally, thus reducing travel, and as such, with poor transport infrastructures, it will necessitate using personal cars to travel to the conurbations already mentioned earlier, Gloucester, Bristol, Avonmouth and beyond - and with just one vehicle per household (unlikely) this will generate circa 10,000 journeys per day, five days per week, notwithstanding those being made at present. The environmental impact is obvious in relation to this issue alone.
	3.2a Do you agree with the strategic objectives as drafted?	
	SO1: Accessible Communities	Yes
	SO1b: Healthy, inclusive and safe communities	Yes
	SO2: Local economy and jobs	Yes
	SO3: Town centres and rural hinterland	Yes
	SO4: Transport and travel SO5: Climate change and environmental limits	Yes Yes
	SO6: Our District's distinctive qualities	Yes
3.2 Strategic Objectives	3.2b Do you support an alternative approach or have we missed anything?	These are merely statements. They become objectives when they can be realistically delivered, in harmony with and not at the cost of each other or the balance of the district as a whole. I refer to my earlier comment in relation to the maintenance of the identity of the centres within the district. You should take this into account when deciding planning strategies. Your focus should be on the district, over the years to cone, and a quick 'fix' in terms of a large scale development that will alter part of the community irreversibly, just to satisfy a numerical requirement in terms if new home numbers must be CAREFULLY considered, along with the views of those likely to be affected.
L		
	4.2a Do you support the broad approach of the emerging growth strategy in terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District?	
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud	No By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through.
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District?	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth?	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through.
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through.
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Manor Village (Bussage)	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kingswood Leonard Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below):
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kingswood Leonard Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Woodchester	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Woodchester Oakridge Lynch Painswick Slimbridge	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Nibley North Woodchester Oakridge Lynch Painswick Simbridge	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brinscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Vodchester Oakridge Lynch Painswick Slimbridge	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Minor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Woodchester Oakridge Lynch Painswick Simbridge Stroud Stonehouse Uley	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brinscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Vodchester Oakridge Lynch Painswick Slimbridge	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Woodchester Oakridge Lynch Painswick Simbridge	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable
	terms of distributing the growth required by national policy for Stroud District? 4.2b Do you support an alternative approach? 4.2c Have we identified the right towns and villages for growth? The following settlements have been identified as potentially suitable for growth. Please tell us if you disagree: Amberley Berkeley Bisley Brimscombe and Thrupp Cam Chalford Coaley Dursley Eastington Frampton-on-Severn Hardwicke Horsley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Kings Stanley Manor Village (Bussage) Minchinhampton Miserden Nailsworth Newtown & Sharpness North Nibley North Woodchester Oakridge Lynch Painswick Stonehouse Uley Uley Uley Uley Uley Uley Uley Ule	By your own admission the options suggested, 1 - 4, offered several choices, with Option 1 and 3, being preferred. Why then do you seem to have moved away from consensus and elected for Option 4 for the area to which this response refers? The 'growth point' option for Sharpness/Berkeley provides none of the desires expressed by earlier respondents nor any of the hybrid suggestions such as being alongside current transport routes or utilising brownfield sites. This merely looks like a 'quick fix' that is ill informed and ill thought through. No: the emerging Strategy has got it wrong for the following settlements (see below): Unsuitable

4.3 Lettiment hierarchy 10 4.3 Settiment hierarchy 10 4.3 Settiment hierarchy and Settiments by including them within the hierarchy and defining settiments by including them within the hierarchy and defining settiments by including them within the hierarchy and defining settiments by including them within the hierarchy and defining settiments by including them within the bierarchy and hierarchy and defining settiments by including them within the bierarchy and defining settiments and bierarchy and defining settiments and bierarchy and defining settiments and bierarchy and defining settiments ana defining settiment bierarchy and defining settimenthe	4.2 The emerging growth strateg	Please explain why you consider any of these settlements to be unsuitable.	Sharpness/Berkeley. If you read my previous statements you will already be aware of my unsuitability comments, but to reiterate. The development is disproportionate, does not recognise transport, public services, schooling and proximity to employment centres. Road networks, public transport (if any) and local amenities are poor. Large scale development without addressing these issues simultaneously will merely compound an already dire set of circumstances. There are few local shopping facilities, community centres and little employment, thus creating the need to travel for almost all eventualities. This is in contradiction to other statements within the plan. Whilst it is accepted that some development is necessary, this should be proprtionate, preserve current community identity and be applied on a dispersal principle, rather that large scale.
 A Settlement liced particular set of setting in the arrange large particular setting in the array large parting in th		(other than identified through Neighbourhood Development Plans). Do any of	
A Settement herea		Arlingham	-
A 3 Settlement hisrardy 4.3 On you support the proposed approach to managing development at the main of transport infrastructure, meaning the settlement of the main			-
A 3 Settement hierarch A 3 Settement hierarch A 4 Settement hi			- -
 4.3 Settement hards 4.3 Controls 4.3 Settement hards 4.3 Settement hards			-
A Settlement Neirord			- -
 A 3 Settement birror? A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? A 3 Are any settements in the wong ter? Via comments A 4 Are comments A 4		Haresfield	-
 All dispert in the second spectra of the second spect			-
A 3 Settement hierardy A 4 Settement hierardy A 5 Settement hierardy A 1 Settement hierardy A 1 Settement hierardy A 2 Settement hierardy A 2 Settement hierardy A 2 Settement hierardy A 2 Settement hierardy A 3 Settement hierardy A 4 A Settement hierardy		Middleyard	-
A 3 Settiment bicrop A 3 Settiment bicrop A 4 2 Po you support to index to many the part of the settlement of the set			-
Lad Settlement bicardy A A Settlement bicardy A Settlement bicardy A			-
A 3 Settement Netrod A 3 Settement Netrod A 3 Or you support the proported agentative to managing development at a field settement. The large scale development that a base of the state of			-
A Settlement hierard			
A 3 Settlement hierarch A 4 5 Settlement hierarch			-
Prese region why suc consider any of these settlements to have growth - 4.24 Do you support for proposals to addressing Gloucester's housing reaching of the settlement is terms of transport infrastructure, proximity to higher endpered methy area and the increased environment is the settlement in the settlement is the settlement in the settlement is the settlement is the settlement in the settlement in the settlement is the settlement in the settlement in the settlement is the settlement in the settlemen			- -
4.3 be you support on afternative approach to addressing Gloucester's housing need? Yes 4.4 be you support an afternative approach to addressing Gloucester's Notating need? Yes 4.5 Connects: Yes 4.5 A re any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A re any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A re any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A re any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A re any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A re any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A ore any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A ore any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A ore any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 4.5 A ore any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes 5.6 Connects Berkeley variation to the fact that it is wrongly doubled. The real provision is the settlement will and and the ore approach to addressing double wrongly doubled. The real provision is the settlement will and and the ore approach to addressing double wrongly doubled. The real provision is the settlement will and and the ore approach to addressing doubled. The real provision is though wrongly doubled. The real provision is though wron			-
A 26 to you support an alternative approach to addressing Gloucester's Yes boulding needs? 4.2e Comments: A 26 Comments:			-
4.2e Do you support an alternative approach to addressing Gloucester's hour of consequences of transport infrastructure, proximity to higher emplyment denity area and the increased environmental issues created by higher vehicle movements can also be cited here. This address to the argument for a more dispensed increase in housing parvision with a bias towards the provingitor with accepting that there do need to be some (proportional) share taken throughout the district. 4.3e Comments: 4.3e Are any actitements in the wrong tier? Yes - Mease agains which actitement and its accepting that there do need to be some (proportion that this is the analiset settlement within The 2 merely draws attendor to the fact that its wordsy dealede. The real provision is settlement within The 2 merely draws attendor to the fact that its wordsy dealede. The real provision is settlement within The 2 merely draws attendor to the fact that its wordsy dealede. The real provision is settlement within The 2 merely draws attendor to the fact that its wordsy dealede. The real provision is settlement within The 2 merely draws attendor to work your and maintoin. Constructive, This is the origon of the fact that its construction is the settlement within The 2 merely draws attendor to work your and maintoin. Constructive and provision is structure, provision is structure, provide with the new and merely and and the employment attendor you will be common settlement and the settlement and the settlement and will be real provision is structure. This is boild on the fact that its could be argued that the one village real and be provided with the district fact draws attend periodo your and antianciton. Counters will and environs a should be real and periodo you will be real provision is should none therease and the settlement and will be argued that the one village real and periodo you will be argued that the one village real and periodo you will be argued			No
4.2e Comments: My comments in trem adds to the argument for a more dispersed increase in housing provision with a bias towards the prosinity of enalphorem tilth acception that there doe need to be some (provision) with a dist to the argument for a more dispersed increase in housing provision with a bias towards the provision with the district. 4.3a Are any settlements in the wrong tier? Yes -Please explain which settlement within Ter 2 merely draws attention to the fact that is surgingly classified. The retail provision is externed wrong the settlement within Ter 2 merely draws attention to the fact that is a wrong classified. The retail provision is externed wrong the settlement within Ter 2 merely draws attention to the fact that is wrong classified. The retail provision is externed wrong a settlement within Ter 2 merely draws attention to the fact that is wrong classified. The retail provision is externed wrong and the employees to provision to write the main, serving Gloucester, Brinch, Avermonth and the employees to provision to write the main serving Gloucester, Brinch, Avermonth and the settlement betwoet schematic and version respectively. This is a communite dominant plane and even and respectively. This is a commune dominant plane and even and respectively. This is a commune dominant plane and even and respectively. This is a commune for minant plane and even and respectively. This is a commune for minant plane the serve building activity known as Canobury Rise well anderway. Bartpress for many of the same respectively that provide a structure, building them write the district is should be in Ter 4. 4.3b Do you support the proposed approach to managing development at single face settlement from falling into Ter 5, build acheed data the one village retail hough receiver and activity down as a canobury. I have mentioned anit and at a cost. A dispersion for minothy the plane he			Yes
4.3 Settlement hierarch Als Do you support the proposed approach to managing development at any settlement provide or of the same frame and the one of the same frame or or one should be minimized on the district. 4.3 Settlement hierarch Als Do you support the proposed approach to managing development at any first should be minimized that the successful to the same framework to approach to managing development at any settlement to the same framework to approach to managing development at any settlement to the same framework to approach to managing development at any first should be in the same framework to address, that the district investigation and the one of the same reactors as the Berkeley court one gamma and the one of the same reactor and the samereactor and the same reactor and the same reactore the		housing needs?	
4.3a comments Berkley; your copatition that this is the smallest settlement within Tier 2 merely draws, is working vasified. The real provision is externely small and the employment provision to which your refer is 'puzzing' as Berkley, much like Sharpness, for which your refer is 'puzzing' as Berkley, much like Sharpness, for which your refer is 'puzzing' as Berkley, much like Sharpness, for which your refer is 'puzzing' as Berkley, much like Sharpness, for which which whithing to become repetitive. This is obme out by the traffic congestion out/with the town admission. Local services are poor and the motion and even on maing and even ingrespecture. This is set to increase with the recent building activity incoven as Cannobury Rise well underway. Berkley such as a construction within the admission of the same reasons as the Berkley scenario, Sharpness for own admission. Local services are poor and transport infravory village by your own admission. Local services are poor and transport infravory village transport on adiatrication provision it should nonetheless it should reclassified. Sharpness for howed by the traffic congestion outworking the tow village retail shop product the is settlement from failing into Tier 5, but actives are poor and transport infravorular by indicating them within the hierarchy and defining deticinement Zevide or is there another alternative? 4.3b Do you support the proposed approach to managing development at small's the town and the movision it should be mainlained country side or is there an alternative approach of simply treating them as 'ope country' differs with distinct dentities and the advelopment is should be mainlained country one of yeach settlement. This should be mainlained country side or is there another alternative? 4.3b Do you support the idea that the Local Plan should set to manage the development an alternative approach? Kes </td <td></td> <td>4.2e Comments:</td> <td>areas and the increased environmental issues created by higher vehicle movements can also be cited here. This adds to the argument for a more dispersed increase in housing provision with a bias towards the proximity of employment whilst accepting that there does</td>		4.2e Comments:	areas and the increased environmental issues created by higher vehicle movements can also be cited here. This adds to the argument for a more dispersed increase in housing provision with a bias towards the proximity of employment whilst accepting that there does
4.3 Settlement hierarch A 3b Do you support the proposed approach to managing development at the district identity some distribution of the some registry. This is some of the some first is sourced as the Berkeley, multi bits provide in the some registry. This is source is a considerable within the hierarchy and distribution of the some results. This is source is a source is the bary of the some results. This is source is a source is the bary of the some results. This is source is a source is the source is the bary of the some resolution. This is not a source is the source is the bary of the some resolution. This is not a source is the bary of the some resolution. This is not a source is the source is th			
A.3 Settlement hierarchy small Tier 4 and 5 settlements by including them within the hierarchy and defining settlement Development Limits? Each settlement should be treated autonomously. I have mentioned earlier that the district is richly diverse with distinct identity owned by each settlement. This should be maintained at all cost. To 'grey' the edges or change communities by large scale development timits? 4.3. Settlement hierarchy A.4. Settlement burden and therative approach of simply treating them as 'open countryside' or is there another alternative? Each settlement sould be treated autonomously. I have mentioned earlier that the district is richly diverse with distinct identity owned by each settlement. This should be maintained at all cost. To 'grey' the edges or change communities by large scale development times. Journal of the burden and needs to address, that the district inevitably faces. 4.3. Co D you support the idea that the Local Plan should seek to manage the cumulative impacts of growth on individual settlements? Yes If yes, how should we develop a policy framework to achieve this? This is not at tacit agreement to the current plan. As indicated, the plan needs careful consideration in relation to 'proportionate' as you indicate within you Section 4.3. It seems that desoite making these references frequently the proposal for Sharpness/Berkeley apoers to contradict your own strategy. Proportionate, capacity and character, based on sustainability, and relative constraints words taken from your own statement. Therefore please adhere to them! If no, do you support an alternative approach? See above. In summary - Dispersal across the district, not large scale development in limited areas Ple			attention to the fact that it is wrongly classified. The retail provision is extremely small and the employment provision to which you refer is 'puzzling' as Berkeley, much like Sharpness, is a commuter dormitory town in the main, serving Gloucester, Bristol, Avonmouth and beyond, as stated previously and withouth wishing to become repetitive. This is borne out by the traffic congestion out/into the town each morning and evening respectively. This is set to increase with the recent building activity known as Canonbury Rise well underway. Berkeley should be Tier 3. Sharpness; for many of the same reasons as the Berkeley scenario, Sharpness is wrongly classified. Another dormitory village by your own admission. Local services are poor and transport infrastructure similar. It could be argued that the one village retail shop procludes this settlement from falling into Tier 5, but acknowledging that provision it should nonetheless it should reclassified. Sharpness should be in Tier 4.
countryside' or is there another alternative? is richly diverse with distinct identity owned by each settlement. This should be maintained at all cost. To 'grey' the edges or change communities by large scale development should be avoided at all cost. A dispersal principle will not only maintain those identities, but will share the burden and needs to address, that the district inevitably faces. 4.3c Do you support the idea that the Local Plan should seek to manage the cumulative impacts of growth on individual settlements? Yes If yes, how should we develop a policy framework to achieve this? This is not a tacit agreement to the current plan. As indicated, the plan needs careful consideration in relation to 'proportionate' as you indicate within you Section 4.3. It seems that desoite making these references frequently the proposal for Sharpness/Berkeley apoears to contradict your own strategy. Proportionate, capacity and character, based on sustainability, and relative constraints words taken from your own statement. Therefore please adhere to them! If no, do you support an alternative approach? See above. In summary - Dispersal across the district, not large scale development in limited areas. Comments on settlement hierachy Please choose a section you would like to go to next. Please click 'next page' once you have selected your choice. 4.4 - Settlement boundaries	4.3 Settlement hierarchy	small Tier 4 and 5 settlements by including them within the hierarchy and defining Settlement Development Limits?	
cumulative impacts of growth on individual settlements? This is not a tacit agreement to the current plan. As indicated, the plan needs careful consideration in relation to 'proportionate' as you indicate within you Section 4.3. It seems that desoite making these references frequently the proposal for Sharpness/Berkeley apoears to contradict your own strategy. Proportionate, capacity and character, based on sustainability, and relative constraints words taken from your own stratement. Therefore please adhere to them! If no, do you support an alternative approach? See above. In summary - Dispersal across the district, not large scale development in limited areas. Comments on settlement hierachy Please choose a section you would like to go to next. Please click 'next page' once you have selected your choice.			is richly diverse with distinct identity owned by each settlement. This should be maintained at all cost. To 'grey' the edges or change communities by large scale development should be avoided at all cost. A dispersal principle will not only maintain those identitites, but will
If no, do you support an alternative approach? See above. In summary - Dispersal across the district, not large scale development in limited areas. Comments on settlement hierachy Please choose a section you would like to go to next. Please click 'next page' once you have selected your choice.			Yes
Comments on settlement hierachy limited areas. Please choose a section you would like to go to next. Please click 'next page' 4.4 - Settlement boundaries once you have selected your choice. 4.4 - Settlement boundaries		If yes, how should we develop a policy framework to achieve this?	consideration in relation to 'proportionate' as you indicate within you Section 4.3. It seems that desoite making these references frequently the proposal for Sharpness/Berkeley apoears to contradict your own strategy. Proportionate, capacity and character, based on sustainabilty, and relative constraints words taken from your own statement. Therefore
Please choose a section you would like to go to next. Please click 'next page' 4.4 - Settlement boundaries once you have selected your choice.			
		Please choose a section you would like to go to next. Please click 'next page'	4.4 - Settlement boundaries
14.4a Do you support the emerging Strategy approach towards maintaining I lifes		once you have selected your choice. 4.4a Do you support the emerging Strategy approach towards maintaining	Yes

	Comments:	Provided these are strictly adhered to in relation to exoansion. As stated earlier, the identity of settlements is an important current and historical ethos, and should remain so. Whilst I can see a need for constant evaluation of this, wherever possible continuity should prevail. In relation to the proposal for Sharpness/Berkeley, the current proposal for 5000+ new homes will change the demographic irreversibly and the sense of community(ies) lost. Any currenty in place limits for development should remain in place and NOT be removed, subject to constant review, and proportionality principles being applied. The current suggestion for expansion is not in line with proportionality nor dispersal, which I heavily support.
	4.4b Do you support an alternative approach?	Yes
	Comments:	See above in relation to Sharpness/Berkeley. To reiterate - proportionality and dispersal
		across the district is preferred.
	4.4c Do you support the proposals to allow some limited development beyond development limits as set out on page 32 of the emerging Strategy?	
	Do you support the approach proposed for settlements in tiers 1-3?	Yes
	Do you support the approach proposed for settlements in tiers 4 and 5?	No
	Comments:	Limited development only. On the basis as outlined. Proportionate and along the dispersal principle.
	4.4d Do you support an alternative approach?	Yes
	Comments:	As stated above. Proportionate and in line with dispersal principles. Any restrictions should remain IN PLACE but constantly reviewed. This DOES NOT mean I support a total lifting of limits to release planning restriction for large scale development of the magnitude suggested for Sharpness/Berkeley.
4.4 Settlement boundaries	4.4e Do you support the specific changes to existing settlement development limits?	
	SDL - BER01 at Lynch Road	Yes
	SDL - CAM01 at Strawberry Field / Elstub Lane	Yes
	SDL-CBR01 at Narles Road / Barton Field	Yes
	SDL-CBR02 at Ryalls Court SDL-DUR01 at Shearing Close, Littlecombe	Yes Yes
	SDL-DOKOT at Sinearing Close, Entirecombe	Yes
	SDL-EAS02 at Alkerton Farm, rear of Bath Road	Yes
	SDL-HAR01 at Sellars Road	Yes
	SDL-HIL01 at no.s 1-3 Alderley Road	Yes
	SDL-HOR01 at Sealey Wood Lane / Nupend Farm SDL-HOR02 at The Chooks / Willow Barn	Yes Yes
	SDL-HOR02 at The Chooks / Willow Barn SDL-HOR03 north of The Street;	Yes
	SDL-HORO4 at The Priory	Yes
	SDL-KST01 at Dyehouse Field / off Woodside Lane	Yes
	SDL-LEO01 at Lyndon Morgan Way / Marsh L	Yes
	SDL-MID01 at Coldwell Close	Yes
	SDL-MIS01: an entirely new settlement development limit SDL-NEW01 at Cromwell Close / south of Gloucester Road	Yes
	SDL-NEWOL at Cromwell Close / South of Gloucester Road	Yes Yes
	SDL-STOO1 at Brunel Way / Oldends Lane	Yes
	SDL-STR02 at Bowbridge Wharf	Yes
	SDL-ULY01 at Goldingham Close	Yes
	SDL-WHI01 at Schoolfield Close	Yes
	SDL-WHI02 at Upton's Garden SDL-WHI03 at Wheatenhurst Cottage, Hyde Lane	Yes Yes
	Please clearly specify which settlement(s) your comment(s) relate to	Any limited development in line with dispersal principles is welcomed. Large scale development such as that suggested for Sharpness/Berkeley is not.
	4.4f Do you support any other changes to settlement development limits, not listed in Appendix A?	No
	Please specify	-
	5.0a Do you support the proposed mini-vision for your area (s)? The Stroud Valleys	
	The Stonehouse Cluster	
	Cam & Dursley	
	The Gloucester Fringe	
	The Berkeley Cluster	No - Please answer Qu. 5.0b
	The SevernCluster The Wotton Cluster	
	The Cotswold Cluster	
	5.0b Would you like to propose alternative wording? (Please be clear and specific about which of the 8 mini-visions your comment(s) relate to).	The Berkeley Cluster/Newtown and Sharpness. In line with my previous comments in relation to the Tier classification I comment as follows; Berkeley. Berkeley has a modest retail role, not a strong retail role. Reason, limited shopping, small, although convenience stores, limited choice. It has a good, diverse range of local community services and facilities. Change from very good. Reason, pressured community services such as GP, and 'strategic' facilities are limited, small and infrequent. Newtown and Sharpness. Newtown and Sharpness has a very basic local retail role, not a basic retail role, similarly a basic level of community services and facilities. Reason, limited access to facilities often meaning a journey to Berkeley or beyond, also classed as Poor. Access to key services and facilities is poor. Reason, same as above, journeys required in the majority of cases to access services and facilities.
5.0 Making Places		
	5.0c Do you support the identified key issues and priorities for action for your area(s)?	
	Stroud Valleys	
	Stonehouse cluster	
	Cam & Dursley Gloucester Fringe	
	Berkeley Cluster	Νο
	Severn Vale	
	Wotton Cluster	
	Cotswold cluster	

	5.0d Are there other important issues and priorities you would like to highlight?	At the risk of becoming repetitive. The proposal for the Berkeley cluster, specifically, Sharpness and Berkeley in terms of housing is hugely disproportionate and out of context with current development and infrastructure. It does not take into account much of the previously stated planning strategies or objectives and is in contradiction to sone of the many themes within this document. Whilst I support some development, this should be applied using a dispersal principle, should be proportionate and should respect present community boundaries and identities.
	Please choose which section you would like to go to now. Please click 'next page' once you have selected your choice.	-
6.0 Background studies	6.1 Are there any other specific local studies that you believe are needed to inform the Local Plan Review?	None.
	Have you any advice on the scope or content of any of these studies?	None.
	If you have any additional studies or data that you would like to submit, they	-
	can be uploaded here (maximum of 3)	