

**Appendix 2 Consultation Statement**  
**Consultation Responses (Regulation 14)**

**General Comments**

	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	SDC planning 1	General	<p>Neighbourhood planning gives you the opportunity to shape the development of your area in a positive manner rather than as a tool to stop important development proposals from proceeding.</p> <p>Your planning policies should use positive language, looking at ways to enhance and improve your area.</p> <p>This can be achieved by using phrases such as 'planning permission will be granted provided that' and 'development will be encouraged where it' rather than 'we will not allow .development unless'. The words 'encouraged,' 'supported' and 'will be permitted all convey positive approaches to development.</p> <p>Recommendation: Please ensure the language in your policies is positive.</p>	We have attempted to do this as far as is compatible with the aim of the policies
2	SDC planning 2	General	<p>Any requests for developer contribution should be supported by evidence demonstrating the existence of an agreed project, which is costed and deliverable within a specified timeframe. Developer contributions should meet the needs generated by the development and not make up for existing deficiencies or make the site unviable, in accordance with the five strict S106 tests.</p> <p>Recommendation Please ensure any requests for contribution conform with S106/CIL statutory requirements.</p>	We have not made any specific requests for s106 contributions. The policy on CIL has been removed.
3	Canal and Rivers Trust		<a href="#">Representation</a>	No changes requested
4	Environment Agency		<a href="#">Representation</a>	No changes requested
5	Marine Management		<a href="#">Representation</a>	No changes requested

6	Natural England		<a href="#">Representation</a>	No changes requested
7	Severn Trent		<a href="#">Representation</a>	No changes requested
8	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	Foreword p.4	In the opening paragraph of the foreword the reference should be to the Localism Act 2011 and not 2013.	Thank you. Change will be made.
9	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	p.6 section1.1	In the heading 'What is a Neighbourhood Plan' reference should be made to the relationship of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) to the existing Development Plan and its position with the development plan hierarchy. In setting out this role, reference should be made to both the NPPF and the NPPG and the 'Basic Conditions' to which the NP must adhere if it is to progress. Direct reference to NPPG Paragraph: 065 Reference ID: 41-065-20140306 together with Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) would assist in setting out the background to the NDP.	This section will be reworded.
10	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	p.9	In line with the comments made above, the NDP would benefit from a more expansive explanation of the role of the referendum within the overall NDP process confirming the role of the NDP as part of development plan. As worded, this section infers the document will be a development plan.	This section makes clear the relationship between the plan, the examination and the referendum.  We don't consider any change to be necessary.
11	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	Para. 1.5	Although the reference to the presumption in favour sustainable development is welcome, the inclusion of an explanation as to the relationship of the NDP to the Basic Condition for the achievement of sustainable development should be included. In addition, the quotation of the NPPF paragraphs 16 and 184 should also include the wider quote in para 184 that: "Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies" Again an earlier inclusion of the Basic Conditions would enable continued reference to be made.	We do not consider this to be necessary. The rewording of section 1.1 will refer to basic conditions.

12	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	Para 1.6, p.13	In identifying Stonehouse as a First Tier Settlement for the purposes of Local Plan Policy CP3 it is considered that a more detailed explanation of the Local Plan hierarchy should be given with particular reference to the inclusion of the settlements of Stroud, Cam and Dursley in the First Tier. This would provide greater context as to role of Stonehouse within the strategic objectives of the Local Plan.	We do not consider that this is necessary as the plan relates only to Stonehouse. The settlement hierarchy is explained in the Local Plan.
13	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	Para 1.6, p.14	The last paragraph refers to the inclusion of an informative on the planning permission for Land West of Stonehouse. However, it is considered further clarification and context for this informative should be given if this paragraph is to remain in the NDP. As written the paragraph is misleading and implies that the West of Stonehouse permission is required to deliver pedestrian improvements on Oldends Lane. The paragraph should either be deleted or expanded to clarify that the provision of such improvements is not a formal requirement of the permission and is dependent on co-operation and funding from a number of parties beyond the control of the applicant.	The wording will be altered to make this clear.
14	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd		A number of the NDP maps include an area of green annotation on land to the north of Oldends Lane (adjacent to the railway line). There is no associated key item relating to this annotation, which in any event covers land which already has planning permission.	We are aware that this land has planning permission. The maps were provided by Stroud District Council and show existing green space. This does not imply any protection for the land.
15	Karen Young		It's a thorough and good plan - thanks for all your hard work.	Thank you for your support
16	Robert Crockford		I am impressed by the thought has gone into a well-considered and comprehensive Plan covering so many of the issues we need to consider. Stonehouse has never been 'fashionable' or 'alternative' but it has a strong sense of community, which is reflected in your Plan. There will be 'conflicts of interest' but a balanced approach should help resolve these. My own comments are intended to help strengthen the case for something that could involve my own contribution to the community ie a new station for Stonehouse (and the Stroudwater Valley).	Thank you for your support
17	Diane Baker		Glad to see that the neighbourhood plan has the greens reserved on Midland Road	Thank you for your support

18	Jackie Edwards		Well done to the Neighbourhood plan team for all the work undertaken and presentation of the documentation and draft plan.	Thank you for your support
19	Pam Swain		Where does one start to thank the diligence, commitment, energy and perseverance of all those on the Neighbourhood plan working group. The Stonehouse Community owes you a huge thank you, not only now but for the next fifteen years.	Thank you for your support
20	Janet Thomas		Well done Stonehouse, but why does SDC seem to stop at Ryeford?	Thank you for your support. The Neighbourhood Plan covers the civil parish of Stonehouse i.e. the area covered by Stonehouse Town Council.
21	John R Thompson		A big thank you to everyone who have worked to produce such a comprehensive well thought out plan. I only hope its complexity doesn't deter people from responding. The TH exhibition was excellent.	Thank you for your support
22	Camilla Hale		What I really liked about the plan was its pride in Stonehouse and the thoughtfulness about strong family connections, community areas for enhancement and the thoughts about integration with the planned new housing and work areas	Thank you for your support

**Theme 1: Amenities and Facilities**

	Respondent	Policy	Comment	Response
1	SDC Planning 4	<p><b>POLICY AF1: PROTECTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES</b> Existing community facilities will be protected for such use. Our particularly locally valued community amenities and facilities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The library;</li> <li>ii) The post office;</li> <li>iii) The youth club;</li> <li>iv) Maidenhill school playing field</li> </ul>	<p>Criteria i, ii, and iii lack flexibility and set out excessive and overly onerous requirements.</p> <p><b>Amend Policy Wording to:</b> Existing community facilities will be protected for such use. Our particularly locally valued community amenities and facilities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) The library;</li> <li>ii) The post office;</li> <li>iii) The youth club;</li> <li>iv) Maidenhill school playing field</li> </ul>	<p>On consultant advice, the wording will be changed to:</p> <p><i>Existing community facilities will be protected for such use. Our particularly locally valued community amenities and facilities are identified on Map X and are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i) The library;</i></li> <li><i>ii) The post office;</i></li> </ul>

		<p>v) Park Junior school playing field</p> <p>vi) Laburnum Recreation field and play area</p> <p>vii) Oldends Lane recreation fields and play facilities.</p> <p>Development proposals that result in the loss of community facilities will only be supported where:</p> <p>i) it can be demonstrated:</p> <p>a) through an up-to-date assessment of community need, that the facilities are no longer needed; or</p> <p>b) through an up-to-date assessment of local economic demand, that the facility is no longer commercially viable. Evidence will be required to show that the facility has been actively marketed for at least 6 months (ideally over two summer seasons) at a realistic and viable price for the existing or similar uses. Marketing should include an offer to the local community for its acquisition or operation; and,</p> <p>ii) it can be demonstrated, through an assessment of local community facilities offer and role, that suitable alternative provision (in terms of size, capacity and type) exists in Stonehouse to serve the community; and,</p> <p>iii) where there remains a need or demand, that suitable alternative replacement</p>	<p>v) Park Junior school playing field</p> <p>vi) Laburnum Recreation field and play area</p> <p>vii) Oldends Lane recreation fields and play facilities.</p> <p>The loss of identified community facilities above will be resisted, unless evidence is provided that the proposal satisfies Local Plan Policy E16.</p>	<p>iii) The youth club;</p> <p>iv) Maidenhill school playing field</p> <p>v) Park Junior school playing field</p> <p>vi) Laburnum Recreation field and play area</p> <p>vii) Oldends Lane recreation fields and play facilities.</p> <p>The loss of identified community facilities above will not be supported, unless evidence is provided that the proposal satisfies Local Plan Policies E16 and ES13 (where relevant).</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		provision is included as part of the development proposal on or off-site within Stonehouse.		
2	Jackie Edwards	AF1	Good to see APT listed as a community facility- thank you important to protect and support all facilities in the town.	Thank you for the supportive comments, there is much evidence in favour.
3	Dean Steve Peck	AF1	Included in protected community areas should be the 3 greens on the Park Estate, Children play on these green areas.	See Theme 5: Environment
4	Pam Swain	AF1	Should Doverow Woods be included in the list of community amenities to be protected?	See Theme 5: Environment
5	Janet Thomas	AF1	Launderette (when open ) will be good for boaters. Love the adult facilities at Laburnum Park. Community Centre does nothing for the community - it's a business. Can't even allow community use. Good idea to have a new community venue for weddings etc	Thank you for the positive support.
6	SDC Planning 5	<p><b>POLICY AF2: ADDITIONAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES</b> Development proposals for new and/or improved community facilities will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the proposal would not have significant harmful impact on the amenity of surrounding residents; and,</li> <li>ii) the proposal would not have significant harmful impacts on the surrounding local environment (with regard to biodiversity, wildlife habitat and landscape character); and,</li> <li>iii) the proposal would not have unacceptable impacts on the local road network (with regard to</li> </ul>	<p>As worded criterion iii sets out an ambiguous requirement. National and Local policy seeks to avoid severe impacts to the road network.</p> <p>Criterion iv could be better related to Local Plan Policy ES4 which deals with surface water run-off issues, water quality and flood risk.</p> <p><b>Amend Policy Wording to:</b> Development proposals for new and/or improved community facilities will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the proposal would not have significant harmful impact on the amenity of surrounding residents; and,</li> <li>ii) the proposal would not have significant harmful impacts on the surrounding local environment (with regard to biodiversity, wildlife habitat and landscape character); and,</li> <li>iii) the proposal would not have severe impacts on the local road network (with regard to additional traffic volume / congestion, demand for parking, and pollution levels); and,</li> </ul> <p>the proposal would adequately address surface water run-off issues, water quality and flood risk (for example, through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).</p>	Changes accepted

		iv) additional traffic volume / congestion, demand for parking, and pollution levels); and, the proposal would adequately address surface water run-off issues (for example, through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).		
7	Jackie Edwards	<b>AF2</b>	Swimming pool would be a great asset to the town.	Thank you for the supportive comments. This was a popular request (21 requests from our consultations).
8	Brenda Fellows	<b>AF2</b>	We need a new purpose built community centre to house at least 200 people. Community centre and Magpies are ageing buildings that require a lot of upkeep. Mixture of affordable housing to supplement this.	Thank you for supporting the general view. Housing mix is in the housing section of the plan.
9	Dean Steve Peck	<b>AF2</b>	Provide outdoor tennis courts Install table tennis tables (outdoor) at Oldends Lane Park	Tennis courts are included in the list of facilities which we would like to be provided through Community Infrastructure Levy
10	Pam Swain	<b>AF2</b>	Minor errors - Assault bars in Old Ends not Laburnum. Basketball court in Old Ends. It would be good to have a netball court.	Agreed. Corrections will be made. A netball court is included in the list of priority projects for CIL funding.
11	John R Thompson	<b>AF2</b>	We have plenty of 'good-enough' facilities but nothing is 'really good' . CofE sold their hall -could they be persuaded to invest in a new shared facility?	Agreed and the plan aims to encourage quality provision.
12	SDC Planning 6	<b>POLICY AF3: TOWN CENTRE RETAIL</b> Development proposals in the defined town centre primary shopping frontage for additional retail units, alterations to existing retail frontages and change of use from retail to other uses (where planning	Policy AF3 is potentially in conflict with Policy EI7 of the Local Plan by allowing a more flexible approach to uses within the defined Primary Shopping Frontages than as set out in Policy EI7.  Furthermore, criterions ii sets out requirements that can only be achieved through S106 or CIL contributions and are subject to the statutory limitations associated with these. Please see general comment and recommendation 2.	In line with Consultant advice, the policy will be changed as follows:  <b><i>POLICY AF3: DESIGN AND QUALITY IN THE TOWN CENTRE</i></b> <i>Development proposals in the defined town centre primary shopping frontage for additional retail</i>

		<p>permission is required) will be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the proposal, subject to its proximity to the edge of the defined primary shopping frontage area, contributes to improving the appearance of the ‘gateways’ to the town centre, where people gain their first impressions of the character of Stonehouse; and,</li> <li>ii) the proposal, subject to viability, includes provision of or a contribution towards the enhancement of the quality of streets and civic spaces in the town centre, to improve pedestrian experience and safety and enhance the setting of any historic buildings; and,</li> <li>iii) the proposal maintains and enhances the built and historic character of the town centre; or</li> <li>iv) the proposal will increase the diversity of retail provision and the vitality and viability of the town centre.</li> </ul>	<p>Finally, criterion iv uses a broad terms such as “vitality” and “viability”. Whilst broad terminology is appropriate to explain a strategy, it may prove overly onerous as a policy requirement.</p> <p>It is the role of the NDP to explain how development could increase the vitality and viability of the town centre. You may have already done that by requiring development proposals to increase the diversity of retail provision.</p> <p>Reflect the Local Plan policy for designated Primary Shopping Frontages, where uses outside Class A will not be permitted.</p>	<p><i>units, alterations to existing retail frontages and change of use from retail to other uses where above ground floor level (where planning permission is required) will be supported where they:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i) subject to proximity to the edge of the defined primary shopping frontage area, maintain and enhance the appearance of the ‘gateways’ to the town centre, where people gain their first impressions of the character of Stonehouse;</i></li> <li><i>ii) maintain and enhance the quality of streets and civic spaces in the town centre, to improve pedestrian experience and safety;</i></li> <li><i>iii) maintains and enhances the built and historic character of their-setting and the town centre; and,</i></li> <li><i>iv) they comply with Local Plan Policy E17.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Proposals which increase diversity of retail provision and offer will be particularly welcomed.</i></p>
13	Jackie Edwards	AF3	Important to keep the High Street vibrant to bring customers in.	Thank you for your supportive comments



14	Colin Knight	AF3	<p>Extend High St improvements to Barnard Parade. Drop the name 'shared space' but continue current design principles. Recent experience shows use of zebra crossing in such areas is an effective way of improving pedestrian access and making shopping easier and pleasanter. The current scheme has lowered speeds and accidents, opportunities for S106?</p>	<p>See Theme 2: Travel and Transport for response</p>
15	Tim Wilkins	AF3	<p>I would love to see more and varied shops in Stonehouse, not all charity shops and food takeaways.          I would love to have the library in the high street so it would get used more as where it is a lot of people miss it or don't know about it.          I have heard and been witness to people either asking if Stonehouse has a library and they don't know we're it is or they do not go to it as it's too far and they cannot see any signs for it.          I think a compulsory purchase of the old club and skittle alley that is behind the post office and junk shop on Queens Road.          That could be a great 2 story library which would expand with more use and could also could have a book shop as part of it or an adult educational centre.          Loads of people use the high street and would increase the people who use the library and Queens Road.</p>	<p>Thank you for support, the Plan is encouraging this mix.           The library is recognised as an important facility.</p>
16	Sport England		<p>Planning Policy in the <b>National Planning Policy Framework</b> identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process and providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type and in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means positive planning for sport, protection from unnecessary loss of sports facilities and an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land and community facilities provision is important.</p> <p>It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects national policy for sport as set out in the above document with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74 to ensure proposals comply with National Planning Policy. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing fields (see link below), as set out in our national guide, 'A</p>	<p>This is helpful information that will be taken into consideration as and when applications come forward</p>

			<p><b>Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England – Planning Policy Statement’.</b></p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/</a></p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on developing policy for sport and further information can be found following the link below:</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</a></p> <p>Sport England works with Local Authorities to ensure Local Plan policy is underpinned by robust and up to date assessments and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports delivery. If local authorities have prepared a Playing Pitch Strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports strategy it will be important that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the recommendations set out in that document and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support the delivery of those recommendations.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/</a></p> <p>If new sports facilities are being proposed Sport England recommend you ensure such facilities are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p>	
17	Andrew Irvine		<p>I have just been reading the Stonehouse plan it states there will be a strong emphasis on public footpaths for the elderly also wheelchair users, so why are the footpaths around the many estates in a terrible condition with weeds growing from the Tarmac resulting in uneven surfaces, although I applaud the great work for Stonehouse in Bloom the Main Street is not the only street in Stonehouse.</p>	See Theme 2: Travel and Transport

			These paths used to be sprayed with weed killer every year I have not seen this practice in many a year now and I know the town council will say it is up to the district or county to carry out this work, so In order to fulfill your long term plan these existing footpaths need to be protected now.	
--	--	--	---	--

## Theme 2: Travel and Transport

	Respondent	Policy	Comment	Response
1	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	Para 1.6 (Page 14)	The last paragraph refers to the inclusion of an informative on the planning permission for Land West of Stonehouse. However, it is considered further clarification and context for this informative should be given if this paragraph is to remain in the NDP. As written the paragraph is misleading and implies that the West of Stonehouse permission is required to deliver pedestrian improvements on Oldends Lane. The paragraph should either be deleted or expanded to clarify that the provision of such improvements is not a formal requirement of the permission and is dependent on co-operation and funding from a number of parties beyond the control of the applicant.	We will make it clear that it is not a formal requirement of the planning permission by inserting the phrase ' <i>although not a planning condition,</i> ' before ' <i>an informative</i> '.
2	SDC planning 3	<b>Page 15 - Objective 2.5</b> Only support major development where it is, or will be made, accessible to the town centre on foot and by cycle	. Please see general comment and recommendation 1	The word ' <i>only</i> ' will be removed
3	John R Thompson	<b>Objectives 2.4 and 2.5</b>	Particularly important that the town develops without increased reliance on cars. A car free town would be wonderful!	We agree but in practice there is and will continue to be, a significance reliance on cars both by residents and by non-resident users of the shops and facilities.
4	SDC planning 7	<b>Page 25</b> The A419 is nearing capacity and comes to a standstill in rush hour when workers are travelling to and from the Stonehouse industrial	The examiner of the Eastington NDP recommended similar comments to be removed from the NDP: "It would be helpful to users of the plan to keep this paragraph factual by deleting perceived fears about traffic" Recommendation: Reword paragraph replacing perceived fears with factual information.	Wording will be changed as follows: <i>The A419 is nearing capacity and comes to a standstill in rush hour when workers are travelling to and from the Stonehouse industrial</i>

		<p>estates. The B4008 in the town centre would also benefit from less through traffic, making the centre a more pleasant environment. Recent planning permission for 1350 houses to the west of Stonehouse is likely to exacerbate these problems.</p>		<p>estates. The B4008 in the town centre would also benefit from less through traffic, making the centre a more pleasant environment. Planning permission has recently been given for 1350 houses to the west of Stonehouse adjacent to the A419 .</p>
5	SDC planning 8	<p><b>POLICY T1: PEDESTRIAN ROUTES</b> Existing public rights of way and other pedestrian routes will be protected and their quality improved where opportunities arise.</p> <p>Improvements to existing walking routes to the town centre, the schools and the canal will be prioritised.</p> <p>Development proposals which result in the closure or diversion of such routes will only be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) a net improvement to pedestrian and wheelchair accessibility is provided; and,</li> <li>ii) pedestrian routes have been designed or adapted to also act as wildlife corridors (where feasible and viable).</li> </ul>	<p>As worded the policy requirements are overly onerous. <b>Policy wording should be amended to:</b> Existing public rights of way and other pedestrian routes should be protected and their quality improved where opportunities arise.</p> <p>Improvements to existing walking routes to the town centre, the schools and the canal will be prioritised.</p> <p>Development proposals which result in the closure or diversion of such routes should protect the existing rights of way network and its <b>ambiance. Where public footpaths or bridleways are routed or realigned through new development, they should be designed as part of landscaped wildlife corridors rather than being routed along estate road pavements as part of the highway network”.</b></p>	<p>We accept these changes with the addition of ‘accessible to all including wheelchair users’ so that the policy reads:</p> <p><i>Existing public rights of way and other pedestrian routes should be protected and their quality improved where opportunities arise.</i></p> <p><i>Improvements to existing walking routes to the town centre, the schools and the canal will be prioritised.</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals which result in the closure or diversion of such routes should protect the existing rights of way network and its ambiance. Where public footpaths or bridleways are routed or realigned through new development, they should be designed as part of landscaped wildlife corridors rather than being routed along estate road pavements as part of the highway network and should be accessible to all including wheelchair users”.</i></p>
6	GCC	<p>Note: GCC comments were made on a previous version before policy</p>	<p>Policy T4: Pedestrian Routes Sentence 1 should be within the context of the Gloucestershire Rights of Way and Countryside Access Improvement Plan.</p>	<p>We agree with GCC’s comments and have attempted to incorporate them into policies T1 and T3</p>

		numbers were changed. Many of the suggested changes have already been made.	<p>Sentence 2 may be more effective if it refers to improved accessibility. Existing walking routes are important but they are only part of the picture in sustaining and increasing levels of walking. As new development and increased transport demand affects the Stonehouse area and its transport corridor, the increased permeability within new development layouts, connectivity between existing and new land uses, and the provision of new walking routes will be of great importance. Walking trip numbers and lengths are a product of factors such as directness, coherence, sense of safety, surfacing, proximity to traffic, natural surveillance etc. as well as some offering a time and distance advantage over the car.</p> <p>Sentence 3 this sentence appears to cloud the previous two. Is it referring to public rights of way or to footways within streets? Is it possible to clarify the intention of this policy. Would it help to tie it into a general requirement for 'non-motorised access' or 'green infrastructure' with definitions of what those would constitute?</p>	
7	Jackie Edwards	<b>T1</b>	Need to support access from canal to town. Important for tourist access	Thank you for your support.
8	Andrew Irvine	<b>T1</b>	<p>I have just been reading the Stonehouse plan it states there will be a strong emphasis on public footpaths for the elderly also wheelchair users, so why are the footpaths around the many estates in a terrible condition with weeds growing from the Tarmac resulting in uneven surfaces, although I applaud the great work for Stonehouse in Bloom the Main Street is not the only street in Stonehouse.</p> <p>These paths used to be sprayed with weed killer every year I have not seen this practice in many a year now and I know the town council will say it is up to the district or county to carry out this work, so In order to fulfil your long term plan these existing footpaths need to be protected now.</p>	Your comments will be passed to the town council as maintenance is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan
9	Pam Swain	<b>T1</b>	Really supportive of emphasis on maintaining and improving walking routes both for well-being and for access but have some concerns where pavements shared with mobility scooters, particularly where pavements narrow and being used by pedestrians.	Thank you for your support . We agree with these concerns which should be taken into account when designing infrastructure.
10	Pegasus on behalf of	<b>T1</b>	Whilst the objective to enhance pedestrian routes is welcomed, there will be occasions where the provision of enhanced routes is not	See alterations made in response to SDC planning

	Robert Hitchins Ltd		possible. To reflect this the policy should include an additional criterion that the proposed diversion or closure leads to the provision of routes of an equal or more commodious nature.	
11	Andrew Irvine		I have just been reading the Stonehouse plan it states there will be a strong emphasis on public footpaths for the elderly also wheelchair users, so why are the footpaths around the many estates in a terrible condition with weeds growing from the Tarmac resulting in uneven surfaces, although I applaud the great work for Stonehouse in Bloom the Main Street is not the only street in Stonehouse. These paths used to be sprayed with weed killer every year I have not seen this practice in many a year now and I know the town council will say it is up to the district or county to carry out this work, so In order to fulfill your long term plan these existing footpaths need to be protected now.	The management of footpaths is outside the scope of the plan but will pass your comments to the appropriate authority.
12	Janet Thomas		Walking is good.	We have agreed and have attempted to facilitate and encourage walking.
13	SDC planning 9	<b>POLICY T2: COTSWOLD WAY LOOP</b> Development proposals which support or seek to introduce an additional loop to the Cotswold Way through Stonehouse will be supported.	This policy can seek to introduce a loop from the Cotswold Way. However, the designation of the route as part of the Cotswold way is outside the scope of the NDP.  Talk to CCB and National Trails on regarding processes.  <a href="mailto:cotswoldway@cotswoldsaonb.org.uk">cotswoldway@cotswoldsaonb.org.uk</a>	We have contacted CCB and will continue to pursue.
14	GCC		Policy T5 Cotswold Way Loop Is this a tourism economy policy? Are there any other linkages that should be listed here which strengthen key walk routes in direct support of the economy (work/ school etc) and indirectly (long distance walks or walk routes of local importance) ?	There are no other relevant routes to our knowledge.
15	Jackie Edwards	<b>T2</b>	Cotswold Way loop is an excellent idea – will help to bring walkers into town	Thank you for your support
16	Colin Knight	<b>T2</b>	Agree BUT must ensure environment is attractive and kept that way if it is to act as an advert for our town!	We agree but this is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.

17	Pam Swain	T2	Very supportive of Cotswold Way loop – could have positive impact on Town Centre. If marked on Burdett Road station could be possible start/finishing point for section of Cotswold Way.	Thank you. The point about Burdett Road station will be added to the text.
18	Les West	T2	An excellent idea but I would suggest that the loop be extended to take walkers into the town car park via the footpath alongside the railway from Queens Road. Toilet, cafe and shopping facilities would be more readily accessible. If formalised, this loop should be added on Cotswold Way websites, in walking magazines and Ramblers Association. Ultimately B and B businesses might also benefit.	Thank you for the suggestion and for your support for the policy.
19	SDC planning 10	<p><b>POLICY T3: NEW DEVELOPMENT AND PEDESTRIAN LINKS TO THE TOWN CENTRE</b> Development proposals <b>will only be supported</b> where they provide safe, convenient and pleasant pedestrian routes to the town centre and to principal facilities including local schools, including safe and convenient crossings of roads and railway lines, where the location of the proposal suggests a need for such routes.</p> <p>These routes should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) accessible to pushchair and wheelchair users;</li> <li>ii) designed to act as wildlife corridors (where feasible and viable); and,</li> <li>iii) meet the requirements set out in the most up-to-date Manual for Gloucestershire Streets and / or Highways Authority Standing Advice.</li> </ul>	<p>It is unlikely that Policy T3 will be applicable to all forms of development. It would be helpful if the policy provided clarity over what type of development this requirement is applicable to, i.e. major development.</p> <p>Policy T3 potentially conflicts with Local Plan Policy EI12 by offering a more restricted approach.</p> <p>Policy EI12 states that <b>where appropriate</b>, new developments will be required to connect into the surrounding infrastructure and contribute towards new or improved walking, cycling and rail facilities within the District and the provision of an integrated public transport network across the District.</p> <p>Developers must take account of the proposals included within Stroud Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Gloucestershire Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>In appropriate circumstances, new development will be required to contribute towards these schemes.</p> <p>Contributions, where reasonable and viable, will be sought towards these strategic transport infrastructure schemes from major development proposals throughout the plan period. Please review and amend Policy T3 to ensure it is not overly restrictive and unduly onerous.</p>	<p>The policy will be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>'In line with local plan policy EI12' where appropriate, new developments will be required to provide safe, convenient and pleasant pedestrian routes to the town centre and to principal facilities including local schools, including safe and convenient crossings of roads and railway lines, where the location of the proposal suggests a need for such routes.</i></p> <p><i>Where possible, these routes should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i) be accessible to pushchair and wheelchair users;</i></li> <li><i>ii) be designed to act as wildlife corridors (where feasible and viable); and,</i></li> <li><i>iii) meet the requirements set out in the most up-to-date Manual for Gloucestershire Streets and / or Highways Authority Standing Advice.</i></li> </ul>
20	GCC		Policy T6: New Development and Pedestrian Links to the Town Centre	We agree but we have been asked by Stroud District Council to restrict

			<p>A key rationale for locating a development near to transport connections and other land uses – such as schools and shops – is so that more people can walk for more of their trips or for more parts of their trip.</p> <p>Therefore, there should be a very strong support for pedestrian routes, not only 'where the location of the proposal suggests a need for such routes'. Existing and new pedestrian routes should closely express pedestrian desire lines. The design and layout of new development should be fine grain and allow for optimal levels of pedestrian permeability. New development should connect well to existing land uses.</p> <p>New development can create new opportunities for more walk trips due to unlocking land and enhancing connectivity where it may not have previously existed.</p> <p>These routes should ... add iii) so that 'MfGS' has a numbered point of its own.</p>	<p>this policy to certain types of development.</p> <p>Policy T5 concerns a commitment to 'walkable' neighbourhoods.</p> <p>A reference to the requirements of MfGS is included in point iii above.</p>
21	Karen Young		I'd like to see a greater emphasis in the plan on cycle and walking route creation around the town	The plan already contains an emphasis on walking and cycling routes in line with the transport hierarchy.
22	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>Policy T3 (New Development and Pedestrian Links to the Town Centre)</b>	The policy as drafted is overly restrictive, disproportionate and impractical in requiring any development proposal to provide for "...convenient and pleasant pedestrian routes". The policy does not take into account the particular circumstances and difficulties that may arise in seeking to provide convenient crossings over roads and railways. Any assessment of need for such crossings should be made in the context of Paragraph 32 of the NPPF.	See comments to SDC Planning above
23	Dean Steve Peck	<b>T3</b>	Install speed restriction humps/bumps at Oldends Lane entrance to park	This is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but the Town Council has been pushing for speed restrictions in Oldends Lane for some time.
24	Pegasus on behalf of	<b>T3</b>	As written the policy is too restrictive and fails to take account of the particular circumstances and difficulties that may arise in seeking to	See response to SDC planning.



	Robert Hitchins Ltd		provide convenient crossings over roads and railway lines. Any assessment as to the need for such crossings should be made in the context of NPPF paragraph 32. The policy should be amended to take account of over-arching policy requirement together with the feasibility and viability implications of such works.	
25	John Robinson	T3/AF2	The site of the former Ship Inn deserves protection against commercial development as it would be a preferred site for a visitor/interpretation centre canoe facility as the adjacent canal proceeds towards a full return to amenity use.	The District Council, as site owner, has other plans for this site but we are hoping that they will provide an alternative site for canal related facilities.
26	SDC planning 11	<p><b>POLICY T4: DESIGN OF OFF-ROAD PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE ROUTES</b></p> <p>All new and improved cycle, public rights of way <b>and</b> other pedestrian routes should be designed, <b>where feasible, to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) meet the requirements set out in the most up-to-date Manual for Gloucestershire Streets and / or Highways Authority Standing Advice;</li> <li>ii) be accessible for safe use by those using mobility scooters; and,</li> <li>iii) be designed to act as wildlife corridors.</li> </ul>	<p>It is important that design requirements do not make development unviable within the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the Town Council might be largely responsible for implementing these projects.</p> <p><b>Policy wording should be amended to:..</b></p> <p>All new and improved cycle, public rights of way <b>and</b> other pedestrian routes should be designed, where feasible <b>and viable</b>, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) meet the requirements set out in the most up-to-date Manual for Gloucestershire Streets and / or Highways Authority Standing Advice;</li> <li>ii) be accessible for safe use by those using mobility scooters; and,</li> <li>iii) be designed to act as wildlife corridors.</li> </ul>	Policy will be changed as suggested
27	GCC		<p>Policy T7: Design of Pedestrian and Cycle Routes</p> <p>Delete or clarify 'and viable'</p> <p>Add point iii) for wildlife corridors</p> <p>It will be important to tighten up the definition of the routes. For example cyclists are legitimate highway users with traffic. Some cyclists sometimes prefer to use traffic free segregated facilities. This policy is talking about multiuser user trails. These could constitute green infrastructure and often make high quality wildlife corridors. However, they aren't all pedestrian and cycle routes but they could be</p>	We welcome these comments which resulted in previous policy revisions, particularly to make clear the distinction between different types of cycle facility

			traffic free multiuser paths which can contribute to mode shift, quality of life, leisure and recreation, wildlife value etc.	
28	Colin Knight	T4/T7	Master plan of quiet off-road cycle network needed. Core can be two parallel routes to B4008 linking to canal towpath. Design standards are important <u>BUT</u> should not become absolute – discretion required. Any chance of CIL for cycle link?	Existing off-road cycle routes and roads suitable for cycling are shown on the Stroud District Cycling Map produced by Stroud Valleys Cycle Campaign, <a href="http://www.thinktravel.info/files/uploads/Stroud2015_Cycle_Map.pdf">http://www.thinktravel.info/files/uploads/Stroud2015_Cycle_Map.pdf</a> . New off-road routes could be introduced as the opportunity arises. However, whilst off-road routes are important, most cycling will take place on road.
29	Janet Thomas	T4	Bikes need priority etc.	The plan aims to facilitate cycling both on and off road.
30	SDC planning 12	<p><b>POLICY T5: PROXIMITY OF NEW DEVELOPMENT TO FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b></p> <p>Development proposals for 10 or more dwellings, employment uses and community facilities will only be supported where they demonstrate, through a Design and Access Statement or Planning Statement, the practical interpretation and application of the Gloucestershire Manual for Streets, with particular attention paid to:</p> <p>i) the defined user hierarchy, in the design and assessment of proposals, considering sequentially: 1. pedestrian, 2. cyclist, 3. public transport users, 4. specialist service vehicles (emergency services, waste, etc.) and 5. other motor traffic;</p> <p>ii) 'walkable neighbourhoods', for example, accessibility to new and</p>	<p>As worded the policy may be perceived as overly restrictive and unduly onerous. We believe it is possible to overcome this issue by better relating Policy T5 with Local Plan Policy EI12.</p> <p><b>Policy wording should be amended to:</b></p> <p><b>In implementing Delivery Policy EI12 on enhancing accessibility particular attention shall be paid to:</b></p> <p>i) the defined user hierarchy, in the design and assessment of proposals, considering sequentially: 1. pedestrian, 2. cyclist, 3. public transport users, 4. specialist service vehicles (emergency services, waste, etc.) and 5. other motor traffic;</p> <p>ii) 'walkable neighbourhoods', for example, accessibility to new and existing community facilities by residents within a 10 minute / 800m walking distance;</p> <p>iii) new community facilities being located on, or within a reasonable walking distance to public transport routes; and,</p> <p>iv) easily accessible children's play areas.</p>	These changes will be accepted with the addition at the end of the policy of the sentence ' <i>Where a Design and Access Statement or a Travel Plan is required by the planning authority, that document should demonstrate compliance with this policy</i> '.

		<p>existing community facilities by residents within a 10 minute / 800m walking distance;</p> <p>iii) new community facilities being located on, or within a reasonable walking distance to public transport routes; and,</p> <p>iv) easily accessible children’s play areas.</p>		
31	GCC		<p>Policy T8: Proximity of New Development to Facilities and Services i) Advise remove ‘a 10 mile/ 800m’ and just leave walking distance. Walking distances are different for school children as opposed to adults for example, and strongly affected by route directness and ambience.</p>	<p>The 800m/10min walking distance is given as an example.</p>
32	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>T5</b>	<p>The policy should be redrafted as it seeks to set out the requirements for the validation and determination of planning applications which is the responsibility of the District Council as the Local Planning Authority. The District Council are the determining authority for planning applications and will set out what documentation is required to support applications.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst Manual for Gloucestershire Streets (MfGS) is a material consideration when assessing any application for highway purposes, it does not form part of the Development Plan. The policy should be redrafted to allow for flexibility in circumstances where the advice within MfGS becomes superseded by more up-to-date national guidance and/or other guidance documents.</p>	<p>It is within the remit of a Neighbourhood plan to comment on the design and location of new development as long as it is in general conformity with the local plan.</p> <p>The policy has been reworded after advice from SDC planning and the reference to Manual for Streets has been removed.</p>
33	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<b>T5</b>	<p>The policy should be redrafted as it seeks to set out the requirements for the validation and determination of planning applications which is the remit of the District Council. The District Council are the determining authority for planning applications and will set out what documentation is required to support applications.</p>	<p>It is within the remit of a Neighbourhood Plan to comment on the design and location of new development as long as it is in general conformity with the Local Plan.</p>

34	SDC planning 13	<p><b>Page 33</b>                  Whilst these are important as transport corridors, they also act as barriers to movement across the town, including for cyclists. This problem will be exacerbated by the planned West of Stonehouse development, which will be separated from the town centre and associated facilities by the Bristol/Gloucester railway line.</p>	<p>Please see comment and recommendation 7</p>	<p>The wording has been changed to:   <i>Whilst these are important as transport corridors, they can also act as barriers to movement across the town, including for cyclists. The planned West of Stonehouse development, which will be separated from the town centre and associated facilities by the Bristol/Gloucester railway line, has the potential to exacerbate this problem..</i></p>
35	SDC planning 14	<p><b>POLICY T6: EXISTING CYCLE ROUTES</b>                  Existing cycle routes will be protected and their quality improved where opportunities arise.</p> <p>Development proposals which result in closure or diversion will only be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) a net improvement to cycle routes is provided;</li> <li>ii) provision is made alongside improved cycle routes for mobility scooter accessibility; and,</li> <li>iii) cycle routes have been designed or adapted to act as wildlife corridors (where feasible and viable)</li> </ul>	<p>As worded the policy requirements are potentially overly restrictive and unduly onerous.</p> <p>Does the Town Council have the support of the Local Highways authority to implement the requirement set by criterion ii?</p> <p>Please see general comment and recommendation 1 and 2</p> <p><b>Policy wording should be amended to:</b>                  Existing cycle routes will be protected and their quality improved where opportunities arise.</p> <p>Development proposals which result in closure or diversion will only be supported where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) there is no net loss to the cycle route;</li> </ul> <p><b>Please review and amend criterion ii to address the Council's concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii) provision is made alongside improved cycle routes for mobility scooter accessibility; and,</li> </ul> <p><b>No changes are recommended for criterion iii</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii) cycle routes have been designed or adapted to act as wildlife corridors (where feasible and viable)</li> </ul>	<p>Criterion 1 will be changed as suggested</p> <p>Criterion 2 will be changed to: 'Where off-road cycle routes are provided they should also be suitable for use by mobility scooters'.</p> <p>The intention was never to have parallel routes.</p> <p>Criterion 3 will remain the same</p>
36	GCC		<p>Policy T10: Existing Cycle Routes                  Refer to existing cycle routes such as Sustrans NCN r. 45. But then note that most cycle routes may not be identified – or else cyclists may be making a range of trip route choices in the way that motorists do – and often with motorists. This policy is confusing and needs re-</p>	<p>These points are accepted and the policy and the accompanying text have been modified accordingly</p>

			working. It borrows from pedestrian and rights of way sections. Cyclists are not pedestrians although they sometimes valued shared use and traffic free facilities. The cycle route network needs to be identified before it can be protected or improved. Cycle routes may or may not also provide motor scooter accessibility; and, although cycle routes tend to be better for wildlife because their impacts are less than those of motorised traffic, the cycle routes themselves may be able to offer no more towards wildlife corridors than any other part of the highway.	
37	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	T6	Whilst the objective to enhance cycle routes is welcomed, there will be occasions where the provision of enhanced routes is not possible. To reflect this the policy should include an additional criterion that the proposed diversion or closure leads to the provision of routes of an equal or more commodious nature. Such an approach would be more reflective of Local Plan Policy EI13 and NPPF paragraph 35.	See changes made in response to comments by SDC planning
38	SDC Planning 15	<p><b>POLICY T7: NEW DEVELOPMENT AND CYCLE LINKS TO THE TOWN CENTRE</b></p> <p>Development proposals will only be supported where they provide safe, convenient and pleasant cycle routes to the town centre and to principal facilities including local schools, including safe and convenient crossings of roads and railway lines, where the location of the proposal suggests a need for such routes. These routes can be on-road or off-road.</p> <p>Where they are off-road they should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) accessible to mobility scooters;</li> <li>ii) accessible to pushchair and wheelchair users;</li> <li>iii) designed to act as wildlife corridors (where feasible and viable); and,</li> </ul>	Please see comments and recommendations 10	The first paragraph will be amended to say: <i>'Where appropriate, new development will be required to provide safe, convenient and pleasant cycle routes to the town centre and to principal facilities including local schools, including safe and convenient crossings of roads and railway lines, where the location of the proposal suggests a need for such routes. These routes can be on-road or off-road.'</i>

		<p>iv) meet the requirements set out in the most up-to-date Manual for Gloucestershire Streets and / or Highways Authority Standing Advice.</p> <p>Where routes already exist they should be upgraded to meet the above criteria. If there are no suitable existing routes then new routes should be provided.</p>		
39	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>Policy T7 (New Development and Cycle Links to the Town Centre)</b>	As per the consideration of Policy T3 above, this policy as drafted is overly restrictive, disproportionate and impractical. It fails to take account of the particular circumstances and difficulties that may arise in seeking to provide convenient crossings over roads and railway lines. Any assessment of need for such crossings should be made in the context of Paragraph 32 of the NPPF.	See changes made above in response to SDC Planning Strategy
40	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<b>T7</b>	Again as written the policy is too restrictive and fails to take account of the particular circumstances and difficulties that may arise in seeking to provide convenient crossings over roads and railway lines. Any assessment as to the need for such crossings should be made in the context of NPPF paragraph 32. The policy should be amended to take account of over-arching policy requirement together with the feasibility and viability implications of such works.	See changes made in response to SDC planning
41	John R Thompson	<b>T7</b>	Making horse trough roundabout safe for cyclists would be a very good idea indeed.	This is included. Thank you for your support.
42	Camilla Hale		I would have liked to see on the maps more idea of walking and cycling proposed options (they may well be there but my computer didn't see them well enough)	Thank you for the suggestion but it has not been possible to do this as we don't know where opportunities will arise.
43	SDC planning 16	<b>POLICY T9: IMPROVING KEY PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE LINKS</b> Development proposals for the improvement of pedestrian and cycle access which better connect the	It is important to note that that the Town Council and the local highways authority are likely to be largely responsible for implementing these projects. Please ensure the Gloucestershire County Council is fully supportive of these schemes.	GCC have not objected to this policy although they have suggested an addition – see below.

		<p>locations and routes identified below, either by improving existing links or creating new ones, will be supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Linking the town centre with the Oldends Lane industrial estate, including an improved railway crossing;</li> <li>ii) Linking the town centre and residential areas with the canal;</li> <li>iii) Linking the town centre with Ebley Road, avoiding the Horse trough roundabout;</li> <li>iv) Linking residential areas with Maidenhill School, with Park Junior and Infant Schools and with the High Street; and,</li> <li>v) Links to Burdett Road Railway station or the site of the proposed Bristol Road Railway Station.</li> </ul> <p>Proposals should pay particular attention to the standards set out in the Gloucestershire Manual for Streets and Gloucestershire County Council Cycle Facilities Guidelines.</p>		
44	GCC		<p>Policy T11: New Development and Cycle Links to the Town Centre                  There needs to more reference to connectivity to the wider area, not just Stonehouse town centre, particularly in the light of significant development proposals affecting west of Stroud.                  This policy is referring to multi-use tracks not cycle links. May benefit from reference to LTP Cycling Strategy.</p>	<p>Policy T11 has been subsumed into other policies but the points have been noted and, as far as possible, policies adjusted accordingly</p>
45	GCC		<p>Policy T13: Improving key pedestrian and cycle links                  Add in the need to link to surrounding areas and to new development, including NCN 45, Stroud, Eastington, Nailsworth and any other locally important aspiration.</p>	<p>Whilst links outside Stonehouse are important, they are not within the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>

46	GCC		<p>Policy T14: Improving access to and along the Canal (add the full name of the canal – Gloucester &amp; Sharpness Canal Towpath)</p> <p>Propose amend to say ' ... to develop the canal as a navigable waterway and its towpath as a corridor for pedestrians, mobility scooters and cyclists and boaters.</p>	The policy will be altered accordingly
47	Colin Knight	<b>T9</b>	Essential for there to be a new link to industrial estate and new developments.	Thank you. We have tried to emphasise this.
48	SDC planning 17	<p><b>POLICY T10: RAILWAY STATIONS</b> The site of the Burdett Road Railway Station and associated land identified on map 6 has potential to contribute to additional station amenities and improved access (including access for the disabled and those with limited mobility and additional cycle parking), and is therefore protected for such uses.</p> <p>Development proposals for such uses and enhancement of existing provision will be supported.</p> <p>Development proposals for additional off-street parking to serve the station will be supported.</p>	<p>Please see general comment and recommendation 1</p> <p>It is not clear whether the NDP is making an allocation or merely identifying a development opportunity.</p> <p>Any site allocation should be supported by a robust evidence base which clearly identifies how the decisions have been made, the issues which have been considered and evidence that the site is likely to be developed over the plan period.</p> <p>When making site allocations consideration should also be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whether the site is available</li> <li>• other reasonable forms of development for the site</li> </ul> <p>Please ensure there is robust evidence to support this proposal or any site allocations.</p> <p>Please also ensure that land owners are fully involved in the process.</p>	As Network Rail are now intending to extend the platforms using most of the land identified, the phrase ' <i>and is therefore protected for such uses</i> ' will be removed'.
49	GCC		<p>Public Transport</p> <p>It may be worth including a policy supporting the reopening of the railway station at Stonehouse Bristol Rd in the NDP. Once the NDP is adopted the policy will have added weight as part of the Development Plan and as such will lend support to any proposals/bids for the reopening of Stonehouse Bristol Rd as set out in the Objectives for getting around. It will be additional proof of local support for the project.</p>	We have been advised that we are unable to include a policy supporting Bristol Road station but we have made our commitment clear in the text.



			Policy T.9 Railway Stations is supported.	
50	Robert Crockford		I am particularly interested in transport (following a career with BR) and more specifically with the reinstatement of the old Bristol Road station (as a member of the working party led by our own Theresa). I am pleased to note that the Council (obviously!) support this project, but I think this support could be strengthened by reference to some of the other Themes. For example at a typical community the size of Stonehouse, the largest access mode to a local station is by walk or cycle. Stonehouse is already blessed with good cycle and walk ways, and your plan is to strengthen them further (particularly to the 'old station' area). On a 'holistic' basis this cross-references perfectly with the problems of road traffic - especially on the A419 where a new station will have the potential to take people out of their cars. If you then add in the benefits of a bus link to the station, the case is further enhanced. However, elsewhere in the Plan I read with interest of a wish to divert the Cotswold Way, and also of the desire to protect and promote our local heritage. The two words I did not see were 'Leisure' and 'Tourism' - yes, Stonehouse is a potential tourist destination! The new station is so close to the restored canal and even the Cotswold Way, that it could easily be the gateway to the Stroudwater valley for walkers on a canal/heritage trail or those who just love walking in an a beautiful area. I know of many similar stations that are featured in rail promotions for such trails. Be positive and think of inward non-car tourism!! We're not just a town to drive through. I believe that there can a real synergy between station, canal, walks, heritage (and sustainability/reducing traffic) and these ambitions are worth bringing out positively in the Plan.	Thank you. Some of these points will be included in the text supporting the re-opening of Bristol Road station.
51	Jackie Edwards	<b>T10</b>	Necessary to support improvements to Burdett Road station and re-open Bristol line station. The Bristol line will need to have adequate parking and direct foot access to the town centre.	We have been advised that we are unable to include a policy supporting Bristol Road station but we have made our commitment clear in the text.
52	Colin Knight	<b>T10</b>	Bristol Road station is a MUST!	Thank you for your support . We have been advised that we are unable to include a policy supporting Bristol Road station but we have made our commitment clear in the text.

53	Dean Steve Peck	T10	I support the re-opening of Stonehouse Bristol Road railway station	Thank you for your support . We have been advised that we are unable to include a policy supporting Bristol Road station but we have made our commitment clear in the text.
54	John Robinson	T10	I strongly support the re-opening of the railway station on the Gloucester-Bristol line.	Thank you for your support . We have been advised that we are unable to include a policy supporting Bristol Road station but we have made our commitment clear in the text.
55	Janet Thomas	T10	Need rail access to Bristol	Thank you for your support . We have been advised that we are unable to include a policy supporting Bristol Road station but we have made our commitment clear in the text.
56	Les West	T10	I strongly support the re-opening of the Bristol Road station. This would assist commuters to Bristol (thereby taking some cars off the road). Adjustment to the height of the platforms at Burdett Road would be welcome.	Thank you for your support . We have been advised that we are unable to include a policy supporting Bristol Road station but we have made our commitment clear in the text.  The height of the platforms is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan but we will pass on these comments.
57	Brenda Fellows		We currently have a good transport bus service	Timetabling of buses is not a land-use issue and so cannot be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
58	Janet Thomas		Need more buses and better timetable planning	Timetabling of buses is not a land-use issue and so cannot be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
59	SDC planning 18	<b>Page 39</b> The Plan consultation showed support for Stonehouse station and	Please see comments and recommendations 17	The highlighted phrase will be removed

		<p>the importance of having a station in town was emphasised. However, access to the station and the amount of parking provided is constrained by the lack of space around the station as can be seen on Map 6. It is important that the space that there is around the station is protected from other development so that it can be used as the opportunity arises to improve access and increase parking and other improvements such as the extension of the very short platform.</p>		
60	SDC planning 19	<p><b>Page 40</b>  Traffic on the A419 is an increasing problem, especially in the rush hour. This is likely to be exacerbated by the planned building of 1350 houses and 10 hectares of industrial development to the west of the town. There are plans to make alterations to the junctions along this road but we have concerns that these will make active travel harder and make the road into more of a barrier cutting off the southern part of the town.</p>	Please see comment and recommendation 7 <b>the</b>	<p>The paragraph will be reworded as follows:   <i>'Traffic on the A419 is an increasing problem, especially in the rush hour. There are plans to make alterations to the junctions along this road in association with the planned development of 1350 houses and 10 hectares of employment land to the west of Stonehouse. We have concerns that these will make active travel harder and make the road into more of a barrier cutting off the southern part of the town.'</i></p>
61	SDC planning 20	<p><b>POLICY T11: LOSS OF PARKING CAPACITY</b>  Development proposals that would result in the loss of off-street car, motor bike, motor scooter or cycle parking will only be supported where:  i) in relation to existing public car parks an equivalent or increased capacity is provided elsewhere in the town;</p>	<p>Please see general comment and recommendations 1   This policy is potentially in conflict with Local Plan policy E112 by setting out overly restrictive requirements.   Criterion i restricts the loss of public parking capacity without any leeway or flexibility and criterion ii restricts the loss of private off-street parking unless the need can be shown to have reduced.   The requirements set by this policy focus on need and exceed those set by national and local policy which are based on whether the</p>	<p>Policy will be reworded to refer only to town centre parking follows:   <i>'Public car parking in the Town Centre will be protected unless it can be shown not to be needed.'</i></p>

		ii) in relation to private car parks or similar off-street parking areas an equivalent or increased capacity is provided elsewhere or the need for the private parking capacity can be shown to be reduced as a result of the implementation of the development proposal or the parking can be shown to be not needed.	proposal would have a severe detrimental impact on the local road network.  Please review and amend this policy to address the Council's concerns.	
62	GCC		Comments on the proposed Transport (Traffic Management and Parking) policies. It may be useful for the Town Council to align the Traffic Management and Parking policies with the County Council Local Transport Plan and to identify opportunities to fund and secure enhanced connectivity and transport investment through development proposals affecting the area around Stonehouse and the associated transport corridors.	We have done our best to align the policies both with the Local Transport Plan and with the Local Plan.
63	GCC		Policy T1: Loss of parking capacity The adequate provision of public vehicle parking is one of the determinants of town centre viability. However, accessibility by all transport users can be a more important one. Over-provision of public car parking can undermine other mode shift policies. Car parking is 'invisible' transport infrastructure in that, whilst it obviously affects car use and access, it also affects levels of walking, cycling and public transport use. Therefore it may be more appropriate to state that 'equivalent' or 'increased capacity is provided elsewhere' where there is demonstrable need and to request an evidence base to that effect. Policy T2: Parking in New Development Agree	A previous version of the policy was reworded in line with these comments but they are also taken into consideration in the present rewording.  Note: the original policies T1 and T2 have been combined into the new Policy T11.
64	GCC		Policy T12: Cycle Parking The policy should not address the replacement of cycle parking. Cycle parking is provided in a different way to car parking and is more space efficient and more thinly distributed. Remove 'provision of additional' and, instead, refer to the provision of appropriate levels and locations of cycle parking (Sheffield stands) within and around the town.	Policy T12 has been subsumed into policy T11, which has been reworded accordingly.

65	GCC		<p><i>LTP PD 3.5 Managing domestic deliveries in urban or other sensitive locations</i></p> <p><i>To minimise the impact of domestic deliveries in urban or other sensitive locations and of wasted delivery miles due to failed deliveries GCC will encourage local communities, Chamber of Commerce, Town and Parish Councils to consider the role of freight within their Neighbourhood or Town Centre Plans.</i></p> <p><i>GCC will do this by implementing the following policy proposals:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To provide specific advisory guidance for local communities to consider the development of Last Mile Delivery Policy and route identification as part of the Neighbourhood/Local Plans process.</i></li> <li>• <i>To provide specific advisory guidance for the development of voluntary Quiet Delivery Service scheme as part of the Neighbourhood/Local Plans process.</i></li> </ul> <p>Stonehouse Neighbourhood Development Plan may want to develop a freight policy in this context, or to note that the County Council is seeking to progress this initiative once LTP is formally adopted.</p>	The freight policy was deleted on the advice of Stroud District Council.
66	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	T11	The policy should be amended to enable public car parking to be lost if this can be supported by evidence that there is no longer a need for such an extent of provision. This would reflect the approach adopted in respect of private car parking.	This policy has been amended
67	Janet Thomas	T11	Need to recognise that <u>some</u> car use is essential and maybe we need more car parks.	We agree that some car use is essential and that town centre car parking should be adequate for the demand.
68	Karen Young	T11	I'd like to suggest the introduction of more residents' only parking schemes to prevent overspill from use of local amenities affecting home-owner parking. With the increase in care-home facilities, there are large numbers of carers associated with individual properties and it is my view that these should be treated as employees rather than residents as far as parking rights are concerned. This issue is going to escalate across the town.	This is not a matter we can deal with in the neighbourhood plan.
69	Camilla Hale	T11	There was no indication of how parking could be increased I felt that the future amount of cars which will inevitably go through Stonehouse was not fully addressed. While I appreciate the really careful ideas about increased walking and cycling and lovely flat ways	See comments from GCC re increased parking encouraging increased traffic

			for people to get around to work and around town and to the new developments people will opt for car first more often than not and how will this affect Stonehouse and what can be done about it? eg residents parking areas only around the station, any bypass options, spaces which could be allocated for parking, park and ride options in the industrial estates etc.	
70	Colin Knight	(AF3)	Extend High St improvements to Barnard Parade. Drop the name 'shared space' but continue current design principles. Recent experience shows use of zebra crossing in such areas is an effective way of improving pedestrian access and making shopping easier and pleasanter. The current scheme has lowered speeds and accidents, opportunities for S106?	Thank you for the suggestion but this is outside of the scope of the plan.
71	Network Rail		Page 14 states: " Various documents in Stroud District Council's Evidence Base for the Local Plan recommend improvements in connections between Stonehouse and West of Stonehouse some with specific reference to the oldends Lane level crossing etc" Oldends if indeed a "cause of constriction" but road closure times are currently kept as short as practicable bearing in mind speed, frequency and mix of train types. Road closures are set to worsen with strategic aspirations to increase the number of trains on the route and by the significant housing expansion causing congestion along the road than by barrier downtime.	We agree with these comments but don't consider any alteration is necessary as the plan does not suggest that Network Rail is to blame for the delays
72	Network Rail		Re-opening of Bristol Road Station. We are aware of the local aspiration for a new / reopened station at Stonehouse Bristol Road. Network Rail will continue to work with Stonehouse Town Council; with this in mind I enclose a link to Network Rail's website; Western route study - Long Term Planning Process - Network Rail This link provides access to Network Rail's Western Route Study, published August 2015 which sets out the strategic vision for the future of the railway in this vital part of the railway network. It is hoped that this will be of use to the Council to keep you up to date with future aspirations for railway development in the Stonehouse area.	Comments noted but no consequential changes needed.
73	Network Rail		Pre-application Network Rail is sure you are aware that we are consulted on planning applications but not pre-applications. Where there is an impact on the railway, Network Rail will require mitigation and we will respond on planning applications accordingly. At this stage in the process our request for a planning obligation can cause a delay	Comments will be passed to the town council

and also be exasperating for any developer, who has undertaken pre-application advice and invested time and money in working through Heads of Terms. It occurred to us that we could alleviate this problem by simply adding a standard paragraph to your pre-application response. We have put together a paragraph which if included as general advice, may help avoid any disruption further along the process.

Should your development be likely to increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing any future planning application should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact. Any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed should be included within the Heads of Terms.

We are sure you are aware the Council have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway: o Schedule 5 (f)(ii) of the Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) order, 2010 requires that... “Where any proposed development is likely to result in a material increase in volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (public footpath, public or private road) the Planning Authority’s Highway Engineer must submit details to both Her Majesty’s Railway Inspectorate and Network Rail for separate approval”. Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact: and the developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed. We hope this information is of use to you and will help reduce any delays or inconvenience caused to developers throughout the planning process.

Network Rail would draw the council’s attention to the following (which applies to England only): The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 Publicity for applications for planning permission within 10 metres of relevant railway land 16.—(1) This article applies where the development to which the application relates is situated within 10 metres of relevant

			<p>railway land. (2) The local planning authority must, except where paragraph (3) applies, publicise an application for planning permission by serving requisite notice on any infrastructure manager of relevant railway land. (3) Where an infrastructure manager has instructed the local planning authority in writing that they do not require notification in relation to a particular description of development, type of building operation or in relation to specified sites or geographical areas (“the instruction”), the local planning authority is not required to notify that infrastructure manager. (4) The infrastructure manager may withdraw the instruction at any time by notifying the local planning authority in writing. (5) In paragraph (2) “requisite notice” means a notice in the appropriate form as set out in Schedule 3 or in a form substantially to the same effect.</p>	
74	Network Rail		<p>Developer Contributions The Neighbourhood Development Plan should set a strategic context requiring developer contributions towards rail infrastructure where growth areas or significant housing allocations are identified close to existing rail infrastructure. Many stations and routes are already operating close to capacity and a significant increase in patronage may create the need for upgrades to the existing infrastructure including improved signalling, passing loops, car parking, improved access arrangements or platform extensions. As Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit it would not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail improvements necessitated by commercial development. It is therefore appropriate to require developer contributions to fund such improvements. Specifically, we request that a Policy is included within the document which requires developers to fund any qualitative improvements required in relation to existing facilities and infrastructure as a direct result of increased patronage resulting from new development. The likely impact and level of improvements required will be specific to each station and each development meaning standard charges and formulae may not be appropriate. Therefore in order to fully assess the potential impacts, and the level of developer contribution required, it is essential that where a Transport Assessment is submitted in support of a planning application that this quantifies in detail the likely impact on the rail network. To ensure that developer contributions can deliver appropriate improvements to the rail network we would recommend that Developer Contributions should include provisions for rail and should include the following: <input type="checkbox"/> A requirement for development contributions to deliver improvements to the rail network where</p>	<p>We do not foresee any developments large enough to contribute to rail infrastructure but if they do occur we are keen that they should contribute to railway crossings especially for pedestrians and cyclists and to the re-opening of Bristol Road Station.</p>



			<p>appropriate. □ A requirement for Transport Assessments to take cognisance of impacts to existing rail infrastructure to allow any necessary developer contributions towards rail to be calculated. □ A commitment to consult Network Rail where development may impact on the rail network and may require rail infrastructure improvements. In order to be reasonable these improvements would be restricted to a local level and would be necessary to make the development acceptable. We would not seek contributions towards major enhancement projects which are already programmed as part of Network Rail's remit.</p>	
75	Network Rail		<p>Planning Applications We would appreciate the Town Council providing Network Rail with an opportunity to comment on any future planning applications should they be submitted for sites adjoining the railway, or within close proximity to the railway as we may have more specific comments to make (further to those above). We trust these comments will be considered in your preparation of the forthcoming Neighbourhood development Plan.</p>	<p>These comments will be passed to the Town Council</p>

Theme 3: Housing

	Respondent	Policy	Comment	Response
1	SDC Planning 23	<p>Policy H1 Local Needs Housing (Dwelling Size and Type)</p> <p><b>To help ensure a locally appropriate supply of dwelling types and sizes, development proposals which demonstrate (across tenures) how they meet the local needs, demand and demographic profile of Stonehouse parish will be supported. Dwelling types and sizes which meet the particular needs of Stonehouse's ageing population (for example,</b></p>	<p>For clarity it would be helpful if the first paragraph of the policy clearly identified the type of development Policy H1 relates to. As worded the second paragraph does not read as a policy and this may cause issues with its implementation.</p> <p>Recommendation: Policy wording should be amended to: To help ensure a locally appropriate supply of dwelling types and sizes, proposals for <b>infill</b> housing development within the settlement development limits which demonstrate (across tenures) how they meet the local needs demand and demographic profile of Stonehouse parish will be supported These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Bungalows which meet the particular needs of Stonehouse's ageing population</li> </ol>	<p>The changes are accepted but with the removal of the word <i>"infill"</i>.</p> <p>Whilst we accept that large developments within Stonehouse are unlikely, there are sites where larger developments might be possible. Although we do not advocate the development of these sites we would wish this policy to apply if there were to be developed.</p>

		<b>bungalows) and younger people seeking to move into their first owner occupied, shared equity or private rented property (for example, 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings) will be particularly welcomed</b>	ii. Smaller dwelling units (1 and 2 bedroom) which meet the particular needs of younger people seeking to move into their first owner occupied, shared equity or private rented property.	
2	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>H1</b>	The policy is looking to go beyond the requirements of adopted Local Plan Policy HC1 with the inclusion of a requirement that development proposals must demonstrate how they meet the local needs, demand and demographic profile of Stonehouse parish. Policy HC1 however only requires proposals to include, where appropriate, a variety of dwelling types and sizes, which meet identified local needs.	Policy to be redrafted in accordance advice from SDC planning department.
3	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<b>H1</b>	The policy seeks to expand on the requirement of Local Plan HC1 via the introduction of a need to comply with a local demographic need for Stonehouse. However, the policy fails to recognise the strategic nature of the Stonehouse settlement and its direct identification with Local Plan Policy CP3 as a key area for strategic growth serving the needs of the wider district.  Recommendation: The policy should therefore be redrafted to align more closely with the objectives of Local Plan Policies CP3 and HC1, to ensure that it does not frustrate the delivery of strategic objectives contrary to the Basic Conditions required of a NP	Policy to be redrafted in accordance with SDC advice.  Robert Hitchins appear to confuse the Parish of Stonehouse with the Stonehouse Cluster within the Local Plan and CP3
4	Jacky Edwards	<b>H1</b>	Important to have a balance of different types of housing in any new build	Thank you for your support.
5	SDC Planning 24	<b>Page 45</b>	The existence of few bungalows and flats does not in itself evidence the demand for such type of housing. You may be able to use the findings of the public consultation as part of the justification for the NDP's support for bungalows and flats.  Recommendation: Please review and amend the supporting text to clarify how the evidence base justifies the NDP's support for particular forms of housing.	There is an identified National under-supply of Bungalows over the last 25 years, In Stonehouse the aging population and physical challenges need a supply of bungalows to meet its need.  At end of para 2 we will add "There is an identified national under supply of bungalows over the last 25 years."

				<p>“Housing for the elderly, or those with limited mobility, starter homes, housing for young families and affordable housing were the most popular responses to consultation on housing need in Stonehouse making up around a quarter (23%) of all comments received on housing for the Plan.”</p>
6	SDC Planning 25	<p>Policy H2: Local Needs Housing in Stonehouse</p> <p><b>Proposals for housing development will be required to satisfy requirements for affordable housing set out in Local Plan policy CP9. In addition, all proposals for affordable housing should: i) demonstrate how they meet relevant requirements set out in the Stonehouse Design Statement; and, ii) demonstrate how they meet local needs for dwelling sizes (bedrooms) and type (for example, bungalows, semi-detached, terraced, maisonettes, apartments / flats, detached).</b></p>	<p>For clarity, it would be helpful if the first paragraph of the policy clearly identified the type of development Policy H2 relates to.</p> <p>In addition the Council has concerns regarding the conformity of the Stonehouse Design Statement with the latest national and local planning policy. The Council has not received any monitoring or review since its adoption as SPA in 2005. At present it will accord little weight.</p> <p>Instead of requiring development to comply with an out of date document, you may be able to bring some important policy requirements from your Design Statement into the NDP</p> <p>Recommendation; Policy wording should be amended to: Proposals for <b>infill</b> housing development within the settlement development limits will be required to satisfy requirements for affordable housing set out in Local Plan policy CP9</p> <p>In addition these proposals should demonstrate how they meet local needs for dwelling sizes (bedrooms) and type (for example, bungalows, semi detached, terraced, maisonettes, apartment/flats, detached}</p>	<p>Agreed save for the inclusion of the word “infill”.</p> <p>CP9 is relevant to all development and not just infill development so the policy amendment recommended to restrict just to “infill” is not logical.</p>
7	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>H2</b>	<p>Similarly, this policy goes beyond the requirements of the adopted Local Plan, in this case Policy CP9 concerning affordable housing. It is recognised that proposals for housing development need to satisfy the requirements for affordable housing, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. However, the requirement to meet local need should be deleted.</p> <p>The District Council undertake a Housing Needs Survey periodically, alongside Strategic Housing Market Assessments, which highlight the need for affordable housing. The Council intend to publish a</p>	<p>Policy to be amended on advice of SDC planning department.</p>

			Supplementary Planning Document to provide more detail on how Policy CP9 will be implemented and that is consider the more appropriate mechanism rather than the Neighbourhood Plan as drafted which may frustrate the delivery of strategic affordable housing requirements.	
8	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	H2	The identification of the nature and form of affordable housing should be led by the Council's Housing Needs Survey and the operation of its Housing register, The reference to a local need should be deleted so as to ensure the policy does not frustrate the delivery of strategic housing requirements.	Policy wording to be amended in keeping with SDC advice
9	Janet Thomas	H2 (ii)	Need bungalows and people need outdoor space (ie not flats) for washing lines etc. and sufficient parking.	Thank you for your support - Comments support H2 & H7
10	SDC Planning 26	Policy H3: Occupancy of Affordable Housing <b>Initial and subsequent occupancy of the affordable housing will be restricted to a person(s) with a local connection who: a) Do not have access to open market housing; b) Is a resident of Stonehouse, or has a local connection with the town because of family ties or a need to be near their workplace. In the event that an occupier who fulfils both (or either) of criterion (a) or (b) cannot be found within a reasonable period of time, then (b) will be widened: i) firstly to a person(s) with a local connection to the wider Stonehouse Cluster because of family ties or a need to be near their workplace; ii) secondly to a person(s) with a connection to Stroud because of family ties or a need to be near their workplace; iii) and thirdly to</b>	By setting out occupancy conditions/local connection criteria for all affordable housing in the neighbourhood area this policy is in conflict with Local Plan policy CP9 which deals with affordable housing need on a district wide basis. As part of the Council's corporate approach to meeting housing needs in rural areas, the council is supportive of the use of local connection criteria on rural exception sites in settlements with a population of less than 4000 people. The Council objects to the use of local connection for all affordable housing in the neighbourhood area as it is contrary to policy and would result in inefficient use of affordable housing stock. The Town Council may be able to secure local connection on a specific site via a Community Right to build Order  Recommendation: This policy should be deleted	Despite popular local support for such a policy, the advice from SDC to delete this policy as the policy area can only be dealt with at District level is accepted and the policy will be deleted.

		a person(s) with a connection to the wider Stroud District.		
11	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	H3	This policy should be deleted. It is not sufficiently precise and not clear how it can be enforced. Furthermore, the occupancy of affordable homes can be adequately administered by the District Council via their Housing Needs Survey, Housing Register and Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The 'local connection' criteria proposed would impose restrictions which could frustrate the wider delivery of the objectively assessed housing needs of the District	Policy deleted
12	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins	H3	The identification and occupancy of affordable housing should be carried out in accordance with the administration of the District Council's Housing Needs Survey, Housing Register and its Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The inclusion of a local residency restriction will directly conflict with the process and the wider delivery of the objectively assessed housing needs of the District contrary to NPPF paragraph 47 to the Strategic Objective SO1 of the Local Plan. The policy is not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the prevailing development and therefore fails to satisfy the Basic Conditions required of a NP. The policy is not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the prevailing development and therefore fails to satisfy the Basic Conditions required of a NP. The policy should be deleted	Policy deleted
13	SDC Planning 27	Policy H4: Retaining Affordable Housing for Long Term Community Benefit <b>Affordable housing should be provided in perpetuity, where feasible, for example, through a Community Land Trust or other community housing scheme which retains stock for the benefit of the local community at an accessible cost. Community housing schemes will be supported.</b>	Feedback from examination of the Stroud Town Centre NDP indicates this is not a land use policy. As was the case with the Stroud Town centre NDP, the SNDP may be able to express its support for Community Land Trusts with promotional statements.  Recommendation; This policy should be deleted	The advice from SDC to delete this policy, as this is not a land use is accepted, despite popular local support for such a policy

14	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	H4	This policy should be deleted as it would be at odds with the Housing Strategy of the District Council where it is recognised that it is an ambition of some households to buy their own home, an ambition which is backed at a national and local level.	Policy deleted
15	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	H4	The policy should be amended to include reference to a Registered Provider or similar organisation	Policy H4 deleted on SDC advice.
16	SDC Planning 28	Policy H5: Retaining Accessible Single Storey Housing Stock <b>In order to protect limited housing stock of single storey accessible housing (bungalows) available to Stonehouse's ageing population, proposals for the conversion of bungalows to two storey accommodation (including loft conversions) which require planning permission will only be supported where there is no adverse impact on the overall stock of bungalows proportionate to likely demand within the 65+ age profile</b>	This is a laudable objective but is not capable of being controlled through planning policy. It would not be possible to implement or monitor. It is also not clear how the Town Council would monitor overall stock and likely demand and make this information available to the public. Feedback from neighbourhood plan health checks in the District indicates that policies such as this are overly restrictive and unacceptable. NDP's should use positive language and encourage the types of development desired. The NDP can support the provision of bungalows and allocate land for it, but it cannot place blank restrictions on the conversion of bungalows into two storey dwellings. If you wish to retain the support for bungalows in the NP as an aspiration make sure it is clearly identified as such.  Recommendation: This policy should be deleted	The advice from SDC to delete this policy is accepted even though the policy has local support.
17	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	H5	This policy should be deleted. Proposals to alter or extend single storey dwellings should be considered on their own merits in light of the relevant adopted planning policies and material considerations. Policy HC8 of the adopted Local Plan relates to the extension of dwellings and does not include any restrictions regarding single storey housing. In fact, the supporting text at Paragraph 4.56 advises that the extension of existing dwellings is often an effective means of improving the housing stock. Furthermore, the policy would be at odds with the NPPF which seeks to encourage the best and most efficient use of land and likewise Strategic Objective 5 of the adopted Local Plan which promotes a development strategy to maximise the re-use of buildings.	Policy deleted on the advice of SDC Planning

<p>18</p>	<p>SDC Planning 29</p>	<p>Policy H6: Ease of access in new Residential Development  <b>Proposals for housing development will be required to satisfy requirements for provides easy access for residents and their visitors, to service vehicles (for example refuse vehicles) and to emergency service vehicles and proposals demonstrate that they comply with advice and standards given in the Gloucestershire Manual for Streets in relation to access and residential street design. To achieve this, particular attention is drawn to local requirements: i) for an average of 2 spaces (excluding garages) per dwelling to be provided; and, ii) that roads should be of sufficient width and an appropriate layout to ensure easy two- way vehicular access, without compromising the safety of pedestrians or cyclists.</b></p>	<p>Policy H6 conflicts with 2015 Ministerial Statement (please see section on parking)                  By setting requirements that are more onerous than those in Local Plan Policy E112 this policy could fail to meet basis conditions.</p> <p>Recommendation:                  Please review and amend this policy having regard to Local Plan Policy E112 and the 2015 Ministerial Statement.</p>	<p>The continued problems and frustrations caused on new developments locally and across the South West have been the subject of much media coverage and well evidenced in these programmes. Local authorities' are now bizarrely considering yellow lines on estate roads. We support housing but not at the cost of the communities safety and well-being. This is designing in neighbour disputes and unnecessary problems.</p> <p>Planning consultancy advice has been taken and it is proposed to reword the policy as follows:</p> <p><b><i>Policy H6: Ease of access in new Residential Development</i></b></p> <p><i>Proposals for housing development will provide clear access for residents and their visitors, to service vehicles (for example refuse vehicles) and to emergency service vehicles.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals should demonstrate that they comply with advice and standards given in the Gloucestershire Manual for Streets in relation to access and residential street design.</i></p> <p><i>Developers are encouraged to consider carefully the design and layout of development so as not to compromise clear and safe access for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles by paying particular attention is-to:</i></p>
-----------	----------------------------	--	---	--

				<p>i) off-street parking provision which is adequate to serve households and dwelling size; and,</p> <p>ii) roads being of sufficient width and an appropriate layout to ensure easy two-way vehicular access, without compromising the safety of pedestrians or cyclists.</p>
19	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	H6	The policy does not conform with the standards set out in Policy E112 of the adopted Local Plan. Parking provision and highway access/design should be provided in accordance with adopted standards pertaining at the time, or where evidence is provided to demonstrate that the level would not have a detrimental impact. The wording of the proposed policy should therefore be amended accordingly.	The policy wording has been amended in line with SDC and planning consultancy advice.
20	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	H6	The parking standards set out in the policy do not accord with those required via the operation of Local Plan E112 and set out in Appendix 2 of the Local Plan The policy is not in conformity with the existing development plan and should be amended accordingly.	The policy wording has been amended in line with SDC and planning consultancy advice
21	Jacky Edwards	H6	Must have enough off-road parking	Thank you for your support
22	SDC Planning 30	Policy H7: Accessible Housing <b>Development proposals for housing on sites of 10 or more dwellings should provide a minimum of 10% of new dwellings to current Building Regulation part M4(2) standards. Should this not be viable, proposals should demonstrate why this is the case.</b>	Policy H7 potentially conflicts with the 2015 Ministerial Statement (please see section on plan making) You may be able to express your support for the provision of new dwellings to current Building Regulation part M4(2) standards with promotional statements.  Recommendation: This policy should be deleted.	Disagree. Policy to be redrafted to replace " <i>current Building Regulation part M4(2) standards</i> " with " <i>be fully accessible to all</i> ".
23	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	H7	It is a central aim of the District Council's Housing Strategy to deliver homes that meet 'Lifetime Home Standards'; for example homes that are designed to allow the easy use of a wheelchair or installation of a stairlift if required.	See above



			However, the justification or evidence base for the 10% target is unclear. Furthermore, the policy as drafted would conflict with Policy CP7 of the adopted Local Plan which requires an assessment to be carried out thereby enabling each individual case to be assessed on its own merits.	
24	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	H7	This policy seeks to control housing of more than 10 unit to be Building Regulation part M4(2) – this is something the Government is clear need to be considered and tested through the Local Plan process and it not appropriate for a NDP. This policy should be deleted	Disagree but redrafted to replace “ <i>current Building Regulation part M4(2) standards</i> ” with “ <i>be fully accessible to all</i> ”.
25	SDC Planning 31	Policy H8: Play Areas in New residential Developments. <b>Development proposals for 10 or more dwellings should demonstrate how they meet the requirements for play space set out in Local Plan policy ES15. Within this context, proposals will be particularly welcomed where they make provision on-site to enable ease of access for new residents</b>	This policy is less detailed than Policy ES15 The NDP should aim to provide the local interpretation so as to aid the implementation of strategic policies. This may be through identifying relevant areas referred to or by presenting more detailed matters. This policy does not appear to be adding any further detail on local implementation.  Recommendation: Please review this policy to ensure that it is locally specific and aid the interpretation of Policy ES15 and its implementation.	For the safety, health and well-being of our under 12’s we recommend that play facilities should be available on all new build sites of 10 or more units.  The following text to be added to the justification:  “ <i>An example of best practice is Blackwell Close where facilities include the elements of swinging, climbing and sliding in a fenced area on a soft surface.</i> ”
26	Jacky Edwards	H8	Very important to have on-site play areas if garden space is small	Thank you for your support
27	General Housing Comments			
28	Colin Knight		Agree	Thank you for your support.
29	Karen Young		I’d like to suggest the introduction of more resident parking only schemes to prevent overspill from use of local amenities affecting homeowner parking, With the increase in care home facilities, there are large numbers of carers associated with individual properties and it is my view that these should be treated as employees rather than	Not within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Comment will be passed to the Highways Authority.

			residents as far as parking rights are concerned. The issue is going to escalate across the town.	
30	Robert Crockford		Just to note that the developments west of Stonehouse are perfectly placed to support a new station.	Thank you. Unfortunately, the planning conditions on this development have already been agreed.
31	Mattie Ross		We need more social housing for rent in Stonehouse and affordable housing so our young people can stay here instead of moving on, rural areas are protected in this way but not urban towns like ours. Housing co-operative, Community Land Trusts, what we don't need is executive homes for commuters.	Thank you for your support
32	Brenda Fellows		Consideration for rental and affordable housing should take priority over. What is going to happen to Willow Road sheltered housing scheme and Burdett, They could become accessible rental housing for those who need supported housing	Thank you for your support.. Comments regarding sheltered housing referred to STC
33	Dean Steve Peck	<b>H3,H4, &amp; H5</b>	I support these policies	Thank you for your support

**Theme 4: Employment**

	Respondent	Policy	Comment	Response
1	SDC Planning	<p><b>POLICY EM1: SAFEGUARDING LOCAL EMPLOYMENT SITES (USE CLASSES B1, B2 AND B8)</b></p> <p>The existing employment areas in Stonehouse are identified on Map 8 (see Appendix 3: Maps, page 83) and are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bonds Mill</li> <li>• Stonehouse Business Park</li> <li>• Upper Mills</li> <li>• Oldends Lane</li> </ul>	<p>This policy is in conflict with Local Plan Policy E11. The flexibility that it seeks to introduce is not appropriate for Key employment sites.</p> <p>The identification of Local Employment Sites may be appropriate for sites that have not already been identified in the Local plan.</p> <p>Please review this policy and exclude sites that have already been identified through the local plan.</p>	<p>Policy E11 provides a generalised commentary at a district level.</p> <p>This policy seeks to pick up from the NPPF, Paragraph 7 key themes and principles in terms of economy the planning system must contribute toward: "building and strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring land of the right type is available in the right places and the right time to support growth..."</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ryeford Industrial Estate</li> </ul> <p>These sites are protected as Local Employment Sites, in recognition that they provide the significant employment opportunities (in addition to the Key Employment Sites identified in Local Plan Policy E11) for the Stonehouse Cluster, the wider District and M5 corridor from Bristol to Gloucester and Cheltenham.</p> <p>Local Employment Sites will be protected for B1, B2 and B8 uses and opportunities taken to minimise adverse impact on amenity and enhance the sites.</p> <p>Development proposals on these sites will be supported where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Support the more effective or efficient use of the site as employment land; or,</li> <li>ii) Propose a change of use to an alternative use or uses on the site where it can be demonstrated that the use of the site solely for employment (Classes B1, B2, B8), is no longer viable, through an active 12</li> </ul>		<p>This detail seeks, through its clauses, to maintain, intensify and improve the ability of Stonehouse's finite supply of employment land to provide conditions for higher value jobs and contribute to raising the district's GVA.</p> <p>The supporting text will be reviewed to make clearer the objective of policy to ensure sufficient land and premises of the right type is available in the right places and the right time to support growth.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>month marketing exercise where the property has been offered for sale or letting on the open market for these uses at a realistic price and no reasonable offers have been refused; or,</p> <p>iii) Propose the expansion of existing premises and support a net increase in full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs or is supported by a business plan which demonstrates a need for additional space to enable the business to grow; and,</p> <p>iv) have no adverse impacts on the surrounding built character or landscape setting;</p> <p>v) propose incubator units for small and micro start-up businesses and comply with policy EM2; and,</p> <p>Meet the requirements of Local Plan policies E13 and / or E14 where relevant.</p>		
2	Pegasus on behalf of	<b>EM1</b>	In achieving the most efficient and effective use of the protected employment sites in line with Aim 4 and Policy EM1 Criterion i), it is considered that the policy should be amended to recognise the role	Agree with comment, Food, drink and wider hospitality uses play a vital role in the functioning of modern

	Robert Hitchins Ltd		that ancillary A3, A4 and A5 uses perform in enhancing the attractiveness of employment sites to potential occupiers and ensuring a complimentary and sustainable form of cohesive development. It is recommended that an additional criterion be added between criteria (ii) and (iii) as follows: “Provide for complementary ancillary uses which improve the attractiveness of the employment site for occupiers; or” This approach accords with the recommendations set out in the Stroud District Employment Land Study February 2013, undertaken by AECOM and which forms part of the evidence base for the adopted Local Plan.	business for informal meetings. Evidence to the effect was provided during the business consultation event.  Policy will be amended to include new criterion.
3	Jackie Edwards	EM1	Very important to safeguard what is already in place. Not just for Stonehouse but the whole district.	Thank you for your support.
4	Pam Swain	EM1	It would be helpful if Map 8 had a key identifying the 5 named employment areas.	Noted, will alter map accordingly.
5	SDC Planning	<b>POLICY EM2: RESISTING LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT SPACE OUTSIDE OF DESIGNATED EMPLOYMENT SITES</b> Outside of the Local Plan designated Key Employment Sites and the Neighbourhood Plan designated Local Employment Sites (Policy EM1), development proposals which would result in the loss of employment space will only be supported where they: i) Propose a change of use to an alternative use or uses on the site where it can be demonstrated that the use of the site solely	The NDP should aim to provide the local interpretation so as to aid the implementation of strategic policies. This may be through identifying relevant areas referred to or by presenting more detailed matters.  Whilst this policy provides an interpretation of what the “holly exceptional circumstances” Local Plan Policy EI3 expects applicants to demonstrate, the NDP criteria could potentially be found to be overly restrictive and unduly onerous at Rec  Perhaps the NDP could add further value by identifying valuable undesignated employment sites. Please review this policy to ensure that it is locally specific and aid the interpretation of Policy EI3 and its implementation, without being overly restrictive or unduly onerous.	In the context of land value making housing development on infill sites an attractive option for land owners this policy, as with EL3, does not seek to provide an ‘exhaustive list’ but in the spirit of NPPF Paragraph 7 this policy seeks to ensure a ‘strong, responsive and competitive economy’ with land and existing land and premises contributing to the wider economy  Predicated on the presumption in favour of sustainable development it is often smaller commercial sites in towns that can be re-used to provide modern small office schemes that improve the commercial attractiveness of a settlement for start-up and SME businesses.  EM2 goes beyond EL3 requiring a test of viability, something

		<p>for employment (Classes B1, B2, B8), is no longer viable, through an active 12 month marketing exercise where the property has been offered for sale or letting on the open market for these uses at a realistic price and no reasonable offers have been refused; or,</p> <p>ii) It is to be replaced with employment space of an equal or higher quality on the same site or another appropriately located site within the parish; or i</p> <p>iii) The proposed alternative use would overall provide equal or greater benefits to the local economy and community.</p>		<p>Stonehouse NP believe is important to demonstrate in a location of significant growth with a limited amount of commercial land.</p> <p>The supporting text will be reviewed to make clearer the objective of policy to ensure sufficient land and premises of the right type is available in the right places and the right time to support growth.</p>
Ko6	SDC Planning	<p><b>POLICY EM3: SUPPORTING SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZED BUSINESS</b>                  Development proposals which enable the start-up and growth of small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) through the provision of small, ‘hot-desk’ and incubator offices or units will be supported where they</p>	<p>As worded the policy requirement is overly restrictive.</p> <p><b>Amend policy wording to:</b>                  Development proposals which enable the start-up and growth of small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) through the provision of small, ‘hot-desk’ and incubator offices or units will be supported where they demonstrate market demand and there is no significant adverse impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the character of the built environment;</li> <li>ii) the character of the natural environment and setting;</li> <li>iii) residential amenity;</li> </ul>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Policy will be amended accordingly.</p>

		<p>demonstrate market demand and there is no adverse impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) the character of the built environment;</li> <li>ii) the character of the natural environment and setting;</li> <li>iii) residential amenity;</li> <li>iv) traffic generation;</li> <li>v) noise; and,</li> <li>vi) light pollution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv) traffic generation;</li> <li>v) noise; and,</li> <li>vi) light pollution.</li> </ul>	
7	SDC Planning	<p><b>EM4</b></p>	<p>Please clarify whether the “defined town centre area” is the same area defined in the Local Plan. It would also be helpful if the NDP included a map showing the extent of the defined town centre area.</p> <p>Please note that criterion i sets out design requirements for a policy that is mostly concerned with land use. This conflict could cause implementation issues which may render criterion i impracticable.</p> <p>As regarding to criterion ii, please see comment and recommendation 6 relating vitality and viability.</p> <p>Finally, as worded criterion iv is overly restrictive. This could be easily resolved by adding the word “significant” before ...<i>adverse impact on residential amenity, traffic generation, noise and light pollution.</i> Please review and amend Policy EM4 to address the Council’s concerns.</p>	<p>All comments accepted Plan will be altered to reflect that “defined town centre” is the same as Local Plan. With other parts amended accordingly.</p>
8	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<p><b>POLICY EM4: TOWN CENTRE USES</b> Development proposals including change of use (where planning permission is required) within the defined primary shopping frontage area will be supported where they meet the requirements of Local Plan Policy E117.</p>	<p>The Local plan reference should be E17 and not E117</p>	<p>Mistake noted:  Policy reference will be altered accordingly.</p>

		<p>Throughout the <b>defined town centre area</b>, proposals for change of use from A1 to A2 - A5 (where planning permission is required) will be supported where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) <b>maintain, and where feasible, enhance the street frontage, built character and street scene within its setting; and,</b></li> <li>ii) <b>enhance the town centre's vitality, viability and diversity of its offer and the overall shopping character is not undermined;</b></li> <li>iii) <b>contribute positively to the town centre as the focus of commercial and community life of the town; and,</b></li> <li>iv) <b>there is no adverse impact on residential amenity, traffic generation, noise and light pollution.</b></li> </ul>		
9	Jacky Edwards	<b>EM4</b>	Important to support local trade and try to refill shop premises as and when possible.	Noted, thank you for your comment
10	Janet Thomas	<b>EM4(iv)</b>	Keep the work out of town- especially noise and traffic.	Noted, highways and transport are not matters addressed by the Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan.
11	Colin Knight	<b>Employment General</b>	Agree	Thankyou for your comment



12	John R Thompson		Is it possible to be '...overly dependent on manufacturing? -Better than being dependant on coffee shops! Manufacturing is our future ( or should be)	Noted, thank you for your comment
----	-----------------	--	---	-----------------------------------

Theme 5: Environment

	Respondent	Policy	Comment	Response
1	Les West	ENV1	I would like to see more wildflower planting. They look great and assist wildlife corridors.	Thank you for your support. Your comments will be passed to the town council.
2	Pam Swain	ENV 1	Could the numbers ringed on Map 10 be identified in a key?	The key to the map can be seen within the evidence base for the Plan under "Natural Environment": <u>Natural habitat areas and open space list - Stonehouse, GWT</u> We will consider reproducing this information in a table in the text of the Plan. Thank you for your supportive comments
3	John R Thompson	ENV1	Pleased that view lines are to be protected.	Thank you for your support.
4	SDC Planning 38	<b>POLICY ENV2: BLUE AND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK</b> A network of connected green and blue infrastructure in Stonehouse is key to achieving some of the objectives of this plan. Our valued green and blue infrastructure is identified on map 11 and will be protected as essential connectivity corridors for recreation / leisure; access to and from the town and across the parish; and, wildlife; and in its performance in the support of biodiversity beyond specific sites and in natural flood	This policy appears to be trying to combine the value of different forms of designations into a blanket restriction over and above their current role or primary purpose.  Each specific designation, i.e. Key Wildlife Sites, Conservation Areas, Flood Plain, Local Green Space designations etc is afforded its own level of protection and in some instances these sites can perform a multiplicity of roles individually or as part of a network.  Not all sites can accommodate a multiplicity of uses without harm to their core interest e.g. a Key Wildlife Site may be damaged through some recreation activities.  It is noted that the NDP has used the Local Plan definition of Green Infrastructure in the glossary, it would be helpful if the NDP	This policy was included because of consultation evidence showing strong support for open green spaces and footpaths as a positive attribute of the town. In addition, Natural England were consulted during the policy development stage and advised in a letter of 6 January 2016 that : "Taking into consideration the policies that have been put forward, we suggest that you may want to consider having a specific policy on green infrastructure. A green infrastructure policy might for example protect existing green infrastructure within the boundary of the plan area and to promote creation of new green infrastructure if new development proposals come forward. A green infrastructure policy would promote the holistic and joined-up

		<p><b>prevention.</b> These protected areas connect designated local sites and areas identified in policies AF1 Protecting Community Facilities, ENV3 Local Green Space and ENV5 Stroudwater canal and heritage corridor</p>	<p>revised glossary to include the term “blue” in the title of the relevant definition, thus matching Policy ENV2.</p> <p>This policy should be reviewed so that it identifies the sites and the role/s it performs. It should identify how these sites could/should be managed or enhanced so that they can continue to perform the green and blue infrastructure role without significant harm being caused to their core interest</p>	<p>consideration of lots of the assets the plan intends to protect and enhance, including open space, recreational space, footpaths and cycle routes, wildlife corridors, wildlife conservation areas and the canal and riverside.”</p> <p>The policy aims to protect the network of paths and open green space in the town.</p> <p>The point that there is a difference in the functions of different sites is accepted. It is also acknowledged that recreational use is not always compatible with enhancing biodiversity.</p> <p>The title of the policy has been changed to Green Infrastructure Network as the definition of green infrastructure includes blue infrastructure (waterways, ponds etc)</p> <p>The policy will be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>‘A network of connected green and blue infrastructure in Stonehouse is key to achieving some of the objectives of this plan. Our valued green and blue infrastructure is identified on map 11.</i></p> <p><i>These corridors connect designated local sites and areas identified in policies AF1 Protecting Community Facilities, ENV3 Local Green Space and ENV5 Stroudwater canal and heritage corridor. They provide essential connectivity for recreation / leisure; access to and from the town and across the parish; and, wildlife; and support biodiversity beyond specific sites and aid natural flood prevention. The network will be enhanced and improved as the opportunity arises.</i></p> <p><i>Although not all the components of the network have statutory protection, the network</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<i>should be considered as a whole when it is likely to be affected by development.</i>
5	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>Policy ENV2 (Blue and Green Infrastructure Network)</b>	Policy should be redrafted to take into account the comments on Policy ENV3 below regarding the inclusion of Local Green Spaces at Severn Road Park Estate Green and Midland Road Park Estate Green.	See responses to ENV3 below
6	SDC Planning 39	<p><b>POLICY ENV3: LOCAL GREEN SPACE</b>  Our locally valued green spaces (green infrastructure) are identified on Map 12 and are designated as Local Green Space. These LGS (and the reason(s) for their designation) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Severn Road Park Estate Green (used for recreation and community events)</li> <li>b) Midland Road Park Estate Green (used for recreation and community events)</li> <li>c) Boakes Drive Green (used for recreation and community events and noted for important wildlife)</li> <li>d) Verney Fields (part of) (local significance due to beauty, historic landscape features, tranquillity, wildlife; a rural, recreational amenity close to town centre)</li> <li>e) Court View Ponds (important wildlife)</li> </ul>	<p>NPPF paragraph 76 enables local communities to designate Local Green Spaces in neighbourhood plans for special protection which will rule out new development on them other than in very special circumstances. Paragraph 78 states that the local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. Paragraph 77 states that Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open spaces. The designation should only be used where</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</li> <li>• the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</li> <li>• where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land”.</li> </ul> <p>Further information on LGSDs can be found under paragraphs 005 to 022 from National Planning Practice Guidance. <a href="http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/">http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/open-space-sports-and-recreation-facilities-public-rights-of-way-and-local-green-space/local-green-space-designation/</a></p> <p>We encourage you to talk to land owners to ensure the land is capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period and avoid substantive objections.</p> <p>Please ensure the evidence base of the NDP provides a robust justification for each site’s exceptional value in relation to the NPPF criteria</p>	<p>Evidence has been gathered to support each site’s inclusion in this policy and can be viewed at <a href="http://www.stonehousetowncouncil.com/the-council/stonehouse-neighbourhood-plan/neighbourhood-plan-evidence-base/local-green-space-evidence/">http://www.stonehousetowncouncil.com/the-council/stonehouse-neighbourhood-plan/neighbourhood-plan-evidence-base/local-green-space-evidence/</a></p>

		<p>These areas will be protected for the reasons and uses set out. Development proposals on or likely to impact on the sites will only be supported where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) maintain or enhance the existing use and amenity value of the site;</li> <li>ii) enhance the access to and use of the site where used for recreational purposes; and,</li> <li>iii) have no adverse impact on the landscape, habitats or biodiversity of the site or (where unavoidable) satisfactorily mitigate such impact.</li> </ul>	<p>Please ensure the evidence base of the NDP provides a robust justification for each site's exceptional value in relation to the NPPF criteria.</p>	
7	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<b>ENV2</b>	<p>In its current form the nature, role and extent of the 'Blue and Green Infrastructure Network' is unclear and appears to encompass a range of features including hedgerows, railway lines and roadside verges. The policy would benefit from a more detailed proposals map with a more specific breakdown as to the function of each area.</p>	See response to SDC planning above.
8	Colin Knight	<b>ENV2</b>	<p>Need to enhance these areas as well as protect. Areas abutting industrial areas are unattractive and scruffy. Need tree planting to soften urban edges.</p>	Thank you for your support. We agree. Your comments will be passed to the town council.
9	Pam Swain	<b>ENV2</b>	<p>Really supportive of green and blue connected infrastructure for health wellbeing of community and protecting, enhancing wildlife. All 9 policies identified under the Environment theme are crucially</p>	Thank you for your support

			important to preserving the natural beauty and heritage assets of the parish. Thank you for the detailed way they have been researched and recorded.	
10	Dean Steve Peck	<b>AF1</b>	Included in protected community areas should be the 3 greens on the Park Estate, Children play on these green areas.	As the land-owners, Stroud District Council, object to the inclusion of the Park Estate greens as Green Spaces, we have tried to reach a compromise by including the most valued and most used greens. See detailed response (Environment 12) to SDC Asset Management below.
11	Pam Swain	<b>AF1</b>	Should Doverow Woods be included in the list of community amenities to be protected?	Doverow Woods is owned by the Doverow Hill Trust and managed by the Town Council and is already well protected.
12	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>ENV3</b>	<p>The Local Green Space designations at Severn Road Park Estate Green and Midland Road Park Estate Green should be deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As a starting point it is important to note the provisions of Paragraph 77 of the NPPF which advises that a Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space and should only be used where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> It is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 78 of the NPPF then indicates the local planning policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts.</p> <p>The Assessment Management department of Stroud District Council have a number of concerns with the proposed designation of these two council owned sites as Local Green Spaces for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Insufficient evidence base to demonstrate that these sites are of particular importance to the local community and warrant the inclusion of these sites in the designation. Particularly, within the</p>	<p>Evidence has been gathered to support the proposed Local Green Space designation. The proposal is largely based on the importance of the areas to the residents of the Park Estate as recreational and green space which is easily accessible and within sight of housing.</p> <p>Although there are some outdoor play areas fairly close to some, although not all, parts of the estate, accessing them involves crossing busy roads and they are not within sight of most houses on the estate. The proximity of these green spaces to the Park Estate community and their value in the context of the estate as relatively safe, convenient and visible recreational and green space is an important reason for the designation proposal.</p> <p>Heritage assets do not need to be nationally designated to have local significance. The Park Estate's local historic significance derives from the role it played housing workers employed in the growing industrial estates as Stonehouse expanded after the World War II.</p>

			<p>evidence base there is an assertion that the Park Estate is of historic significance, however it is not subject to any statutory designations (i.e. Listed Buildings; Conservation Area) and therefore little weight should be given to this in the designation process. Furthermore, in term of local importance, the consultation responses during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan do not appear to specifically support their inclusion – there is no overwhelming level of public support. A number of other outdoor play spaces are within close proximity to these sites and therefore undermines the value put on these sites for recreational purposes.</p> <p>2) Accordingly, these sites fail to meet the relevant criteria set out in the NPPF for inclusion in the designation. Furthermore, the value of the sites is not sufficient for them to be treated on a basis consistent with policy for Green Belts.</p> <p>3) Furthermore, sufficient safeguards are in place for these green areas in the adopted Local Plan, namely Policy ES13.</p>	<p>It is part of the story of Stonehouse as it developed from a country town to a local centre for industry. Large local authority estates are no longer being built and its open design is a good example of mid twentieth century approaches to developing social housing. Historic significance is not the primary reason for proposing the designation of some parts of the Greens as Local Green Space but it is a relevant factor.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We propose that the sites do meet the relevant criteria set out in the NPPF and set out evidence to support their inclusion.</li> <li>2. The policy is in conformity with Local Plan policy ES13 which states that: “Local communities through Neighbourhood Plans shall designate Local Green Spaces which are of importance to them and are of particular local significance.”</li> </ol> <p>4 and 5. Planning consultancy advice was sought regarding the wording of the policy which is appropriate to the subject matter: Local Green Space.</p> <p>6,7 and 8. Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan Group met with Stroud District Council Asset Management Staff on 15 March 2016 to discuss the Local Green Space proposals regarding the Park Estate and were made aware of possible future estate regeneration projects (see Evidence Base for notes of meeting). As a result, the proposed designation was limited to two specific areas leaving significant areas undesignated to allow flexibility for Stroud District Council over the use of the greens in future regeneration projects.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				Therefore Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan Group believe that the proposals to designate Severn Road Park Estate Green and Midland Road Park Estate Green as Local Green Space are justified and will not amend this policy as suggested.
13	Cllr Mattie Ross	ENV3	The Local Green Space designations at Severn Road Park Estate Green and Midland Road Park Estate Green should be deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan.	District Cllr. Ross, Chair of Stroud District Council's Housing Committee attended a meeting on 15 March 2016 with Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan Group and Stroud District Council to discuss the Local Green Space proposals regarding the Park Estate. We refer Cllr. Ross to the comments given in response 10 above.
14	Janet Thomas	ENV3	Need for amenity centre along the canal. Keep green space on all list especially Boakes Drive. Need to recognise and support needs of residents adjacent to the canal when determining parking, mooring noise etc. Canal corridor good.	Thank you for your support. Your comments will be passed to the town council.
15	John R Thompson	ENV3	Essential to preserve all public green spaces	We are unable to protect all green spaces through the neighbourhood plan. We have protected the ones that our consultation revealed as the most important to people.
16	Diane Baker	ENV3	Glad to see that the Neighbourhood Plan has the greens reserved on Midland Road.	Thank you for your support
17	SDC Planning 40	<b>POLICY ENV4: PROTECTING THE HERITAGE ASSETS OF STONEHOUSE</b> Our locally valued heritage assets, including those identified in the Town Character Assessment, will be protected from adverse impact arising from their development, alteration or demolition and from	<b>Comments and recommendations from the Councils Senior Conservation Officer:</b> 1. Points (i) and (ii) do not appear to add much to either national planning policy or local planning policy. The extent to which the character and significance of heritage assets should be protected (and how this presumption should be balanced against other material planning considerations) is well established in the NPPF and national Planning Practice Guidance, and this is reflected in ES10. The wording of ES10 was scrutinised by Historic England, to ensure broad correlation with NPPF and to	ENV4 (i) and (ii) will be deleted.  The wording of the paragraph 4 of the supporting text will be amended to:  <i>"Further buildings and structures of local heritage interest may be identified. Should a list of locally identified heritage assets be developed for Stonehouse, guidance would be sought from Stroud District Council to ensure a</i>

		<p>the impact of other development proposals.</p> <p>Development proposals will only be supported where they demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) they do not compromise the character and distinctive and important features of the historic built environment;</li> <li>ii) they do not compromise the character of heritage assets and the positive elements of their setting;</li> <li>iii) they have complied with the Stonehouse Design Statement and Town Character Assessment;</li> <li>iv) where relevant, they enhance the entrance to Stonehouse via the canal; and,</li> <li>v) if within the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area (IHCA), that they have complied with the IHCA Management Proposals Supplementary Planning Document</li> </ul>	<p>avoid the use of more ambiguous terms like “compromise”.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Points (iii), (iv) and (v), by contrast, do add something locally distinctive. These are specific, measurable and clear criteria which are distinctive to Stonehouse. These are ‘material considerations’ which are particular to Stonehouse.</li> <li>3. Remove reference to “proposed changes to the Local Plan” in the last paragraph of the Justification. The Plan is adopted and the wording of ES10 and its supporting text does indeed make reference to ‘locally identified heritage assets’. This may or may not take the form of a “Local List” - SDC has yet to develop a strategy in relation to this, but it is quite unlikely that there will ever be a District-wide comprehensive survey to identify ‘locally significant heritage assets’. One mechanism though, would be for ‘local lists’ to be delivered through the NDP process. Ideally, this would mean a skeleton ‘list’ of assets would be identified and adopted along with the NDP. However, this won’t always be possible – and clearly Stonehouse is a case in point, because the emerging NDP is well advanced. It would be worth looking at the approach taken by Stroud NDP: this plan identifies a series of criteria which will be used to assess candidates for future ‘local listing’, either incrementally or as part of a comprehensive survey. This is intended to ensure that anyone (community or Council officers) carrying out a process of identifying such heritage assets in the future would be working to an agreed, consistent and locally appropriate set of criteria. It is quite likely that SDC will be advising all future NDPs to consider including such a ‘framework’ in their plan. Happy to discuss this in more detail.</li> </ol> <p>This policy seeks to protect existing areas of open space unless it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus of such spaces or a replacement facility is proposed to be provided with a net benefit to the community.</p>	<p><i>consistent and appropriate set of criteria were used.”</i></p>
--	--	--	---	--



		and IHCA Design Guide.	<p>4) The policy as drafted fails to provide any definition as to inappropriate development or any exceptions to this.</p> <p>5) Similarly, the policy as drafted is unduly restrictive and does not allow for any development or wider redevelopment opportunities that would bring about significant social and community benefits.</p> <p>6) The District Council's Housing Strategy advises that the Council has an approved budget of £15 million to build new homes in the district for the first time in over a generation and are in the process of examining all council land for opportunities to support the development of new affordable homes.</p> <p>7) The three priorities of the District Council are sheltered housing, new building and estate regeneration. These areas offer flexibility with regard to future estate regeneration projects. Any new projects will likely be of mixed type and tenure and include appropriate levels of green space which would be laid out and of a specification to meet the needs of existing and future residents.</p> <p>8) A Local Green Space designation would frustrate the ability of the District Council to bring forward regeneration projects in a comprehensive manner which would bring a wide range of social and community benefits.</p> <p>The policy should therefore be amended in light of the above representations.</p>	
18	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<b>ENV 4</b>	<p>In seeking to protect heritage assets, the policy duplicates the requirements of Local Plan ES10. However, the policy fails to include an allowance for the balancing of the public benefits which may arise from development affecting such assets. The policy should therefore be re-drafted to include such a judgement in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 132-134 and Local Plan Policy ES10(5).</p>	Policy ENV4 will be amended in line with Stroud District Council advice (see response 13 above).
19	Colin Knight	<b>ENV4</b>	Agree v important	Thank you for your support

20	Sue Bohlen		<p>Path up from Grove Farm - small corner at top left part of vineyard and path. V. Lovely spring flowers (memorial garden? called Baby Lane? ). Discuss issue of spraying fence edge.</p> <p>Verney fields - some bramble, nettle management needed to maintain and preserve</p>	<p>Thank you for your support. Your comments will be passed to the town council.</p>
21	SDC Planning 41	<p><b>POLICY ENV5: STROUDWATER CANAL AND HERITAGE CORRIDOR</b> The Cotswold Canals Trust's long-term vision of a navigable through- route to the Rivers Thames and Severn is supported. To help achieve this vision, to improve accessibility and to protect the canal and environs as a valuable local asset:</p> <p>i) The green and blue canal corridor identified on Map 13 as the land within the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area (see appendix 3: Maps, page 86) (including heritage assets and associated amenity land used for recreation adjacent to the canal) will be protected from inappropriate development which does not relate to the maintenance, use or enhancement of the canal;</p>	<p><b>Comments and recommendations from the Councils Senior Conservation Officer:</b></p> <p>4. It isn't immediately clear what the nature or extent of the "Heritage Corridor" is. The policy refers to Map 13 (p86), which depicts the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area boundary (IHCA). As a conservation area, this is a designated heritage asset, with specific statutory protections and development controls. Is the "Heritage Corridor" something else or just an alternative term for the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area? Does its boundary match that of the conservation area or does it take in more or less land? What is the purpose of the "Heritage Corridor" and how does this differ from that of the conservation area? As a descriptive term for the historic canal and its related environs, "<i>heritage corridor</i>" is quite useful and succinct – but the concern is that, by using it as a formal title, "Heritage Corridor" becomes an entity itself. But without a clearly defined status, function or extent.</p> <p>5. With reference to point (i) of this policy: this refers to the IHCA boundary, shown in Map 13, and stipulates that this area "will be protected from inappropriate development which does not relate to the maintenance, use or enhancement of the canal". This is excessively restrictive. Particularly given that the conservation area boundary extends well beyond what might be perceived as the "canal corridor" (e.g. it includes the former rail station site off Bristol Road; employment sites at Bonds Mill, Ryeford and Upper Mills; housing at Avenue Terrace), this policy as currently worded would be impractically prohibitive. Either the extent of the affected "canal corridor" needs to be more closely drawn (and its direct correlation with the IHCA boundary removed), or the scope of acceptable forms of development need to be widened. Including the term "green and blue" further muddies the water. As a</p>	<p>Policy title to be amended to: <b>"ENV5: Protecting and enhancing Stroudwater Canal."</b></p> <p>ENV5 (i) to be deleted.</p> <p>The words "<i>will be supported</i>" will be added to ENV5 (ii).</p>

		<p>ii) Opportunities to develop and improve the canal and its towpath as a travel corridor for pedestrians, mobility scooters, cyclists, and boaters;</p> <p>iii) Proposals for moorings will only be supported where they:</p> <p>a) Do not restrict access to the water by wildlife;</p> <p>b) Do not adversely impact on the biodiversity, habitats or ecology of the canal or canal-side; and,</p> <p>c) Where adverse visual or landscape impact is unavoidable, use tree and hedgerow planting where necessary (using species local to its setting) to mitigate this impact.</p> <p>iv) the provision of temporary moorings will</p>	<p>general point, this paragraph (a single sentence) is rather long and convoluted; it is not easy to read and digest.</p> <p>6. With reference to point (ii) of this policy: this sentence seems incomplete. Presumably, this type of development “...will be supported”? Or is the intention that any form of development in the ‘canal corridor’ should demonstrate that “opportunities to develop and improve the canal [...etc]” <i>have been explored / incorporated into the development proposals?</i></p> <p>7. With reference to point (iii) of this policy (particularly criterion c): Are these guidelines necessarily specific to the creation of new moorings? Might they also be applicable to other forms of acceptable development? If this is about ecological impact / biodiversity / natural character / local distinctiveness, would it be worth having a more general policy / point about canalside hard- and soft-landscaping?</p> <p>8. With reference to point (v): Local Plan policy ES11 is generally worded in a positive manner, rather than a prohibitive manner – identifying ways in which canalside and canal-related development can contribute to maintaining, restoring and regenerating the canal(s), rather than prohibiting specific forms of development or limiting what will be deemed acceptable.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>be supported where it can be demonstrated that such expansion is likely to benefit Stonehouse by means of increased tourism, commerce and leisure activity; and,</p> <p>v) development proposals along the canal route will need to meet the requirements set out in Local Plan policy ES11.</p>		
22	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<b>ENV 5</b>	<p>As drafted the policy seeks a prohibition on non-canal related development within the whole extent of the extensive canal corridor contrary to the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in the NPPF and goes beyond the requirements of Local Plan Policy ES11.</p> <p>The policy fails to provide any definition as to inappropriate development and fails to contain any criteria as to how and such landscape impact should be considered.</p> <p>The policy should therefore be redrafted to ensure it is conformity with the prevailing development plan and the requirements of NPPF paragraph 113.</p>	Policy ENV5 has been amended in line with Stroud District Council advice (see response 17 above).
23	Colin Knight	<b>ENV5</b>	<p>Canal is a major opportunity. The immediate environs (boundaries structure adjacent dev) must be enhanced to ensure it is attractive to visitors. WE also need to capitalize on the canal - pub/canoe hire etc etc - a good model is Brassknocker Basin near Bath. There is the Ship Inn Site, Wycliffe Boat House and others where such facilities could be provided. Saul Junction is another honey pot example.</p>	Thank you for your support we agree.
24	Jackie Edwards	<b>ENV 2, 3 and 5</b>	<p>Very important to the local community to keep as much green space as possible to enhance people's health and wellbeing. Good to see Green Park Estate as part of the infrastructure. ENV8 It is so important for new development to have amenity space factored in</p>	Thank you for your support.

25	SDC Planning 42	<p><b>POLICY ENV6: PROTECTING VIEWS AND VISTAS</b>                  The views and vistas important to Stonehouse (identified by the Town Character Assessment) are set out on map 14 (see appendix 3: Maps, page 87) and should be protected from any adverse impact of new development (such as detracting from or obstructing vistas and views). These views and vistas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) within Stonehouse, those of St Cyr’s Church, Nutshell Bridge and the Ocean;</li> <li>ii) from Stonehouse to the open countryside over the canal (and in particular from the Ebley Road)</li> <li>iii) from Stonehouse South, West and East to surrounding Cotswold escarpment, and to the landmarks of Selsley Common, Selsley Church, Stanley Mills, Penn Woods and Coaley PEak</li> <li>iv) to and from Stonehouse from</li> </ul>	<p>As worded this policy may be perceived at examination as being overly restrictive and unduly onerous.</p> <p>Another potential issue is the policy’s failure to account for positive change. Neighbourhood plans should strive to promote the enhancement of the local area. The term “protect” can discourage positive change that could improve and enhance the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>It would be helpful if the NDP provided more detailed information about the surveyed views and vistas so that a future decision maker could be better informed about whether/how a development would affect them.</p> <p><b>Amend policy wording to:</b>                  The views and vistas important to Stonehouse (identified by the Town Character Assessment) are set out on map 14 (see appendix 3: Maps, page 87) and should be conserved from any significant adverse impact of new development (such as detracting from or obstructing vistas and views). These views and vistas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) within Stonehouse, those of St Cyr’s Church, Nutshell Bridge and the Ocean;</li> <li>ii) from Stonehouse to the open countryside over the canal (and in particular from the Ebley Road)</li> <li>iii) from Stonehouse South, West and East to surrounding Cotswold escarpment, and to the landmarks of Selsley Common, Selsley Church, Stanley Mills, Penn Woods and Coaley PEak</li> <li>iv) to and from Stonehouse from the Doverow Hill escarpment; and,</li> <li>v) from Stonehouse to Haresfield and Standish hills to the North and East.</li> </ul> <p>Development proposals will need to demonstrate, through their design and access statement or planning statement, that their design, scale, height and massing does not adversely impact these existing views and vistas, and positively enhances them where possible.</p>	<p>The proposed change to policy wording is accepted.</p> <p>More detailed information about the surveyed views and vistas can be seen at map 14 and in the Town Character Assessment</p>
----	-----------------	---	---	---

		<p>v) the Doverow Hill escarpment; and, from Stonehouse to Haresfield and Standish hills to the North and East.</p> <p>Development proposals will need to demonstrate, through their design and access statement or planning statement, that their design, scale, height and massing does not adversely impact these existing views and vistas, and positively enhances them where possible.</p>		
26	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<b>ENV6</b>	<p>The policy seeks to protect key views and vistas contrary to established planning case law that outside of the City of London, views are not a material consideration for the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>It is considered that the policy should be reworded to refer to the setting of the identified features rather than a view of them, in order to ensure compliance with the Basic Conditions for a NP.</p>	Policy ENV6 has been amended in line with Stroud District Council advice (see response 22 above).
27	Colin Knight	<b>ENV6</b>	<p>Priority projects:- cycle network, High Street improvements canalside improvement and facilities Bristol Road Station Also v important. Also need to protect areas like the fields by Ebley Road Near Ryeford to protect the setting of the town and Ryeford.</p>	Thank you for your support. We can only protect the greenspaces that are most important to local people as shown by our consultation.
28	SDC Planning 43	<p><b>POLICY ENV7: HIGH QUALITY DESIGN</b></p> <p>Development proposals will be supported where they have demonstrated through a Design and Access Statement or Planning Statement that they are of high quality design,</p>	<p>Criterion ix is in conflict with the requirements of Policy H6.</p> <p>Please see comments and recommendations 29 relating to parking spaces.</p> <p>Please resolve the conflict between NDP policies having regard to local and national policy relating to parking standards.</p>	Policy ENV6 has been amended in line with Stroud District Council advice (see response 22 above).

		<p>complementing the local vernacular, will enhance visual amenity and minimise any adverse impacts on the built environment.</p> <p>They should take into account the Stonehouse Town Character Assessment, Stonehouse Design Statement, Stroud Design Guide and the Gloucestershire Manual for Streets, and particular attention should be paid to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) ensuring that the size, height, density, scale and location of the development respect its setting and the character of the area;</li> <li>ii) ensuring that materials and design of the development are sympathetic and complementary to its setting and character of the area;</li> <li>iii) ensuring that it is designed in such a way as to minimise its impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding landscape, on views of the proposed development and</li> </ul>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>on the natural environment and mitigating any adverse impact using landscaping where necessary;</p> <p>iv) opportunities to provide habitats for insects and bird nesting;</p> <p>v) opportunities for 'greening' the built environment through natural planting of shrubbery and trees;</p> <p>vi) preserving or enhancing the Conservation Area and heritage assets in the parish;</p> <p>vii) using Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to minimise the impact of surface water flooding and wider flood risk;</p> <p>viii) ensuring that footpaths, cycle paths and access roads throughout the development are provided to the standards set out in the Gloucestershire Manual for Street to ensure good and safe access to all dwellings for</p>		
--	--	---	--	--



		<p>ix) residents, visitors, delivery and service vehicles and the emergency services; and, ensuring that adequate car parking and secure cycle storage is provided in accordance with Local Plan policy E112.</p>		
29	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>Policy ENV7 (High Quality Design)</b>	<p>The policy should be redrafted as it seeks to set out the requirements for the validation and determination of planning application which is the responsibility of the District Council as the Local Planning Authority. The District Council are the determining authority for planning applications and will set out what documentation is required to support applications.</p> <p>The policy as drafted presents an inconsistency between the operation of this policy and Policy H6 which requires compliance with a parking standard at odds with Policy E112 in the adopted Local Plan. The wording therefore needs to be redrafted accordingly.</p>	Stroud District Council have only commented on one conformity issue (re Local Plan policy E112) with regard to ENV7 which we will work to resolve; therefore the policy will not be largely redrafted.
30	Pegasus on behalf of Robert Hitchins Ltd	<b>ENV7</b>	<p>There is inconsistency between the operation of this policy and policy H6 which require compliance with a parking standard at odds with that contained in Local Plan Policy E112.</p> <p>The policy should be redrafted accordingly</p>	We are seeking advice on this point
31	Colin Knight	<b>ENV7</b>	Great local/vernacular architecture. WE draw on need to protect local identity.	Thank you for your comment
32	Pegasus on behalf of SDC Asset Management	<b>Policy ENV8 (Provision of Private Outdoor Amenity Space in New Developments)</b>	<p>The policy should be redrafted as it seeks to set out the requirements for the validation and determination of planning applications which is the responsibility of the District Council as the Local Planning Authority. The District Council are the determining authority for planning applications and will set out what documentation is required to support applications.</p>	Stroud District Council did not comment on this policy so we assume that it is in conformity with the Local Plan and do not intend to redraft it.
33	Pegasus on behalf of	<b>ENV8</b>	The policy should be redrafted as it seeks to set out the requirements for the validation and determination of planning	Stroud District Council did not comment on this policy so we assume that it is in conformity

	Robert Hitchins Ltd		applications which is the remit of the District Council. The District Council are the determining authority for planning applications and will set out what documentation is required to support applications	with the Local Plan and do not intend to redraft it.
34	Jackie Edwards	<b>ENV8</b>	It is so important for new development to have amenity space factored in.	Thank you for your support
35	GCC	<b>General Comment</b>	<p>We are minded to agree with the screening exercise that determined that neither an SEA nor HRA is necessary to be produced to inform and consider the details of the NDP. It is good to see a map (9) of the local Key Wildlife Sites which picks up on a previous recommendation we made. Map 10 produced by GCER usefully shows natural habitats and open space plus Map 11 indicating blue and green infrastructure with Map 12 revealing local green spaces (existing &amp; proposed).</p> <p>Theme 5 has an aim with objectives that include protection and enhancement for biodiversity and green spaces which is welcomed. The wording of the associated policies ENV1, ENV2 &amp; ENV3 are agreeable for helping to achieve the aims and objectives. Perhaps in ENV3 at part (III) the word 'habitats' is not strictly necessary and could be deleted (alternatively change word 'biodiversity' to 'species').</p> <p>Under the Review of the Plan on page 74 the indicators for ENV1, ENV2 and ENV3 are reasonable.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Policy ENV3 will be amended by deleting "habitats" from (iii).
36	GCC	<b>Archaeology Comments</b>	The only additional comment to those made previously in March is that the title of Map 13 is misleading as it only shows designated heritage assets. There are numerous further historic buildings and archaeological sites within the parish that are also heritage assets. Information regarding these assets can be located in the Gloucestershire Historic Environment Record.	<p>Title of Map 13 to be changed to: "<i>Designated Heritage Assets</i>"</p> <p>The justification for ENV4: Protecting the Heritage Assets of Stonehouse refers to heritage assets "whether designated or not" and to "buildings of local heritage interest...not protected by statutory designation" making it clear that the term heritage assets includes those which are not designated.</p> <p>Data from the Gloucestershire Historic Environment Record has been obtained and will be added to the Stonehouse Neighbourhood Plan evidence base.</p>

Priority Projects

	Respondent	Policy	Comment	Response
1	SDC Planning 44	<p><b>POLICY PP1: PRIORITY PROJECTS FOR COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDING</b></p> <p>Developer contributions which are generated from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which are required as a result of negotiations (with regard to planning obligations) or CIL (through the local authority adopted CIL, where relevant and feasible), should contribute towards the priority projects for CIL funding identified and periodically reviewed and updated by Stonehouse Town Council. Infrastructure projects identified during the development of the Neighbourhood Plan (Appendix 1: Priority projects for CIL funding) will inform Stonehouse Town Council's list of priority projects for CIL funding.</p> <p>The use of CIL receipts awarded to the Town Council will be considered on the basis of the priority projects for CIL funding list, appropriate timing in terms of the use of the funding and their deliverability (for example, whether the total amount of funding required to deliver the project is in place).</p>	<p>This is not a land use policy and the text presents factual errors relating to CIL and Section 106 contributions. We believe the highlighted section meant to say: <i>"Developer contributions which are generated from the S106 which are required as a result of negotiations (with regard to planning obligations)"...</i></p> <p>The contents of policy PP1 should not be presented as a policy but rather as a statement of intent, which could form part of a new section of the NDP focused on <i>"How the Town Council will help deliver the plan"</i>, as was the case with the Stroud Town Centre NDP.</p> <p>There is also scope for the Town Council to simplify this section by focusing more on an explanation of how the list of priority projects has been created, how it will be maintained and updated and where it will be made available to the public, rather than focusing on the intricacies of where the funding is coming from.</p>	<p>We accept that this is not a landuse issue and the policy will be deleted. A chapter on priority projects will be added.</p>
2	John Robinson	Priority projects	I strongly support the re-opening of the railway station on the Gloucester - Bristol line.	Thank you for your support

3	Colin Knight	Priority projects	Cycle network High Street improvements Canal side improvements and facilities Bristol Road station	Thank you for your suggestions.
---	--------------	-------------------	---	---------------------------------