

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 January 2019 11:27  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** so called PS29

Sir,

having spent some time browsing this plan in the local library (trying to use the thoroughly inadequate, and undemocratic, maps provided, about which I will be putting in a complaint to the Local Govt Ombudsman) I now wish to state my opposition to this idea, which seems to run contrary to nearly all the local plans, your own policies. and the feeling of the residents. I can hardly be described as a NIMBY as I myself am living in probably the largest urban regeneration schemes in Gloucestershire, at Littlecombe. Forgive me if I don't distinguish each report as the "DNP," etc as it is difficult for a layman to distinguish between them, but I HAVE read them, and taken notes as I went.

In a report on Environment/Sustainability, about the position of the AONB/woodlands I see

"additionally (to the woodlands -PM)) the grasslands along the perimeter are ideal for protected species including amphibians, reptiles and mammals, as identified by the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust. The remaining borders abut agricultural land, and it is important that links in the form of wildlife corridors be retained between these areas.."

"retaining trees, and enhancing tree plantation/hedgerows..can provide..essential pathways..." (Dursley Biodiversity Wildlife report 2014, and Policy ES1)

As someone who has lived in rural Cornwall for all my adult life, I can confidently state that based on my experience of living at Littlecombe (which was the subject of an enormous Environmental report at the planning stage, and which I have read with attention) absolutely **none** of the pious hopes mentioned within it, and despite loads of tree plantings, hedges etc, the wildlife has **not** returned, to any significant amount, particularly birds. I have never lived in such an environmentally impoverished area in my life, and that, after all the advice on protection was implemented. I could not even find a worm in my garden when I bought it--- upset the environment with building and humans, and it would take centuries to recover--animals do not move and return to suit developers.

Under Policy E52 (bearing in mind my comment about laymen) I found

"planning applications proposing development which is of a scale that could impact on the surrounding landscape, should demonstrate how the proposal **enhances and protects the AONB**. I haven't seen any sign of this happening, nor can I envisage any way that a housing estate on (beautiful PM) green fields against an AONB could possibly be justified or fulfill the points mentioned.

"Views to the wooded and grassed slopes and distinctive hills surrounding the town should be retained" (Dursley Landscape Character Assessment 2015).. I believe that attention has to be paid to leaving "buffer zones" between AONBs and ordinary lands, to protect the integrity of the AONB--this proposed development doesn't provide this, by building right up the AONB's verge.

BellCornwell respond that

"the allocation of land at Uley Road would help deliver **many** (not all? PM) of the Dursley Neighbourhood Plans's objectives.....would protect and **enhance** wildlife..multi functional green corridors which can support movement of wildlife across Dursley, increase the provision of green space and allotments policy ES53"

I can only conclude that this is a "cut and paste" job , inserted by someone who thinks that putting houses on a beautiful green field spot , and promising to enhance the green space by so doing, has **never** seen countryside. It is up to Stroud Council to disabuse them!

Apart from the green aspect of this proposal, I submit, that this development (even with the nominal 80 houses, which I think is a smokescreen) the development is on the wrong side of town, and will add to the traffic struggling to get through town at "rush hours", caused mainly by pedestrian crossing in the middle ( a bridge would be a good idea even now). Transport links are heavily weighted to the North end--bus terminal (the Uley Road area has a minimal service now), and links to motorway and railway. There is a lot of development at the far end of Cam, ideally placed for access, and room for a great deal more, as there is a large expanse of fairly low grade agricultural land between there and the motorway. As , having looked at Avant Homes (very uninformative) website, it seems they concentrate on small "rabbit house" type houses (again not worth wasting good land for) which will be aimed at first time buyers etc, these buyers will need to get to work easily, and access to railway transport is a "green" asset to be considered,rather than clogging up Dursley, with more traffic, and turning it, even more than it is already, into a dormitory town . It follows that the buyers will need schools and Community facilities, and the local ones are already under strain--the Leisure Centre is becoming a victim of its own success, with parking problems.

Building around the Dursley area needs to come with employment--travelling long distances to work is no longer considered good policy, and the houses proposed don't seem to have made any provision for home working; it would be a good idea for planners generally to consider far more "live/work" developments for sustainability.

Finally--why does Stroud entertain proposals from a mass builder , based in "Yorkshire and the Midlands" ? a local developer would have a far better "connection " to the area .

The area proposed is plainly absolutely contrary to the Council's own previous policies and resolutions, and is not fit for purpose--what has this builder offered to make the Council reverse its own decision to not allow development, please.?

**A RECEIPT, PLEASE, FOR THIS.**

