

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: _WEB_Local Plan
Subject: RE: PS29

Categories: Consultation response

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to oppose the PS29 part of the Emerging Strategy Paper.

I would live in one of the houses in the proposed development as it would be close to the outskirts of town. However I know the land: **it is a bog in winter** where you can literally here the water running down from the escarpment over the fields of clay.

I would live in the proposed development because I would get a great spot overlooking the AONB – but then **would that AONB have a great view looking at the development?** I think not.

I would live in the proposed development **but it's the wrong end of town**. The increased numbers of houses would make the commute through the middle of Dursley and the bottleneck at Sainsburys would become even more tortuous. Then we get to The A38 Junction 14 rush hour mess – have you seen it recently??

Transport – several points

Point 1: Traffic surveys would seem to suggest that roads in Dursley – both central Dursley and the roads closer to the development are a long way short of capacity. In traffic flow yes, most of the time, but not in central Dursley at rush hour. Shakespeare Road, the access road, and many other access roads are often not full width as many cars are parked on the road, reducing many parts to single lane.

Point 2: Lack of sensible public transport. Any new development will comprise of commuters to Bristol for example (there are no trains northwards at commuter times). The train station at Cam and Dursley is an asset but suffers from lack of integration with the bus service. So I and many others now drive to and from Bristol 5 days a week.

Loss of a valuable facility

I do not look over the fields. I will lose no view. However, **the town will lose this facility**. These are fields that my son grew up with. He got to know the wildlife, the changing seasons, the beautiful spring flowers, the subtle colours of flowering grasses, the butterflies, grasshoppers, crickets, the many species of bird and open views. Direct contact with nature shapes our world view as acknowledged by so many agencies benefitting health, education, environment, psycho-social well-being – the list is endless, the rationale obvious.

This is an unusual place that is close to town, is open meadow, has not been landscaped (as would happen on even the unbuilt areas of the proposed development) and that is left to its own devices except for the hay harvest. It is all this and is more – it is next to a town and is appreciated and valued by the hundreds of people who use it. The hedgerows are acknowledged in the plans in the past and have been retained but will not be part of an open field but restrained between houses and urban gardens. This area is by default set aside, a recognised type of land about which DEFRA (2008) observed: “Although introduced to curb production, it soon became apparent that, by effectively re-introducing fallow land into continuous arable rotations, set-aside had the potential to deliver a range of biodiversity, resource protection and other environmental benefits,” [accessed 16th May 2014, from: <http://archive.defra.gov.uk/evidence/statistics/foodfarm/enviro/observatory/setaside/>].

The wildlife survey said the present environment does support a wide range of wildlife. I would suggest that this is hugely lacking in comprehensiveness. You could find the same range of animals in my tiny, rather urban/inhospitable garden which is presently home to newts and I didn't have to look for them. These must be in my garden because of the proximity of the wild fields. They will be isolated if this development goes ahead and I will lose my bit of nature.

In a DEFRA (2012) document “Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services” the following observation was made in the introduction: “The groundbreaking UK National Ecosystem Assessment (NEA) published in June 2011 provides a comprehensive account of how the natural world, including its biodiversity, provides us with services that are critical to our wellbeing and economic prosperity. However, the NEA also showed that nature is consistently undervalued in decision-making and that many of the services we get from

nature are in decline. Over 40% of priority habitats and 30% of priority species were declining in the most recent analysis.” [accessed 16th May 2014, from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/.../pb13583-biodiversity-strategy-2020-...>]

Please do not let the loss of these fields be part of that decline.

And it's the wrong end of town.

Thankyou for your consideration

