Part B - Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation:	Form	0.3234647		
3. To which part of the L	ocal Plan does this re	presentation relate	e?	
	ibilication	Local Plan for Pr	Hw10 r	
Paragraph	Policy PS37	Policies Map		- 1:05 val
4. Do you consider the L	ocal Plan is :	igiobie sono	19.10	
		CART SERVER OF	in Over	
4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes		No	V
			23700 6	er suit med
4.(2) Sound	Yes	See that see a	No	
				√
4 (3) Complies with the				A
Duty to co-operate	Yes		No	$\sqrt{}$
			× 21	casa lenga
			100 100	
Please tick as appropriate				
Please give details of is unsound or fails to cor possible.				
If you wish to support the compliance with the duty comments.	-			
The plan to build on this location be carbon neutral by 2030. The not be built upon – it is not grant to be built upon – it is not grant built upon ver grant built upon – it is not grant bui	e land is classified as best/	PPF and is incompatible most valuable agricult	with the ural land a	SDC plan to and should
Development on pristine Green habitats will be destroyed. It is endangered species, should de	s ironic if Slimbridge, which	is known world-wide		
The views into and out of the	AONB will be ruined contrar	ry to the SDC pledge to	protect s	uch views.
80% of the proposed development in this area and increased traff			lead to an	oversupply
PS37 will be a dormitory site, industrial development will not				

storage (as the Wisloe, Rocket Rentals and Cambridge Mill sites) generating very little employment. SDC do not appear to have a business strategy to sit alongside the housing strategy.

The proposals to increase train use will make no significant difference to road traffic. With the Cam developments the Park and Ride Car Park is generally full so older residents of Slimbridge who cannot walk as far as the station have already been forced to use their cars to reach Gloucester. Some increase in capacity might be possible by increasing train length but the new developments at Cam, Yate and the Yate Park and Ride will eat into that extra capacity. Additional train services will be constrained by the difficulty of interweaving stopping services with intercity high-speed trains. Use of Cam and Dursley station will require a footbridge over the M5 which will have a significant cost and not be accessible for less mobile people.

The above comments show that PS37 is less sustainable than either PGP1 or PGP2. These alternatives have been rejected without any comparison of sustainability compared with PS37.

Slimbridge is a small rural parish with about 500 houses. The addition of another 1500 or more in one lump will swamp Slimbridge and not encourage the integration of new and old residents. The option of dispersing new settlements throughout would avoid this problem and provide a diversity of housing designs as different developers build different designs of property at different times – why has dispersal been rejected? The present proposals will join Cam and Slimbridge into one large monotonous small town with no centre, shops, services, youth facilities or soul.

The local infrastructure is already challenged by the developments around Box Road in Cam and further afield in Dursley. Local shopping facilities will be inadequate creating further traffic towards Gloucester for supermarkets and other shops. Similarly, there are no local centres of entertainment forcing people to travel north again for Cinemas etc., this and the lack of employment conjures up a picture of repeated travel up and down the A38. Local secondary schools are full; pupils will have to be bussed to other schools such as the Crypt in Gloucester – this will extend their day and make it hard for them to take part in extracurricular activities.

The proposed site is placed between the A38, M5 and A4135 with the railway close by. The M5 is raised at this point making noise attenuation exceedingly difficult. Sound does not travel in straight lines so any sound barriers will lose effectiveness with distance and during a temperature inversion (e.g., at night) sound from the M5 will be refracted back down to nearby properties. It will be an awful place to live and mostly impossible to sit out and converse – listening to birdsong will be impossible. Air pollution levels will be high, but there is no evidence this has been monitored/measured.

There is strong evidence that Roman (and earlier) settlements are located in the proposed area. The discovery of a Roman Villa on the Cam development supports other evidence and shows how disruptive such a discovery can be. There has been no archaeological survey and the site cannot be further considered until the extent of our heritage which would be lost is known.

I have lived in Slimbridge for more than 20 years and know that whenever there is a storm there will be problems. The most recent problems (December 2020) follow on from large remedial programmes by Severn Trent yet there were still flooded roads and foul drains overflowing in houses. Parts of the Site are very low lying and flooding from the river Cam should be expected, aggravated by run off from Box Road developments.

As if all this was not enough, there is a high-pressure gas pipeline under the site, no assessment seems to have been carried out of the impact either on the safety of the residents or how much of the site will be unavailable for building.

The emphasis of all the recent developments has been small "starter homes". Where is the consideration of what happens when the residents have children and need a larger property with space for the children to run around. Equally there is little consideration of the needs of older people who cannot manage a house and need single level accommodation of a decent size – unlocking this could release existing larger properties.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

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.

PS37 should be removed from the SDC Local Plan	
(Continue on a separate sheet /expand b	ox if necessary)

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)

	while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to aring session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm participate.
3. If you wish to consider this to b	participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you be necessary:
adopt to hear th	Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to ose who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the
	entified the matters and issues for examination.