

**Planning Application S.08/0408/FUL
Proposed Development at Bath Road, Leonard Stanley**

Response from Leonard Stanley Parish Council

Objection

The Parish Council and the community of Leonard Stanley accept that this site is designated for development as stated in the Stroud District Local Plan. However, this particular application contravenes the Local Plan in several key areas and therefore the Parish Council wishes to object. Our response has been compiled following a well attended public consultation meeting and identifies the main concerns raised by parishioners and councillors.

Please note that the Parish Council considers it imperative to have ongoing liaison and monitoring between themselves, the developers and all agencies involved in this and any future proposed development, in particular GCC Highways Department. This is vital to ensure that any building work carried out is in no way detrimental to the quality of life of those living nearby, those using the roads, or to the village as a whole. Of particular concern are highway safety issues and flooding and we ask that these and other issues are given due consideration and resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

We request that under Section 106 we are accorded appropriate measures by the developers, Stroud District Council and Gloucestershire County Council, in particular the Highways Department, to ensure that village facilities and infrastructure are improved to enable us to cope with increased residents and traffic.

General Issues:

1) It appears that the correct procedure has not been followed by the planning department at SDC as, at the time of the public consultation held on 2nd April 2008, no notification of the proposed development had been received by any properties adjoining the site.

2) There is an insufficient number of affordable houses proposed (only three 2- bedroomed houses)

Local Plan HN4 and HN5

The Parish Council wishes to see more provision for affordable houses, with preference given to local (i.e. Leonard Stanley) families.

3) The proposal shows thirty houses. The field has been designated for twenty five houses. At the time of designation Leonard Stanley still supported a Post Office and shop. This facility no longer exists. Additionally, a number of houses have already been built in the village since the introduction of the

Local Plan and this number should therefore be deducted from the initial allocation.

Local Plan HN23 (5.8.34b) & BE1

The Local Plan indicates “approximately 25 dwellings”.

The Parish Council is concerned that the additional proposed development would put added pressure on a whole range of services and utilities that was not envisaged when the Local Plan was agreed.

We consider that the size of the development will obstruct views from the centre of the village to the open countryside beyond, thereby detracting from the character of the village.

4) A triangular plot of land not originally set aside for developing has been utilised for this proposed development.

Local Plan (5.4.2)

Use of an additional area being used that was not agreed in the Local Plan for development.

The Parish Council expects only the previously agreed area to be used for development. The loss of further Greenfield land is unacceptable.

Design Issues:

Local Plan HN23 (5.8.34a), HN8 & BE2 (7.3.25)

The Local Plan states that the development should reflect the traditional built form and character of Leonard Stanley.

The Parish Council does not consider the proposed dwellings to be in keeping with either the neighbouring properties or the village as a whole. The layout and mediocre design is more suited to a suburban area and severely compromises the historic character of the village. No mention is made of the use of local materials. The photographs of “typical” local buildings submitted by the developers in no way reflect the appearance and character of our village and in particular the area adjacent to the development site. (Several of the photographs are of buildings not even in our parish).

The scene illustrations provided give no indication as to how the proposed houses would fit in with surrounding dwellings.

A three-dimensional model would need to be studied to assess the true impact of the proposed development in relation to the surrounding area.

We would have expected due consideration to have been given to the provision of as many sustainable or “green” features as possible. We pride

ourselves on our environmentally friendly efforts and cannot accept a development which omits to make any mention of this vital issue.

Parking:

We consider the amount of allocated parking to be inadequate. We are aware that the allocation of 1.5 spaces conforms to Appendix 8 of the Local Plan, but would argue that in this instance this allocation needs urgent reconsideration. Whilst we have no wish to encourage the use of cars, in view of the lack of facilities in our village it is likely that most residents of the development will consider car use to be essential. With the majority of residents travelling to work outside the village, the proportion of dwellings needing to accommodate more than one vehicle is likely to be high. Inadequate parking facilities could lead to residents parking dangerously and inappropriately on Bath Road. It is also important to ensure that any parking lots are well lit and designed in a way that discourages criminal activity. Consultation with the Police is therefore necessary.

Landscaping:

1) There is no mention of retaining the watercourse or incorporating a buffer zone.

Local Plan HG23 (5.8.34e)

The Local Plan states there is a small watercourse along the site's north-eastern boundary, and any development should incorporate a buffer zone along it, and address its long term retention as a feature of the site.

The Parish Council wishes to see this issue properly addressed.

2) The Pond

The pond is shown to be on part of the land that was not included in the Local Plan for developing. No indication is made of who might be responsible for the maintenance of the pond. We also feel that if a pond is present within the development, it should be available to be enjoyed by the whole community and have appropriate access.

3) Lack of detail regarding the Landscaping.

Local Plan HG23 (5.8.34e)

The Local Plan states that the site is sensitive in landscape terms and substantial landscaping will be necessary. In particular a new hedgerow of indigenous species will be required at the rear of the site.

The proposal does not address this issue adequately and so considerably more detail is required as to how the developers propose to conform to this policy.

Highway Issues:

Local Plan GE5

This policy states that development will not take place where it would be likely to be detrimental to the highway safety of any user.

Bath Road already suffers from speeding drivers and has recently been the location for a fatal accident (December 2006) as well as countless less serious accidents. The proposed development makes no mention of addressing this problem, even though the Local Plan specifies that development of this site must include a pedestrian crossing.

We also wish to highlight a potential increase in traffic and parking problems at the nearby primary school as residents from the development drop their children off at school on their way to work.

The increased traffic will also have a detrimental effect on Brockley Road and the Ryeford end of King's Stanley.

We feel that the additional traffic generated by the proposed development would severely exacerbate the danger state of Bath Road and request that traffic calming in the form of a properly constructed (i.e. raised, not painted) roundabout be seriously considered in an attempt to lessen the likelihood of accidents to vehicles using this stretch of Bath Road from all directions, including those exiting the proposed development or the neighbouring Grange complex.

As well as the provision of a pedestrian crossing, we would also expect to see the footpaths greatly improved along this stretch to enable/encourage children to walk to school safely

Flooding:

Several of the dwellings in the vicinity of the proposed development were are prone to flooding and suffered in last summer's floods. It is vital to ensure that any development in no way increases the likelihood of future flooding.

Our understanding is that Severn Trent Water only looked at the pipe work in the area of 100 metres adjacent to the proposed development. The new houses will join the pipe-work at the Church Road area, some 250 metres from the proposed development and add to an existing problem behind the Old Post Office.

We would therefore request that this be investigated and any remedial work carried out before any development is approved.

Additional Considerations:

Little thought appears to have been given to the potential loss of light and privacy of the property adjoining the eastern boundary of the proposed development. **Policy GE1** is thus contravened. Little consideration has been shown for existing residents as the proposed development is built right up to the boundaries.

We would prefer that the proposed development doesn't build right up to the boundaries and showed some respect to the existing residents.

Policy BE12 argues against any development that compromises the setting of a listed building. Clutterbuck House/The Grange is set in a way that characterises and dominates this part of the village. The inappropriate designs of the proposed development would be detrimental to this character.

Policy TR1 specifies the need for consideration for a wide choice of transport and for provision for disabled people and the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. Rather than being catered for, disabled people appear to have been ignored, with no assessment of their needs in evidence. Similarly, there is nothing to show that pedestrians and cyclists would be encouraged. The added danger to the road and inadequate access design is rather more likely to discourage them.

Policy 5.8.34a cites the need for improved recreation facilities. There is no evidence that this need will be addressed.

We also wish to know what measures will be put into place to minimise disruption whilst the building works are in place.

Section 106:

Finally, in the event of development at this site, under Section 106, Leonard Stanley Parish Council submits the following issues for consideration.

- Highway safety improvements to Bath Road, including pedestrian crossing on Bath Road with appropriate warning signs, and safe means of access to and from the development in the form of a roundabout.
Top priority.
- Provision of play area within the development or improvement to existing facilities in the playing field opposite the site.
- Financial contribution towards the improvement of village public facilities, for example towards the provision of a Community Shop.