

EXAMINATION OF THE STROUD DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

INSPECTORS' MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

MATTER 10D: Design

On behalf of: Robert Hitchins Ltd

Date: February 2023 | Pegasus Ref: SHF/P17-2258

Author: Philip Smith



Document Management.

Version	Date	Author	Checked/ Approved by:	Reason for revision
V1	27.01.2023	P. Smith	S. Hamilton- Foyn	



Pegasus is instructed by Robert Hitchins Ltd to submit a Statement in respect of Matter 1, pursuant to the Matters and Questions identified by the Examination Inspectors.

Separately additional Statements have been submitted in respect of the following Matters:

- Matter 1
- Matter 2
- Matter 3
- Matter 6
- Matter 6a
- Matter 6c
- Matter 6d
- Matter 6g
- Matter 7
 - Matter 7a
 - Matter 7b
 - o Matter 7c
- Matter 8
- Matter 10
 - o Matter 10a
 - o Matter 10c
 - Matter 10d
 - Matter 11
 - o Matter 11a
 - Matter 11b
 - o Matter 11c

Following the submission of the Reg 19 representations in July 2021 Pegasus along with PFA Consulting and Pioneer Housing and Development Consultants have also responded to the Stroud District Local Plan Review Additional Technical Evidence in October 2022.

The Hearing Statements should be read alongside our representations and supporting evidence. As instructed, we have not repeated our representations of July 2021 or October 2022; but instead sort to highlight the salient points in response to the MIQs and indicated what changes we consider necessary in order for the Plan to be found sound.



CONTENTS:

raye NU

10. MATTER 10D – DESIGN

1



10. MATTER 10D - DESIGN

Better design of places - Delivery Policy ES12

- 1. In relation to Delivery Policy ES12:
 - a. Is it clear what the purpose of this policy is and what it is seeking to achieve?
 - b. Is it clear how a decision maker would use this policy when determining development proposals?
 - c. Is the policy consistent with national policy and guidance on design?
 - d. How does it relate to other Plan policies which reference design, and does it unnecessarily duplicate these?
- 1.1 A minor point of clarification would be to set the policy in the context of the Framework's aim at paragraph 126 to create 'high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places'.
- 1.2 The Policy by referencing Design Statements etc, gives sufficient signposting to how a decision maker would use the Policy in determining design proposals.
- 1.3 The Policy is consistent enough with national policy and guidance not to raise an issue of soundness on this matter. However, for clarity and avoid doubt it should made clear that documents referenced for appraising design do not form part of the Development Plan, nor have the weight of it, other than Neighbourhood Plans.
- 1.4 There is considerable duplication with Core Policy CP4 (Place Making) and Core Policy CP14 (High Quality Sustainable Development). In effect, Policy ES12 can be reduced to the two final paragraphs.

<u>Public art contributions – Delivery Policy ES16</u>

- 2. In relation to this policy:
 - a. Is it consistent with national policy and justified by evidence?
 - b. How will it be decided whether a contribution will be proportionate and on what basis?
 - c. Has the viability of this policy been fully assessed?
- 2.1 No comments.



Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Cirencester

Pegasus House, Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, GL7 1RT T 01285 641717 E Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk Offices throughout the UK & Ireland

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

All paper sources from sustainably managed forests

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: Querns Business Centre, Whitworth Road, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RT

We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001







PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK