

### STROUD DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW

#### **Written Statement**

In response to the Matter 6b of the Matters, Issues and Questions

On behalf of Mrs R. Bish and Mr F. Russell

### Contents

1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Question 19	5
3.0	Question 20	6
4.0	Summary and Conclusion	8

The contents of this statement must not be copied or reproduced in part or in whole without the express written consent of SF Planning Limited





### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 SF Planning have prepared this written statement in response to the Inspectors Matters, Issues and Questions produced to guide the Examination in Public into the Review of the Stroud Local Plan.
- 1.2 The following written statement has been prepared on behalf of our clients Mrs R. Bish and Mr F. Russell and comments on the soundness of the plan, particularly in relation to the settlement of Minchinhampton and level of proposed allocations for development.
- 1.3 Our clients own a site that lies adjacent to the safeguarded site PS05a at Woefuldane Bottom, Minchinhampton see figure 1 below, but is not currently included within any allocation.



Figure 1 The Site

1.4 It is our position that this site should be allocated, either as part of a wider allocation PS05 or PS05a; or as a small site stand-alone allocation for residential use.

### 2.0 Question 19

2.1 Matter 6b, Question 19 (h) asks:

> The site is allocated for up to 80 dwellings and associated community and open space uses and strategic landscaping.

- h. Some of the representations raise concerns about other issues affecting the site including site access, traffic, loss of grazing land and accessibility to local services and public transport. Have these and any other relevant factors been suitably assessed as part of the process to allocate this site?
- 2.2 Site access might be better served through the inclusion of my clients land within the wider allocation, including the safeguarded land adjoining my clients land, and provision of access to this site from this land and off of Woefuldane Bottom. This would allow for access from a quieter road, and would give more options regarding site layout and design.
- 2.3 This could provide either secondary access to the allocation (as a whole) or act as the primary access point to the allocation. Access at this location would also allow for active travel to this side of the settlement, allowing closer access for those wishing to walk or cycle to the services provided at Minchinhampton, thereby giving the possibility to make the allocation more sustainable, than the current proposals.
- 2.4 There is no evidence to suggest that this option has been considered in relation to the currently proposed allocated land.

## 3.0 Question 20

3.1 Matter 6b, Question 20 asks:

> The 'Safeguarded Land PS05a East of Tobacconist Road' site lies within the AONB and is identified in the Plan as being safeguarded 'with potential to meet the future housing needs of Minchinhampton, if required'. However, we are confused as to what the site's status in the Plan is, as it is not a designation or allocation set out in policy. It is not required to meet any identified needs for the Plan period and it is uncertain as to whether it would be required to meet future needs beyond 2040. Indeed, the Plan specifically states that the principle of development and its allocation will be considered at the next Local Plan Review, 'subject to evidence of local housing need and the site performing best against reasonable alternatives'.

> A. Why is it necessary to identify the site within this Plan, when it may or may not be required in the future and will be considered at the next Local Plan Review? As the site is not allocated within a policy, what is its status in the Plan?

- b. As a site located within the AONB, has the impact of its development on the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB been robustly assessed?
- 3.2 Rather than being identified as safeguarded land, we believe the site should be allocated now, to help meet the wider needs of Stroud District, rather than the capped housing requirement, currently proposed to be planned for.

- 3.3 The site should be allocated, along with my clients land as part of the PS05 allocation so that the site can be comprehensively masterplanned, allowing the impact on the AONB to be minimized through good site design and layout.
- 3.4 Minchinhampton has been identified as a vulnerable settlement (within evidence base document EB72, Stroud District Settlement Role and Function Study Update), due to its constrained nature and therefore lack of growth in previous years, and yet it is also identified within the submission plan as a sustainable location for growth. In order to boost the local economy and maintain vitality of the settlement, a larger allocation should be included in this plan review.
- 3.5 The impact on the AONB has been assessed through evidence base document EB38, Evaluation of Site Landscape and Visual Issues, which identified this entire area to have local impacts, if developed, due to its location and lack of long views into the site.
- 3.6 Whilst it is acknowledged that any impact on the AONB must be fully considered, this needs to be balanced against the need to boost the local economy and aid a vulnerable settlement to survive and thrive.

# 4.0 Summary and Conclusion

- 4.1 In conclusion, the allocation of PS05 is supported, however, it is felt that better use of land and improved flexibility in terms of masterplanning could be achieved if the allocation were widened to include land currently identified as a safeguarded site PS05a, and my clients land, as shown in figure 1.
- 4.2 Impact on the AONB from development of the allocation could better be addressed through comprehensive masterplanning of the site. Furthermore, through a larger allocation, greater support could be given to enable a currently vulnerable settlement to grow and thrive, thereby boosting the local economy.

**Word Count: 987** 

