From:

 Sent:
 03 December 2017 12:30

 To:
 \_WEB\_Local Plan

**Subject:** Issues and Options paper

Attachments: SDC Issues and Options comments.docx

# Dear planners

I have just completed your online questionnaire. It does not seem to give me the option of recording what I wrote!

I attach some notes I made a while ago. Apologies for any overlap!

**Thanks** 

Gloucestershire County Councillor Wotton-under-Edge Division

# **SDC Issues and Options**

- relating to Wotton-under=Edge

p11: Renishaw's HQ at New Mills is in Kingswood parish.

# p14:

- Supporting existing retailers to make better use of websites and e-retailing to widen their appeal and increase footfall
- Marketing our town centres on-line for their leisure and tourism potential
- Reviewing town centre car parking charges

It is not possible to introduce car parking charges in The Chipping without changing the lease agreement with the Town Trust. If charges were introduced then the introduction and level of charging at the Civic Centre car park would need consideration.

- Reviewing town centre planning policies and boundaries to reflect a smaller future retail area and to be more flexible to encourage other uses into town centres

  Allowing further change of use to residential would exacerbate car parking issues. A smaller variety of retail outlets could deter people from shopping here.
- Supporting small town centre office uses which provide work spaces with flexible rental
   Arrangements

# p15-16

Possible options for improving the town centre include:

- Marketing the town for its tourism potential as a southern historic gateway to the Cotswolds
- Finding a solution for the lack of car and coach parking, including allocating a site

  All planning applications for new housing should include adequate off-street
  parking and applications that reduce the off-street parking at existing dwellings
  should be refused unless they retain at least 2 off-street places excluding garages.

Any new car and coach park should respect the attractiveness of the town and its setting within the landscape.

### p26

Previous public consultations have identified local concerns within the District around the impact of growth at Charfield on local traffic, the local environment and on local services, particularly, within Wotton-under-Edge. However, growth may also provide opportunities to improve transport connections north and south and to deliver new or extended local services.

The disbenefits within the town are likely to outweigh the benefits. I understand that Junction 14 of the M5 has reached capacity.

Substantial growth at Charfield should include facilities that make it more self-sufficient: doctors' surgeries, everyday shopping needs etc.

### Question 3.3a

We welcome views on whether there are opportunities to improve transport links between areas within Stroud District and South Gloucestershire, Bristol and beyond; or to provide new local services; and what development within the District might be appropriate to deliver these.

Reopening Charfield railway station, securing an appropriate number of trains stopping there and introducing a shuttle bus service from Wotton and the surrounding communities to meet the trains.

Further park-and-share/bus availability at Junction 14 of the M5 could help.

### Question 3.3b

We welcome views on the most appropriate locations for housing and employment growth on the southern edge of Stroud District. Current Tier 2 settlements in the area are Berkeley and Wotton-under- Edge.

The escarpment means that Wotton-under-Edge has reached its limit for housing growth. Any windfall and brownfield sites should be used for truly affordable housing.

Past change-of-use planning decisions by Stroud District Council have removed employment sites, turning it irreversibly into a dormitory town.

# p28-29

Wotton under Edge: Potential to provide modest levels of jobs and homes. How modest? Where?

### Question 3.4

Do you agree with the current hierarchy-based approach towards identifying settlements suitable for different levels of development?

As your text makes clear "it does not reflect the environmental constraints that affect many settlements."

Is there a different approach you would prefer? One that acknowledges the constraints.

Do you agree with the different tiers identified in the current Local Plan and the scale of development proposed for each tier?

Not in terms of ability for further development because it does not take the constraints into account.

Are any of the settlements in the wrong tier and, if so, for what reason? As above.

# p61 (location map)

The exclusion of sites from development on grounds of high landscape impact is applauded. The reasons for including the land at Holywell Farm as having "future potential" are not understood, particularly given the recent refusal of planning permission and the appeal which is currently in progress.

Perhaps the proposed "community use" of WUE009 could include a car and coach park with a shuttle bus to Wotton-under-Edge. This would also relieve the B4060 from the extensive on-road parking by KLB parents, particularly at the end of the school day.

We would like to understand what you believe to be the key issues relating to places in the District and future land use needs. Are they broadly the same as those identified in the current Local Plan? Or are there new issues emerging that we need to take account of in preparing the new Local Plan?

# Question 1.0a

What are your priorities for Stroud District? Can you list your top 5 issues, challenges or concerns for the next Local Plan? You could pick five from our list of 40... Or tell us if we have missed something.

### **Question 1.0b**

Do you have ideas and suggestions for how the Local Plan might tackle particular issues?

### Question 2.1a

What do you think are the biggest challenges facing the local economy in Gloucestershire for the future? How can we help to address these? Does Stroud District have a specific role to play, relating to business start ups and specialist technologies or should we seek to compete with other locations for growth?

### **Question 2.1b**

Do you think there is a need for further employment land allocations? If yes what types of premises are required and where should they be located?

# **Question 2.1c**

Do you think locating growth adjacent to M5 junctions should be supported; or would continuing expansion of employment land at existing settlements/sites be preferable?

### **Question 2.1d**

Should there be increased flexibility to allow other job generating uses on all employment sites or would this limit the options for those companies operating in the B classes? Should increased flexibility be allowed only on some sites? Please specify any sites where a more flexible approach could be taken.

Alternatively, a percentage threshold, in terms of units or site floorspace, could be identified for non B class employment uses, which might help to provide services to other businesses?

# **Question 2.1e**

Should the Local Plan look to promote further home working, encourage development of livework units and co working facilities? Is there a specific need in your area?

### **Question 2.1f**

Should the Local Plan look to promote further farm diversification to reflect changing farming practices and to avoid rural dereliction, or does the pattern of rural development need more control to avoid further adverse impacts on the countryside, landscape and local communities?

# **Question 2.2**

Do you agree with the options set out for improving our town centres? Have we missed any important options? What do you consider to be the most important actions to undertake?

### Question 2.3a

Tell us about housing needs and opportunities in your area:

Does your neighbourhood provide opportunities for local people to access the housing market, bearing in mind the growing gap between local incomes and house prices? Are there opportunities in your area for households to rent reasonably-priced properties? Are younger people in your neighbourhood able to access housing without moving elsewhere?

If older people in your neighbourhood wished to downsize to smaller, more suitable properties in the area, are these opportunities likely to exist?

Would individuals or small groups be able to locate suitable land for self-build projects in the neighbourhood?

Do you know of other unmet housing needs in your neighbourhood?

# **Question 2.3b**

Do you think that local housing need surveys should also be used to influence the housing mix on local for-sale housing sites?

# Question 2.3c

Do you know of any suitable land for development to meet the housing needs of your neighbourhood, or do you have suggestions about how or where these needs might be met?

### Question 2.4a

Does your neighbourhood lack a particular form of community facility, open space or sports facility? If so we would like to know about that need.

### **Question 2.4b**

Are there existing facilities or local spaces that you consider important for protection? If so please tell us and explain why they are of particular importance.

### **Question 3.1**

How should we meet future development needs?

Option 1: Continue to concentrate housing and employment development at a few large sites located adjacent to the main towns in the district

Option 2: Take a more dispersed approach with some medium sized housing and employment sites on the edge of the larger villages, as well as towns

Option 3: Disperse development across the district with most villages including at least one small to medium site allocated to meet local needs

Option 4: Identify a growth point in the district to include significant growth, either as an expansion of an existing settlement, or to create a new settlement

Option 5: Do you have an alternative strategy option that you would like us to consider? Do you have a preferred option? Or would some combination of these approaches be the best way to meet our future needs? Please explain why.

# Question 3.2a

We welcome views on whether the following broad locations should be considered for development, if needed, or whether you can identify better sites in Stroud District or in neighbouring areas that should be assessed:

- **G1 South of Hardwicke** (housing/community uses)
- **G2 Whaddon** (for housing/employment/community uses)
- G3 South west of Brockworth (for housing/community uses)

# G4 South of M5/J12 (for employment uses)

### Question 3.2b

Could any further development help to establish a firm southern landscaped boundary to the city, in effect a "rounding off" of the urban area, or would it simply exacerbate further sporadic growth?

# **Question 3.2c**

Are there any specific community needs arising from Hardwicke, Haresfield, Brookthorpe, Whaddon or Upton St. Leonards that could be met in these areas; and what safeguards could be put in place to protect the local character and setting of existing villages?

#### Question 3.3a

We welcome views on whether there are opportunities to improve transport links between areas within Stroud District and South Gloucestershire, Bristol and beyond; or to provide new local services; and what development within the District might be appropriate to deliver these.

### Question 3.3b

We welcome views on the most appropriate locations for housing and employment growth on the southern edge of Stroud District. Current Tier 2 settlements in the area are Berkeley and Wottonunder-Edge.

### Question 3.3c

Do you consider that there is more potential for further growth at Sharpness/Newtown? What are the opportunities and are there any potential barriers to growth?

# **Question 3.3d**

We would also like to know whether there are specific community needs arising from Berkeley, Wanswell and Brookend that could be met at Sharpness/Newtown; and what safeguards could be put in place to protect the local character and setting of existing villages.

### Question 3.4

Do you agree with the current hierarchy-based approach towards identifying settlements suitable for different levels of development? Is there a different approach you would prefer? Do you agree with the different tiers identified in the current Local Plan and the scale of development proposed for each tier?

Are any of the settlements in the wrong tier and, if so, for what reason?

### Question 3.5a

How should development proposals on the edges of our towns and villages be managed?

Option 1: Continue with existing settlement development limits amended as necessary

Option 2: Assess proposals on a case by case basis using broader criteria (e.g. landscape impact; form of settlement, proximity to services, etc.)

Option 3: Continue with settlement development limits but expand the types of development that are allowed beyond them in the countryside

Option 4: Do you have an alternative approach that you would like us to consider?

# **Question 3.5b**

Are there any changes to existing settlement development limits that you would like to suggest?

### Question 3.6

Read through the settlement summaries over the following pages and tell us whether you agree with the potential broad locations for growth, if future housing, employment or community facilities are needed. Where more than one location is identified you can tell us which is the best option.

You may identify an alternative or additional location or site by indicating so on a map. You may also identify broad locations or sites at smaller villages that you think are appropriate for some development.

In all cases, please specify whether the site is appropriate for housing, employment, retail and/or community uses including open space.

# **Question 4.1**

Are there any specific additional local studies or data that you believe are needed to inform the Local Plan review? Have you any advice on the scope or content of any of these studies? Have you prepared, or are you preparing your own studies, which may help to inform the Local Plan?

Email 11 October 12:03