STROUD DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN REVIEW, ADDITIONAL HOUSING OPTIONS CONSULTATION.

In your introduction to this consultation you point out that it relates to additional sites that may have to be found should among other reasons the council decides to remove or reduce numbers at any of the site allocations that were set out in the **2019 Draft Local Plan.**

I would submit that the proposals for major new housing developments in the Severn Vale at Grove End Farm., Whitminster (WH1014) for 2250 dwellings and at Moreton Valence/Hardwick (HAR006-009 and HAR015-016) for 1500 dwellings represent a far more sustainable solution than the major development proposed for the Berkeley Cluster (PS36) where there are numerous potential issues and uncertainties on multiple levels. While it would not be appropriate to consider these in depth now, it is worth noting that at the time of writing one of these issues has been referred to the secretary of state.

The Severn Vale proposal is in a much better location for access to existing transport links with much of the housing being located between existing transport arteries the M5 and A38. There is also easy access for rail travel which will be further boosted by firm proposals for reinstating the station at Stonehouse on the Bristol to Gloucester line.

From an environmental perspective Whitminster and Moreton Valence are already well developed and biodiversity in this area will have been limited by decades of development such as the long time redundant three concrete runways of Moreton Valence (Haresfield) airfield. Further housing development will therefore bring little additional detriment. The Sharpness proposal on the other hand will build out land largely unspoilt since Viking times and which is bounded by a European Special Area Of Conservation (SAC) Special Protection Area (SPA) and a RAMSAR site.

Looking at the Gloucester 2050 vision, development in Whitminster and Moreton Valence will feed seamlessly into planned employment areas, whereas with a direction of commute in the South of the district feeding into Bristol, PS36 would be at odds with the vision and have a propensity to add to the considerable transport and air quality issues around Bristol.

For these reasons and others which will become clear at inspection, I respectfully suggest that as per your introduction, you take this opportunity to remove PS36 from your emerging strategy and replace it with (WH1014) and (HAR006-009 / HAR015-016).

As always, I would be grateful if you would specifically bring this response to the direction of the inspector.

Cllr Gordon Craig