

I thought the presentation in the roadshow was extremely professional, well-researched and well presented. It was extremely helpful and useful. I would like to make the following personal observations relating to the new local plan with respect to Minchinhampton.

1. On the day of the roadshow there were 36 properties listed for sale in Minchinhampton itself (68 if you included those under offer), 55 if you went within $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile of the town but within the parish (98 including those under offer) and 93 if you went $\frac{1}{2}$ mile from the town (165 including those under offer), again within the parish. The properties listed covered all price ranges and all sizes and ages. It is therefore difficult to understand where the need for properties in the town and the wider parish comes from.
2. If Minchinhampton is classed as a tier 2 settlement, then Painswick should be. It would be helpful to have different levels of settlements within those tiers.
3. Public transport levels have diminished dramatically and there is no meaningful public transport system to enable people living here to commute sensibly to work outside the town.
4. I think it would be helpful to look again at the levels of employment available within the town as I suspect that the levels suggested are due to high levels of self-employment – where people have businesses based at home, but which require travel to different places, often a long distance from the town. These are not strictly businesses offering employment opportunities. The NDP survey of local businesses may provide helpful information. It is not sustainable in the long term if people moving to the town have to travel long distances to work.
5. It would be helpful to make public the numbers of planning permissions granted for new houses in each of the last three years and completion certificates issued so that we can help put pressure on local MPs to change the planning system so that companies cannot seek new permissions when they have not completed the building houses for which permissions have already been granted. This would also help us to challenge the government figures on housebuilding requirements.
6. The NDP Group carried out surveys of the town's residents and businesses and the results of those surveys would be useful to SDC as part of this process. There was also a housing needs analysis carried out.
7. A previous application to build on Glebe Farm and Tobacconist Farm brought over 500 objections that were almost all traffic related. This was despite the offer of space for a new surgery. I think that this showed that the effect of an increase in traffic which affects people's lives on a daily and sometimes hourly basis is what really mattered and will matter to local people.
8. The town centre faces particular difficulties – single track access at every point into the town centre, listed buildings along these routes where home owners are prevented for making alterations to sound proof their homes, where homes are more fragile and vulnerable where vehicles pass in close proximity. To date, no noise pollution or other pollution tests have been carried out but these ought to be considered due to the channelling and funnelling of fumes in the narrow streets. It is impossible to make planning decisions without taking these issues into consideration.

9. Part of the way of life here is the coexistence with the cattle and horses that graze the Common or that use the Common for exercise. The biodiversity of the Common depends on this relationship continuing. An increase in traffic across the Common might well jeopardise this. It will also have a knock on effect on other Commons and other communities as traffic crossing the commons usually then descends to Stroud. It is impossible to make planning decisions without also taking these issues into consideration.

10. If part of this process is to work with local communities so that planning and development reflects the needs of that community, would it not be a sensible idea to work with the communities to explore Community ventures for example? Also, if this could happen, then planning decisions could actually reflect the needs of the community and what a particular community wants and which may therefore be acceptable to a community – for example housing that is affordable to young people who already live in the community or is designed to enable elderly people wishing to downsize but stay within their community. “Affordable” housing is meaningless unless you define what affordable means – what is affordable to one young person is not affordable to another.

—