

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph Policy Policies Map

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4 (3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tick as appropriate

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

These representations have been prepared by Black Box Planning on behalf of Taylor Wimpey (TW) in respect of the land interests at site G2: Land at Whaddon. TW have majority control over land (130 ha) at Whaddon.

It is bizarre that the SLP Core Policy CP3 Settlement Hierarchy fails to recognise the presence of Gloucester City abutting the district's boundary. The opening paragraph of Policy CP3 sets out that locating development in accordance with the settlement hierarchy will reduce the need to travel, yet it ignores a major urban area offering County-wide key infrastructure such as Gloucestershire Royal Hospital, major employment provision and desirable retail/leisure provision. The SA (May 2021) recognises the presence of Gloucester City and associated amenities/infrastructure, yet this is not adequately reflected in Policy CP3. Policy CP3 is

considered too inward looking and should be revised. Rather it should recognise that certain locations in the District are better located to deliver sustainable development by virtue of their proximity to Gloucester City.

The omission of any reference to Gloucester City in the settlement hierarchy jars with Part 3 of the SLP: 'Shaping the future of Gloucester's rural fringe', which states (p139);

'The strategy in the parishes of Hardwicke, Haresfield, Harescombe, Hunts Grove, Brookthorpe-with-Whaddon and Upton St Leonards.

These parish adjoin Gloucester city, which acts as a major strategic provider of services, facilities and employment, particularly for communities in the north of our District.'

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Policy CP3 should be modified to makes reference to the role of Gloucester City in respect of travel patterns in Stroud District. The Gloucester fringe areas should be acknowledged within the settlement hierarchy.

Land at Whaddon provides a sustainable option for strategic housing provision in the District yet the settlement hierarchy as set out in CP3 provides little indication of the potential role for such a location in the event that the land is not required by the JCS authorities to meet the needs of Gloucester City. Policy CP3 should provide some indication that the parishes on the Gloucester fringe are treated differently to other parishes of similar size in the district because of their inherent relationship and accessibility to urban Gloucester as a major strategic provider of services, facilities and employment for particularly the north of Stroud district.

Please note In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

TW control a majority proportion of the strategic site 'G2' Land at Whaddon. On behalf of TW, Black Box Planning request attendance at the hearing sessions to assist the Inspector with any queries or discussions regarding the site at Whaddon.

In addition, specific to policy CP3, we request the opportunity to make oral submissions regarding revisions to the policy as referred to above, and partake in general discussions regarding the settlement hierarchy.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

9. Signature:

[Redacted Signature]

Date:

[Redacted Date]