

**Public Consultation Record**

**for the**

**BISLEY-WITH-LYPIATT VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT**

**April 2008 to March 2010**

## **RECORD OF THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT FOR THE BISLEY-WITH-LYPIATT VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENT**

The first step in the development of the Village Design Statement was to select a format for the report, based on work completed by other towns/villages. Following guidance from Stroud District Council, the Cottenham Village Design Statement format was adopted by the Steering Group as a useful model to follow.

### **Initial Public Consultation To Obtain Residents' Views:**

Public Meetings were then arranged in April/May 2008, in order to identify the key issues that were important to Residents. These meetings consisted of a short presentation on the purpose of a Village Design Statement, followed by group workshops to discuss and capture what was considered to be important by the Residents. To aid the discussions, the categories of "Housing & Built Environment", "Natural Environment & Landscape", "Highways" and "Economy" were used. A Public Meeting was held in each of the 3 main villages in the Parish.

The number of Residents attending each meeting varied (Bisley = 39, Eastcombe = 10, Oakridge = 9) but useful discussions were held and similar issues were generally identified by the 3 villages. The discussion group comments were recorded on flip charts, and some individuals provided their comments by filling in a table. The comments collected were collated, and the Steering Group then used this information to draft some VDS Guidelines to reflect the Residents' views. The table used to collate the information from the Public Meetings is presented in Appendix A.

Guidance on these draft proposals was then sought from Stroud District Council.

### **Mid Term Public Consultation To Check That The Residents' Views Were Being Correctly Represented:**

The Village Design Statement report and draft Guidelines were then developed and in September 2009 further Public Consultation was undertaken, to check whether the Steering Group had correctly interpreted the issues raised by Residents during the Public Meetings, whether there was general support for the proposed VDS Guidelines, and whether there were any other significant issues that needed to be included. This time the Public Consultation was undertaken by presenting displays at the Bisley Village Fete, the Oakridge Village Show, the Lamb Inn in Eastcombe and the Eastcombe Women's Institute. The draft VDS Report and Guidelines were also put onto the Parish Council's website for Public Comment.

Appendix B presents the draft VDS Guidelines that were used for this phase of the Public Consultation. The responses collected were collated onto a table, which is presented in Appendix C. This table also contains a record of the Steering Group's responses to the information collected.

Guidance on these revised draft proposals was again sought from Stroud District Council.

### **Final Public Consultation To Give All Residents The Opportunity To Comment On The Proposals:**

The Village Design Statement report and the draft Guidelines were then developed further, and in March 2010 the final comprehensive Public Consultation was undertaken. The method of consultation used was to send a Questionnaire to every Household in the Parish, so that every Resident was given the opportunity to see what was proposed, to register their level of support/opposition to each individual proposal, to provide written feedback on the proposals if required, and to identify any issues that had not been included in the proposals.

To back up the Questionnaire, further information was placed on the Parish Council's website, and a 2 hour surgery was advertised for face to face discussions should they be required. A total of 4 Residents took the opportunity to drop into the surgery.

The response rate was considered to be good, with an average return rate of 17% (16% for Bisley, 14% for Eastcombe and 22% for Oakridge). The views expressed by the 3 villages were generally very similar, and for most proposals there was clear evidence of support from the Residents. The responses collected were collated onto a table, which is presented in Appendix D. This table also contains a record of the Steering Group's responses to the information collected, and it shows where relevant changes were made to the VDS document.

The VDS document was then given to Stroud District Council for further comment, prior to its submission to be considered for adoption by the Council. Appendix E contains a record of the final changes made.

**Supporting Art Project: “Bisley Future Visions”:**

In 2009 the artists’ group “Walking the Land” worked with Thomas Keble School to improve local children’s understanding of their environment, and from this Bisley with Lypiatt Parish Council commissioned local artist Dominic Thomas to collaborate with 6 teenagers from the school specifically to address the Bisley and Miserden Village Design Statements.

The project involved a series of walks in the landscape, visits to organisations such as The Green Shop, and meetings in parts of the Bisley and Miserden communities - such as Whiteway Colony - that historically have influenced local life in different ways.

From their photographs, landscape sketches, drawings, and discussions, the 6 self selected young people decided to make a short CD / Film. This paints a picture of what these typical youngsters felt life might be like in Bisley in the future. In 4 minutes it illustrates some young people’s worst fears, but also happily the opportunities that imagination and invention, design and science, they think could bring to their future. The film was shown at the Public Meetings.

“Bisley Future Visions” can be seen via the link on [www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk](http://www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk).

The art project was funded by Gloucestershire Rural Community Council, Awards for All Big Lottery Programme, and Gloucestershire Digital Arts Forum.

**APPENDIX A:**

**RECORD OF INFORMATION FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS**  
**(April & May 2008)**

**COLLATION OF INFORMATION FROM THE FIRST PHASE OF THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION - BISLEY VILLAGE**

<b>BISLEY: HOUSING &amp; BUILT ENVIRONMENT</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts No. of Public Signed In = 39; Head Count ~60)</b>	<b>Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals (3 people returned comments)</b>	<b>Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments</b>
Style of Buildings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SDC Bisley Conservation Area policy document.</li> <li>• Maintain the heart of the Village</li> <li>• Varied.</li> <li>• Better developments merge new with old.</li> <li>• Expensive to build in the old style.</li> <li>• Incorporate features in new build to reduce cost and encourage sustainability?</li> <li>• Based on historical context; not completely new.</li> <li>• No large houses with tiny gardens.</li> <li>• Bisley is beautiful. The vernacular should be respected; traditional features should be incorporated into new build.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bisley could have some interesting modern designs as part of its architectural mix.</li> <li>• Should be in keeping with existing Cotswold natural stone, although reconstituted tiles are now acceptable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Bisley Conservation Area Policy Document</i></li> <li>• <i>Maintain the heart of the Village</i></li> <li>• <i>Better developments merge new with old.</i></li> <li>• <i>Incorporate features in new build to reduce cost and encourage sustainability?</i></li> <li>• <i>The vernacular should be respected; traditional features should be incorporated into new build.</i></li> </ul>
Listed Buildings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General regulations are draconian and lack common sense.</li> <li>• Small alterations are difficult.</li> <li>• More flexibility required to adapt buildings for modern requirements.</li> <li>• Buildings have to grow and adapt.</li> <li>• Issues with interpretation of visual intrusiveness for energy conservation items.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>More flexibility required to adapt buildings for modern requirements.</i></li> <li>• <i>Buildings have to grow and adapt.</i></li> <li>• <i>Issues with interpretation of visual intrusiveness for energy conservation items.</i></li> </ul>
Materials Used In Buildings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sources of stone now depleted. Reconstituted stone and slates being used?</li> <li>• Use traditional materials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Use traditional materials.</i></li> </ul>
Setting Of Buildings?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be respected, especially where listed.</li> </ul>	
More Development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider more dense housing, as the old centre of the village, with allotments or public space further out.</li> <li>• To grow, could expand the envelope or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No expansion of the existing village planning envelope, only infilling with some affordable housing. Not to make existing village bigger, or it will lose its</li> </ul>	

	develop in gardens etc in the village.	character and close sense of community.	
Affordable Housing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing is necessary.</li> <li>• Make planning consent easier for rented properties.</li> <li>• Small parcels of land for small units; more affordable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Affordable housing is necessary.</i></li> <li>• <i>Make planning consent easier for rented properties.</i></li> <li>• <i>Small parcels of land for small units; more affordable.</i></li> </ul>
Holiday Homes?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discourage.</li> </ul>	
Second Homes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Empty houses.</li> <li>• Take up valuable space; often the best houses.</li> <li>• No input to the community.</li> <li>• No economic benefit.</li> <li>• Inflate prices.</li> <li>• Tax is the answer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discourage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Discourage.</i></li> <li>• <i>Empty houses.</i></li> <li>• <i>No input to the community.</i></li> <li>• <i>No economic benefit.</i></li> <li>• <i>Inflate prices.</i></li> </ul>
Range of Housing Unit Sizes (eg. For older people)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough small units for young and old.</li> <li>• Small units could be built in gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need houses for first time buyers: ie. small houses, cheaper.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Not enough small units for young and old.</i></li> <li>• <i>Need houses for first time buyers: ie. small houses, cheaper.</i></li> </ul>
Energy Efficient Building Design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem with energy efficiency with the older housing stock.</li> <li>• Secondary glazing better than double glazing for listed buildings.</li> <li>• Visual obtrusiveness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> </ul>	
Renewable Energy (Wind Power, Solar Water Heating, Photovoltaic Electricity Generation)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compromise on old buildings ? (solar tiles, thermal, rainwater collection).</li> <li>• Wind power and photovoltaic not economic?</li> <li>• Wind turbines a possibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good sense for decision on Over Court panels.</li> <li>• Rainwater harvesting in all new buildings.</li> <li>• Support renewable energy.</li> </ul>	
Designing in Land for Home Food Production?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments valued.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viable/thriving allotment; needs traditional hedging between plots &amp; managed paths. Make more inviting. Currently feels a losing battle.</li> <li>• Support more allotments and land for cultivation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Allotments valued.</i></li> </ul>

Miscellaneous Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land covenanted to the village should not be taken by SDC.</li> <li>• Need more public space for children: Feoffees land, unused allotment land?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School has an allotment?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Need more public space for children: Feoffees land, unused allotment land?</i></li> </ul>
----------------------	--	--	---

<b>BISLEY: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT &amp; LANDSCAPE</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts</b>	<b>Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals</b>	<b>Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments</b>
What Landscapes Are Valued?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feeling of space.</li> <li>• No noise but the sounds of the countryside; calming.</li> <li>• Flowers in hayfields.</li> <li>• Trees a great benefit.</li> <li>• Village compact but miles of countryside.</li> <li>• Streams, springs, wells.</li> <li>• Variety of landscapes.</li> <li>• Uninterrupted views. (Unprotected?)</li> <li>• Want landscape to stay the same.</li> <li>• Valued sites which need protecting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Toadsmoor Valley.</li> <li>- Sapperton Valley</li> <li>- Battlescombe</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Trees were cut down? - don't want that to happen again.</li> <li>• Churchyard excellent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments.</li> <li>• Wells.</li> <li>• Views.</li> <li>• Valley walk wet meadows) past Jilly's.</li> <li>• Please let the field next to the Village Hall remain a field.</li> <li>• Trees within the WI Hall site should be pollarded and responsible husbandry exercised. (Should not rely on adjacent properties to pay for remedial work).</li> <li>• Landscapes sympathetic to the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Variety of landscapes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Uninterrupted views. (Unprotected?)</i></li> <li>• <i>Want landscape to stay the same.</i></li> <li>• <i>Valued sites which need protecting:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Toadsmoor Valley.</i></li> <li>- <i>Sapperton Valley</i></li> <li>- <i>Battlescombe</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Biodiversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent flora and fauna.</li> <li>• Roadside verges.</li> <li>• Lots of biodiversity. Deer, badgers &amp; squirrels in gardens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can farm shop become organic?</li> <li>• Tree planting as habitat, shelter, food source, shade.</li> <li>• Support biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Support biodiversity.</i></li> </ul>
Dry Stone Walls?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to maintain dry stone walls.</li> <li>• Local workshop for maintaining walls?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain/improve/restore.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Important to maintain dry stone walls.</i></li> <li>• <i>Local workshop for maintaining walls?</i></li> </ul>
Hedgerows?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be good if they were layed.</li> <li>• Should not be flailed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain/improve/restore.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Would be good if they were layed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Should not be flailed.</i></li> </ul>
Footpaths? Light Pollution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lots of footpaths; give good access to the countryside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain/improve/restore.</li> <li>• Light pollution: Little/none - keep it that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Lots of footpaths; give good access to the countryside.</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good network of footpaths, well marked.</li> <li>• Overgrown, but ok.</li> <li>• Fairly well maintained.</li> <li>• Dog gates would be useful.</li> <li>• Footpaths poor; Wysis way. Too many styles. Nettles Dog gates too small.</li> <li>• There are no street lights, but security lights are too bright.</li> <li>• No light pollution; stars are wonderful. Security lights a problem.</li> <li>• Reduce brightness of security lights, and all night. (Put a plea in the Newsletter).</li> </ul>	way.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Good network of footpaths, well marked.</i></li> <li>• <i>There are no street lights, but security lights are too bright.</i></li> <li>• <i>Light pollution: Little/none - keep it that way.</i></li> </ul>
Household Waste (Re-Cycling)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council don't take much, but collections are reliable.</li> <li>• Cardboard bank.</li> <li>• Local recycling of kitchen waste.</li> <li>• Good weekly collection service by SDC.</li> <li>• Refuse collectors are helpful.</li> <li>• Village composting excellent.</li> <li>• Need lids on boxes; litter blows out of boxes, and the collection vehicles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collect cardboard.</li> <li>• Compost Club has been a huge success. Should be adopted by the Parish Council for the use of all inhabitants.</li> <li>• More recycling if possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Cardboard bank.</i></li> <li>• <i>Local recycling of kitchen waste.</i></li> <li>• <i>Village composting excellent.</i></li> </ul>
Miscellaneous Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more bins.</li> <li>• Dog bins need emptying.</li> <li>• Litter from cars.</li> <li>• Litter on the verges a problem.</li> <li>• Waste bags attract foxes?</li> <li>• Test water from the wells to see if fit for drinking</li> <li>• Too many overhead cables; spoil the views.</li> <li>• Trees need managing around the church; block the view.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pen "common" area for general recreation. There's no space in Bisley like Eastcombe's pitch/play area in terms of green space to run around. Every play space is organised, controlled, managed and enclosed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Litter on the verges a problem.</i></li> <li>• <i>Too many overhead cables; spoil the views.</i></li> </ul>

BISLEY: HIGHWAYS			
Issue	Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts	Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals	Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments
Reasons For Travel?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work</li> <li>• School</li> <li>• Shopping</li> <li>• Doctor</li> <li>• Entertainment</li> <li>• Children to play area/clubs in Bussage</li> <li>• Socialising</li> <li>• To see countryside</li> </ul>		
Opportunities For Reducing The Amount Of Travel?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilities in village</li> <li>• Car share schemes</li> <li>• Bus with cycle racks</li> <li>• Community bus; cover several villages?</li> <li>• Free school buses; too expensive for families with lots of children.</li> <li>• Safe bicycle routes.</li> <li>• Cycle path to Eastcombe/Bussage</li> <li>• Too dangerous to cycle to school.</li> <li>• Roads too narrow for cycle lanes.</li> <li>• Public transport not an option.</li> <li>• Too few buses; timetable not planned for college or work.</li> <li>• Existing Tesco bus.</li> <li>• Use shops in village.</li> <li>• Night bus; has been stopped.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car share where possible</li> <li>• Village minibus, possibly shared with other villages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Community bus; cover several villages?</i></li> <li>• <i>Free school buses; too expensive for families with lots of children.</i></li> <li>• <i>Safe bicycle routes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Roads too narrow for cycle lanes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Too few buses; timetable not planned for college or work.</i></li> <li>• <i>Night bus; has been stopped.</i></li> </ul>
Speed Limits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Speed is an issue for many in Bisley; ask for speed restrictions.</li> <li>• National limits imposed through village - 20mph?</li> <li>• Extend Stancombe limit into village.</li> <li>• More spot checks on speed needed.</li> <li>• No good having a speed limit if it can't be enforced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpaths on principal roads are visible deterrent to speeding &amp; awareness of passing through a village.</li> <li>• 20mph maximum in village. Grading to 30mph &amp; 40mph signs, so not from 60mph to 20mph in one step.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Speed is an issue for many in Bisley; ask for speed restrictions.</i></li> <li>• <i>National limits imposed through village - 20mph?</i></li> <li>• <i>No good having a speed limit if it can't be enforced.</i></li> <li>• <i>Gateways to village.</i></li> <li>• <i>Use signs that flash speed.</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No history of accidents.</li> <li>• Some people can't get insurance because of the number of accidents?</li> <li>• Concerns over pinch point by the bear.</li> <li>• Traffic jams outside George Stores.</li> <li>• Could slow traffic; considered to be positive.</li> <li>• Gateways to village.</li> <li>• Trucks accessing Calfway Lane?</li> <li>• Use signs that flash speed.</li> <li>• Speed cameras</li> <li>• T shirts "20 is plenty" for people to wear.</li> <li>• Lollipop Lady at school times.</li> </ul>		
Road Signs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some want more signs; some disagree.</li> <li>• Taking some signs away could be more effective.</li> <li>• Less road signs (from one group).</li> <li>• Signage to stop lorries needs to be further along.</li> <li>• Street names for Hay Hedge Lane?, Back Lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rationalise all current road signs to see if still needed.</li> <li>• Pictorial signs showing no lorries in village (English not always understood).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Rationalise all current road signs to see if still needed.</i></li> </ul>
Street Lighting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Happy to be without street lighting; peaceful and saves energy.</li> <li>• Do not want street lights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain as is.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Do not want street lights. Maintain as is.</i></li> </ul>
Footpaths?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chop down nettles.</li> <li>• Trying to get pavement to join Little close with Bearsfield. (GCC coming up with funding?)</li> <li>• Bearsfield footpath being damaged by tree roots.</li> <li>• No metal kissing gates.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cheltenham Roads – Stroud Road.</li> <li>• Make safer crossing from Stirrup Cup to Van der Breen Street; traffic calming?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Trying to get pavement to join Little close with Bearsfield. (GCC coming up with funding?)</i></li> <li>• <i>No metal kissing gates.</i></li> </ul>
Miscellaneous Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking on pavements an issue. Causes problems for the elderly and people with pushchairs.</li> <li>• Create One Way routes through the village?</li> <li>• No logic to bus times (eg. For trains).</li> <li>• Mini roundabout outside the Stirrup Cup.</li> <li>• Pelican crossing.</li> <li>• Change priorities coming into village from Stroud Road: make Mare's Lane a priority, or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle tracks along roads for greater safety, to calm traffic.</li> <li>• Village gateways at entrances to the village to slow traffic (like Water Lane).</li> <li>• 20mph light up signs (like at Camp) to slow traffic.. At present traffic sometimes travels at high speed along the high street and other streets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Parking on pavements an issue. Causes problems for the elderly and people with pushchairs.</i></li> <li>• <i>Create One Way routes through the village?</i></li> <li>• <i>No logic to bus times (eg. For trains).</i></li> <li>• <i>Change priorities coming into village from Stroud Road: make</i></li> </ul>

	<p>change junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mirror opposite lane from calfway lane, opposite Manor Street.</li> <li>• Toll system.</li> <li>• Timing of school leaving times causing a problem. Come out of Bisley School exactly when traffic from TK is coming through the village (they leave school 15 minutes earlier).</li> <li>• Should be a weight restriction for HGVs through the village.</li> </ul>		<p><i>Mare's Lane a priority, or change junction.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Mirror opposite lane from calfway lane, opposite Manor Street.</i></li> <li>• <i>Timing of school leaving times causing a problem. Come out of Bisley School exactly when traffic from TK is coming through the village (they leave school 15 minutes earlier).</i></li> <li>• <i>Should be a weight restriction for HGVs through the village.</i></li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

<b>BISLEY: ECONOMY</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts</b>	<b>Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals</b>	<b>Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments</b>
Location Of Employment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local School major employer. Important for the economy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bisley has a good mix. Keeps it a thriving, dynamic community.</li> <li>In workshops at edge of village and working at home.</li> </ul>	
Small Workshops?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Farm buildings converted into small units.</li> <li>Planning can discourage such enterprises. Proven need in Bisley.</li> <li>Provision of new buildings a priority. Visually compatible with existing buildings.</li> <li>Consultation about identifying possible small sites suitable for business units. Ask SDC to include in the Local Plan.</li> <li>Employment for young people (apprenticeships) will come if there is more diversity in the area.</li> <li>Light development of small workshops to attract more employment in the village.</li> <li>Must create employment, or will become a "retirement village".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support small workshops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Support small workshops.</i></li> <li><i>Farm buildings converted into small units.</i></li> <li><i>Planning can discourage such enterprises. Proven need in Bisley.</i></li> <li><i>Provision of new buildings a priority. Visually compatible with existing buildings.</i></li> <li><i>Consultation about identifying possible small sites suitable for business units. Ask SDC to include in the Local Plan.</i></li> <li><i>Light development of small workshops to attract more employment in the village.</i></li> </ul>
Local Production Of Renewable Energy (including bio-mass)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve woodland management and logs for fuel.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Micro incinerator for whole Parish: Bisley too small by itself.</li> <li>If wind turbine, careful siting. Any scheme should demonstrate direct benefit to villagers.</li> <li>Support local production of renewable energy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Improve woodland management and logs for fuel.</i></li> </ul>
Support For Existing Local Businesses?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to use the local Post Office.</li> <li>Shop closed at lunchtime, and closes too early for those commuting to work.</li> <li>Village services Map - Website &amp; Notice Board?</li> <li>Is there a Business rate rebate for local businesses, to encourage start-ups?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footpath from village to Green Shop.</li> <li>Make footpath to Farm Shop inviting/usable for villagers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Artisan &amp; Craftsman workshops.</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Artisan &amp; Craftsman workshops.</li> </ul>		
Miscellaneous Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adult education courses/skills courses.</li> <li>• Small workshops on starting allotments/machinery use.</li> <li>• Young allotmenters workshop.</li> <li>• Community rotavator.</li> <li>• Tea Shop needed; perhaps one of the Pubs would open one.</li> <li>• Child Care is a problem; need a Nursery.</li> <li>• After Schools Clubs; need fully qualified person.</li> <li>• Dual use for WI Hall?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Tea Shop needed; perhaps one of the Pubs would open one.</i></li> <li>• <i>Child Care is a problem; need a Nursery.</i></li> </ul>

**COLLATION OF INFORMATION FROM THE FIRST PHASE OF THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION - EASTCOMBE VILLAGE**

<b>EASTCOMBE: HOUSING &amp; BUILT ENVIRONMENT</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts (No. of Public Signed In = 10; Head Count = 10)</b>	<b>Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals (4 people returned comments)</b>	<b>Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments</b>
Style of Buildings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New housing vernacular style means pastiche?</li> <li>• Excellence within its own period absolutely essential – use high quality modern architecture?</li> <li>• Hideous pastiche – people are frightened?. Pressure from local planners?</li> <li>• Get an architect designed home, then the Residents should support it?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No 3 storey houses.</li> <li>• Use stone facing.</li> <li>• Roof pitches must be correct.</li> <li>• No flat roofs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Conservation Area requirements?</i></li> <li>• <i>Excellence within its own period absolutely essential – use high quality modern architecture?</i></li> <li>• <i>No 3 storey houses.</i></li> </ul>
Materials Used In Buildings?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More stone, less render.</li> </ul>	
Setting Of Buildings?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not be too prominent.</li> </ul>	
More Development?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building line should be increased to accommodate affordable housing on the Bisley side.</li> <li>• Worried that infill will cause Village to become cluttered, with no green spaces.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield only.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Building line should be increased to accommodate affordable housing on the Bisley side.</i></li> <li>• <i>Worried that infill will cause Village to become cluttered, with no green spaces.</i></li> </ul>
Affordable Housing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome affordable housing. More research needed.</li> <li>• Sufficient affordable housing in Bussage?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Welcome affordable housing. More research needed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Sufficient affordable housing in Bussage?</i></li> </ul>
Holiday Homes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second homes/holiday lets generate local income and employment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not desirable, but difficult to enforce regulation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Second homes/holiday lets generate local income and employment.</i></li> </ul>
Second Homes?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not desirable, but difficult to enforce regulation.</li> </ul>	
Range of Housing Unit Sizes (eg. for older people)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep extensions in proportion. Clarify planning law and ensure that it is enforced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small/bungalow housing for 1<sup>st</sup> time buyers and elderly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Keep extensions in proportion. Clarify planning law and ensure that it is enforced.</i></li> <li>• <i>Small/bungalow housing for 1<sup>st</sup></i></li> </ul>

			<i>time buyers and elderly.</i>
Energy Efficient Building Design?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underground/turf roofed buildings with planning permission?</li> <li>• Help older properties install renewable/insulation in a sensitive manner.</li> <li>• Contemporary buildings to very high eco-efficiency?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solar panels.</li> <li>• Insulation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Help older properties install renewable/insulation in a sensitive manner.</i></li> <li>• <i>Solar panels.</i></li> <li>• <i>Insulation.</i></li> </ul>
Renewable Energy (Wind Power, Solar Water Heating, Photovoltaic Electricity Generation)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solar panels can be fitted sensitively. It matters which way they face.</li> <li>• Log burners = local wood production.</li> <li>• Local woods could provide wood chip for biofuel.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Solar panels can be fitted sensitively. It matters which way they face.</i></li> <li>• <i>Log burners = local wood production.</i></li> <li>• <i>Local woods could provide wood chip for biofuel.</i></li> </ul>
Designing in Land for Home Food Production?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments part of Enclosure. PC hold titles.</li> <li>• More enquiries for allotments in Eastcombe than anywhere else.</li> <li>• More allotments down Accommodation Lane.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grow vegetables: allotments, sheds, greenhouses.</li> <li>• Need more allotments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Allotments supported.</i></li> </ul>
Gardens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve gardens. Conflict with building line; no distinction in rural/urban gardens?</li> </ul>		
Misc Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial support for older properties?</li> <li>• Village Green very important.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Village Green very important.</i></li> </ul>
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Squatters built where they could, with big gardens to sustain themselves.</li> <li>• Village green is unclaimed common land gifted to the Parish?</li> <li>• Few public green spaces – no titles.</li> <li>• Geologically different from Bisley.</li> </ul>		

<b>EASTCOMBE: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT &amp; LANDSCAPE</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts</b>	<b>Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals</b>	<b>Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments</b>
What Landscapes Are Valued?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toadsmoor Valley - naturally secluded, diverse ambiance, plenty of wildlife, never intensively farmed.</li> <li>• Picturesque views. Open fields.</li> <li>• Water important (streams, river etc).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stonewalls, fields, woods, small fields, stone buildings.</li> <li>• Open views: less "weed" trees.</li> <li>• Would like to celebrate the social and communal spaces. The village green is a barren space rather than the focus for the village. The playground seems rather bleak much of the time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Toadsmoor Valley - naturally secluded, diverse ambiance, plenty of wildlife, never intensively farmed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Picturesque views. Open fields.</i></li> <li>• <i>Water important (streams, river etc).</i></li> </ul>
Biodiversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diverse range of landscapes.</li> <li>• Local people very aware of wildlife, which is valued.</li> <li>• Threats from unmanaged woodlands. Obscured views; ash, sycamore.</li> <li>• Threat from Himalayan Balsam</li> <li>• Water meadows - fields abandoned.</li> <li>• Deer are becoming a threat to the landscape.</li> <li>• Bat boxes – House Martins?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage.</li> <li>• Mow verges, but not in spring &amp; early summer.</li> <li>• Habitats should be developed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Threats from unmanaged woodlands. Obscured views; ash, sycamore.</i></li> <li>• <i>Threat from Himalayan Balsam</i></li> <li>• <i>Deer are becoming a threat to the landscape.</i></li> <li>• <i>Mow verges, but not in spring &amp; early summer.</i></li> </ul>
Dry Stone Walls?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinctive feature.</li> <li>• All walls important.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be maintained, and vegetation cleared at their base. Treat stumps.</li> <li>• Encourage people to have dry stone walls. Train them to build them?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Distinctive feature.</i></li> <li>• <i>All walls important.</i></li> <li>• <i>Should be maintained, and vegetation cleared at their base. Treat stumps.</i></li> </ul>
Hedgerows?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hedgerows - more bats, dormice.</li> <li>• Do not flay hedges.</li> <li>• Lay hedges if possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be mixed.</li> <li>• Only cut in Spring, before birds nest.</li> <li>• Yes, especially for bird life.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Do not flay hedges.</i></li> <li>• <i>Lay hedges if possible.</i></li> <li>• <i>Should be mixed.</i></li> <li>• <i>Only cut in Spring, before birds nest.</i></li> </ul>
Footpaths? Light Pollution?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are lots of footpaths, but they should be well maintained.</li> <li>• Footpaths are very important. Need to be maintained. One or two are overgrown, or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Footpaths are very important. Need to be maintained.</i></li> <li>• <i>Too many safety lights; too bright and intrusive. Not shaded enough.</i></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>very muddy.</li> <li>Too many safety lights; too bright and intrusive. Not shaded enough.</li> <li>Would not like to see more street lighting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Would not like to see more street lighting.</i></li> </ul>
Household Waste (Re-Cycling)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SDC not doing enough recycling.</li> <li>Carry out a survey to baseline how many people recycle compost.</li> <li>Minimise waste by refusing packaging.</li> <li>Community composting. Food waste.</li> <li>Bisley Parish waste policy?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cardboard recycling.</li> <li>Encourage composting.</li> <li>Perhaps there could be more active encouragement to recycle items that people may not automatically think of.</li> <li>Carry out a survey to see how many households compost?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Community composting. Food waste.</i></li> <li><i>Encourage composting.</i></li> <li><i>Encourage recycling</i></li> </ul>
Misc Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Posters on telegraph poles and traffic lights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Get rid of Leylandii etc; eg. by Baptist Church entrance and graveyard. Get rid of invasive trees near graves, walls, buildings.</li> <li>Get ivy off walls.</li> <li>Refuse collection can be a bit “messy”. There is often lots of litter left on the road after a collection.</li> </ul>	
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Farms not owned by the farmers.</li> <li>Wildlife corridors connect.</li> </ul>		

EASTCOMBE: HIGHWAYS			
Issue	Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts	Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals	Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments
Reasons For Travel?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic passes through the Parish.</li> <li>Work or leisure? It makes a difference due to timetabling if relying upon public transport for work vis-a-vis having more flexibility if travelling for leisure</li> <li>School children – with many having to travel further to access schools – however this helps sustain village schools</li> <li>Shopping – sometimes bus is fine for this as choice/costs are limited locally</li> </ul>		
Opportunities For Reducing The Amount Of Travel?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider home working. Planning – Home Office?</li> <li>A small number of parishioners use the bus by choice for certain journeys</li> <li>Night bus needs more promotion</li> <li>Bus timetable – satisfied with current services but for how long? – sad to see almost empty buses.</li> <li>Car sharing - difficult to promote sustainably and practically</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Night bus needed</i></li> <li><i>Bus timetable – satisfied with current services but for how long? – sad to see almost empty buses.</i></li> </ul>
Speed Limits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enforcement – more police required to provide this</li> <li>Possibility of pedestrian crossing outside TKS? – geography of the road (bends) precludes as drivers need good vision of such provisions</li> <li>20 mph limit and creation of a school safety zone</li> <li>“Speed racing” by teenagers in “hot spots”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blackspots are the School &amp; Crouch End Road.</li> <li>More flashing signs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>20 mph limit and creation of a school safety zone</i></li> </ul>
Road Signs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many</li> <li>Unsafe exit road from Mares Lane (Bisley) into Stroud Road (Eastcombe resident who travels this route each day)</li> <li>Mobile speed sign – appears to be effective due to ability to move around different locations – perhaps procure more of them</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Unsafe exit road from Mares Lane (Bisley) into Stroud Road (Eastcombe resident who travels this route each day)</i></li> <li><i>Mobile speed sign – appears to be effective due to ability to move around different locations –</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drivers approaching Dr Crouch's Ln take no action to reduce their speed from Toadsmoor Hill – Village “gateway” may be a good idea</li> </ul>		<p><i>perhaps procure more of them</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Drivers approaching Dr Crouch's Ln take no action to reduce their speed from Toadsmoor Hill – Village “gateway” may be a good idea</i></li> </ul>
Street Lighting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain the lack of street lighting – do not want light pollution</li> <li>Lack of lighting still preferred</li> <li>Youths only gather around (illuminated) telephone box</li> <li>Night time crime very low – most occurs in daylight – therefore lack of night/street lighting provides more protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No street lighting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Retain the lack of street lighting – do not want light pollution</i></li> </ul>
Footpaths?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poorly maintained – many very muddy</li> <li>Waymarking could be improved</li> <li>To Bisley could be improved at Eastcombe end – muddy</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Poorly maintained – many very muddy</i></li> <li><i>Waymarking could be improved</i></li> </ul>
Miscellaneous Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sodium security lighting (observation by Eastcombe resident about a premise on Stroud Rd, Bisley)</li> <li>Road surface maintenance</li> <li>Large delivery vehicles (particularly Fidges Ln)</li> <li>HGVs and use of Sat Nav</li> <li>Parking around village shop (especially Wed (Lottery) but generally poor at most times</li> <li>Use of Website links to reporting potholes was promoted</li> <li>“On-line shopping” – delivery vehicles – access problems caused by inappropriate size vehicles being used – small parcels could be delivered by Post Office</li> <li>Reliance upon the road infrastructure has increased over years, perhaps our own personal ambitions/practices/preferences have contributed to this</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>HGVs and use of Sat Nav a problem</i></li> <li><i>“On-line shopping” – delivery vehicles – access problems caused by inappropriate size vehicles being used – small parcels could be delivered by Post Office</i></li> </ul>

EASTCOMBE: ECONOMY			
Issue	Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts	Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals	Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments
Location Of Employment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most commute to work.</li> <li>Schools, Rob Gardiner, Shop, Pub, self employed, retired, homeworkers.</li> </ul>		
Small Workshops?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No local, old redundant industrial building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Necessary.</li> </ul>	
Local Production Of Renewable Energy (including bio-mass)?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, but not too obtrusive. Small scale windmill.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Yes, but not too obtrusive. Small scale windmill.</i> Yes, but not too obtrusive. Small scale windmill.</li> </ul>
Support For Existing Local Businesses?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local businesses would be supported by more people being around in the daytime.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes. Rates need to be reasonable.</li> </ul>	
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Big employer in Eastcombe is Gardiners?</li> <li>Poor soil suitable for grazing. Woodland would be slow to establish.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village shop, post office, school &amp; pub excellent.</li> </ul>	

**COLLATION OF INFORMATION FROM THE FIRST PHASE OF THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION - OAKRIDGE VILLAGE**

<b>OAKRIDGE: HOUSING &amp; BUILT ENVIRONMENT</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts (No. of Public Signed In = 9; Head Count = 9)</b>	<b>Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals (8 people returned comments)</b>	<b>Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments</b>
Style of Buildings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Height of extensions (eg. 3 stories) can be a problem.</li> <li>As far as possible, retain/respect the traditional styles/colours/windows etc.</li> <li>If affect the appeal of the Cotswolds, could have an effect on tourism?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuation of Cotswold design; extensions etc done in keeping with the rest of the village.</li> <li>Traditional; fitting into a Cotswold village.</li> <li>The beautiful, traditional Cotswold cottage style is world famous, and is part of this Country's heritage. We should preserve this style as far as we possibly can in any repairs, extensions or new buildings.</li> <li>Should blend with adjacent dwellings.</li> <li>Three storey buildings would be too high.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only single or double storey buildings.</i></li> <li><i>Should blend with adjacent dwellings.</i></li> </ul>
Materials Used In Buildings?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traditional Cotswold materials.</li> <li>Stone, or faced with stone.</li> <li>Outer walls, if not inner, should be faced with traditional Cotswold stone. Modern tiles will have to be used on roofs, but in the traditional colour.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Traditional Cotswold materials desired.</i></li> </ul>
Setting Of Buildings?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As existing footprints.</li> <li>Within the village.</li> <li>Single/double storey only.</li> </ul>	
More Development?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> <li>Minimal, to protect the countryside.</li> <li>The character of the area (AONB) would be ruined by anything beyond the most minimal development.</li> <li>Need consultation with the community. Housing to be in keeping, and at a variety of sites. Not as a separate enclave, but linked with rest of village.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Only minimal development.</i></li> <li><i>If there was to be any development, would need consultation with the community.</i></li> </ul>
Affordable Housing?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> <li>Some needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Some affordable housing is needed.</i></li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desirable, but within the broad criteria indicated above.</li> </ul>	
Holiday Homes?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> <li>Do not contribute anything to the village in terms of the school or village amenities. Bring trouble in terms of parking and noise.</li> <li>Highly undesirable.</li> <li>Encourage owners to use local facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Not seen as positive</i></li> <li><i>Encourage users to use local facilities..</i></li> </ul>
Second Homes?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No</li> <li>Highly undesirable.</li> <li>Encourage owners to use local facilities.</li> </ul>	<i>As above.</i>
Range of Housing Unit Sizes (eg. for older people)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideally would like to maintain a mix of house sizes.</li> <li>Development of properties makes them less affordable.</li> <li>Should challenge the size of extensions and new build.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain current mix.</li> <li>Desirable, but within the criteria indicated above.</li> <li>Keep a wide variety of types and sizes of buildings, to ensure a variety of people in the community.</li> <li>Would like to keep small housing available for the elderly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Desire variety of types &amp; sizes of buildings, to encourage a variety of people in the community (eg. Affordable &amp; Elderly).</i></li> <li><i>Development of properties make them less affordable: challenge size of extensions &amp; new build.</i></li> </ul>
Energy Efficient Building Design?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes.</li> <li>Yes, but with regard to the points made above about traditional Cotswold style.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Yes, but with regard to the points made above about traditional Cotswold style.</i></li> </ul>
Renewable Energy (Wind Power, Solar Water Heating, Photovoltaic Electricity Generation)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed views on wind turbines. Depends upon size and their impact on AONB. Some not in favour at all.</li> <li>Solar panels – generally more favourable opinion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No problem with that.</li> <li>Renewable energy is important, but large wind turbines would spoil the character of an area designated of outstanding natural beauty.</li> <li>Wind turbines are highly disruptive of the beauty of the Cotswold natural &amp; built environment. Their relatively low efficiency does not justify them.</li> <li>Solar panels mainly concealed by roof design ok.</li> <li>Not wind power.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Solar panels acceptable if not obtrusive.</i></li> <li><i>Mixed views on wind turbines. Generally, large wind turbines not supported.</i></li> </ul>
Designing in Land for Home Food		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes.</li> </ul>	

Production?			
Miscellaneous Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Purchasing houses for renting purposes should be strictly monitored.</li> </ul>		

<b>OAKRIDGE: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT &amp; LANDSCAPE</b>			
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts</b>	<b>Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals</b>	<b>Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments</b>
What Landscapes Are Valued?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep landscapes natural.</li> <li>• Be selective with development, to keep wild life corridors and wild life colonies.</li> <li>• Maintain visual aspect of lanes.</li> <li>• Canal – need a balance. Ensure no spreading out to affect the valley. Negative effects could be noise and pollution.. Mixed views on restoration of the canal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All landscapes are valued.</li> <li>• Fields, woods, areas for wildlife and wild flowers.</li> <li>• Need to keep nature reserves (Siccaridge Wood, 3 Groves Wood etc).</li> <li>• Keep grass triangles in the roads. They are peculiar to Oakridge, and act as traffic calming.</li> <li>• If the canal was developed, the canal and countryside around it could be spoiled; roads, building by canal, noise.</li> <li>• Landscapes will inevitably change as different crops are grown, animals grazed etc. The essential is to protect the land from building, and also to preserve woods, nature reserves etc.</li> <li>• Canal should not be restored.</li> <li>• Do not like rape fields.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Keep landscapes natural.</i></li> <li>• <i>Keep nature reserves.</i></li> <li>• <i>Canal – need a balance. Ensure no spreading out to affect the valley. Negative effects could be noise and pollution.. Mixed views on restoration of the canal.</i></li> </ul>
Biodiversity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife becomes more apparent in the valley.</li> <li>• Could parcels of land be identified which could aid bio-diversity?</li> <li>• Encourage land owners/farmers' practices to aid biodiversity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, but balance kept over differing needs (food, fuel etc).</li> <li>• Ok in principle, but the implications of some biodiversity developments might be serious and need to be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Could parcels of land be identified to help biodiversity (eg. Maintain sites of Nature Conservation Interest).</i></li> </ul>
Dry Stone Walls?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ward strategy to set money aside/obtain grants to maintain some of the PC walls.</li> <li>• Walls play an important part of village environment.</li> <li>• Planning Approvals could require maintenance/repair of existing walls associated with the property.</li> <li>• Could local skills be developed to rebuild walls.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important characteristic of village.</li> <li>• Important to keep, but may be expensive for fields and large open areas. Private houses/gardens to maintain own stone walls.</li> <li>• We should aim to retain as much as possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Stone walls are an important characteristic of the villages. Expensive to maintain for field boundaries.</i></li> <li>• <i>Planning Approvals could require maintenance/repair of existing walls associated with the property.</i></li> <li>• <i>Could local skills be developed to rebuild walls.</i></li> </ul>
Hedgerows?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advice available on when to “maintain”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep hedges; wildlife.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Hedges important for wildlife.</i></li> </ul>

	hedgerows, to limit wildlife damage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be cared for and cut back at the right time of the year.</li> <li>• Retain; possibly expand. Important to birdlife.</li> <li>• If dry stone walls are too expensive to maintain, then plant hedges.</li> <li>• Like to keep hedgerows and verges as uncut as possible. Link with wildlife groups and youth groups to plant wild flowers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be cared for and cut back at the right time of the year.</i></li> </ul>
Footpaths? Light Pollution?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value footpaths to Canal etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footpaths around the village are an important characteristic.</li> <li>• Important to keep paths in good condition both in the village and in the fields and woods.</li> <li>• Important to keep. Need to maintain stiles etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Footpaths around the village are an important characteristic.</i></li> <li>• <i>Important to keep paths in good condition both in the village and in the fields and woods.</i></li> <li>• <i>Need to maintain stiles</i></li> </ul>
Household Waste (Re-Cycling)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No street lighting.</li> <li>• Street lights are not wanted.</li> <li>• Very important to resist this.</li> </ul>	<i>(See Highways for street lighting)</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be given more boxes for re-cycling. Also should pick up food waste.</li> <li>• Encourage recycling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Should be given more boxes for re-cycling. Also should pick up food waste.</i></li> <li>• <i>Encourage recycling.</i></li> </ul>

OAKRIDGE: HIGHWAYS			
Issue	Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts	Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals	Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments
Reasons For Travel?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commuting to work.</li> <li>• Buses are expensive for a family.</li> <li>• School buses are important.</li> <li>• Home delivery adds to traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Older people etc without cars need to get into town.</li> <li>• Keep the bus running.</li> <li>• School</li> <li>• Shopping</li> <li>• Medical care</li> <li>• Leisure</li> <li>• Further education</li> </ul>	
Opportunities For Reducing The Amount Of Travel?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep Post Office/Shop in Village.</li> <li>• Work from home more.</li> <li>• Improve local facilities. Youth club needed. Films. Adult education.</li> <li>• Could the Post Office receive undelivered parcels?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keep the bus service running.</li> <li>• Village shop</li> <li>• Further education &amp; other classes held in village.</li> <li>• Sports facilities in village.</li> <li>• Important to ensure best possible broadband service/connections.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Keep the bus service running.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ensure best possible broadband service/connections.</i></li> <li>• <i>Could the Post Office receive undelivered parcels?</i></li> </ul>
Speed Limits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No road restrictions.</li> <li>• Speed warnings are occasionally needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want 20mph through village.</li> <li>• Could do with traffic calming, as drive too fast in village (eg. around the corner near the shop, where there are children).</li> <li>• Encourage observance of current speed limits, eg. with portable "slow down" sensors (non permanent).</li> <li>• Could reduce speed by narrowing sections by bringing in the grass verge, and having give way signs. Possibly rumble strips. Would be concerned over more urban traffic calming methods being used.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Encourage observance of current speed limits, eg. with portable "slow down" sensors (non permanent).</i></li> <li>• <i>No urban traffic calming methods.</i></li> </ul>
Road Signs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid duplication of road signs. No new signs, except possibly brown signs for Shop &amp; Village Hall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have plenty already.</li> <li>• Yes for Church, Pub &amp; Shop.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Avoid duplication of road signs. No new signs, except possibly brown signs for Shop &amp; Village Hall.</i></li> </ul>
Street Lighting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street lighting not necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitely not.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>No street lighting.</i></li> </ul>

Footpaths?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect footpaths.</li> <li>• Maintain asphalt “snicketts”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of the village character. Children love the maze of paths.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Part of the village character.</i></li> <li>• <i>Protect footpaths.</i></li> <li>• <i>Maintain asphalt “snicketts”.</i></li> </ul>
General Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New road surfaces are slippery – ice.</li> <li>• Verges are being eroded.</li> <li>• “Green Triangles” are a method of traffic calming.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No pavements.</li> <li>• The area is entirely unsuitable for mass tourism, heavy (or medium) industry, and anything requiring heavy/large vehicles.</li> <li>• Dog fouling is a problem</li> <li>• Keep areas of land, and protect them, where wild flowers can grow and wildlife encouraged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Verges are being eroded.</i></li> <li>• <i>“Green Triangles” are a method of traffic calming.</i></li> </ul>

OAKRIDGE: ECONOMY			
Issue	Comments From Facilitator's Flip Charts	Comments From Tables Filled In By Individuals	Steering Group's VDS Proposal Derived From Collation Of Public Consultation Comments
Location Of Employment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local businesses would attract young people to stay in the area. Apprenticeships.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to try and save local employment, rather than centralising in larger towns.</li> <li>Encourage local employment where possible, providing it does not adversely affect the general criteria for preserving the character of the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Encourage local employment where possible, providing it does not adversely affect the general criteria for preserving the character of the area.</i></li> </ul>
Small Workshops?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise issues with local workshops.</li> <li>Should be small.</li> <li>Heavy lorries not desired.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be lovely to see more.</li> <li>Yes, if not noisy or anti-social in other ways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Should be small.</i></li> <li><i>Yes, if not noisy or anti-social in other ways.</i></li> </ul>
Local Production Of Renewable Energy (including bio-mass)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safeguard land for food production.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, if kept in balance with land needed to grow food &amp; for grazing.</li> <li>No wind power.</li> </ul>	
Support For Existing Local Businesses?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up-dated new shop is brilliant. Need to support local shop, local fish &amp; meats.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Up-dated new shop is brilliant. Need to support local shop, local fish &amp; meats.</i></li> </ul>
Miscellaneous Issues		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise or large vehicles could be a problem if people work in the village.</li> <li>Have great concerns about the canal restoration and the effect it would have on the valley and lanes. It would totally change the character.</li> </ul>	

**APPENDIX B:**

**GUIDELINES USED FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION IN SEPTEMBER**  
**2009**

<b>DRAFT SETTLEMENT GUIDELINES</b>
------------------------------------

- S1     - The existing Village Settlement Boundaries should be maintained, to protect the rural character of the villages.
- S2     New developments should respect the individual and historic settlement patterns in terms of the balance between infill and open space:  
      **Bisley:** It has a dense core that will support development that enriches the character. (The Bisley Conservation Area Statement presents details of the character of the centre of the village).  
      **Eastcombe:** The village green open space in the centre of Eastcombe should be protected from development.  
      **Oakridge:** The village has developed with a higgledy-piggledy layout, crisscrossed with a warren of footpaths and narrow roads.
- S3     The small green spaces (*list the green spaces?*) and the web of public footpath links within the settlements should be conserved, to maintain their traditional character.

## DRAFT LANDSCAPE & WILDLIFE GUIDELINES

- L1 The parish lies wholly within the Cotswolds AONB and has two distinctive landscape character areas (High Wolds – Bisley Plateau, and the Toadsmoor and Frome Valleys). Essential elements of the landscape should be both conserved, and enhanced through sensitive management. Specifically:
- All new development, including where permission is granted outside of existing settlement boundaries, should be designed to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the landscape, and this character should influence the layout and form of any such development.
  - The open landscape with wide vistas should be maintained.
  - Land managers and owners should conserve and enhance existing woodlands, limestone grassland, hedgerows and drystone walls which are a particular feature within the parish, and manage such features to develop wildlife corridors.
- L2 Land owners and managers should recognize and promote measures in landscape management and practices to adapt to changes in landscape character and appearance brought about by climate change.
- L3 Developers and landowners should be aware of the possible archaeological importance of their sites and contact Gloucestershire County Council Archaeology Service for information and advice. Specifically:  
The preservation and protection of archaeological sites and historic structures should be encouraged.  
Access, interpretation and educational use should be encouraged where appropriate to the sites accessibility and sensitivity.
- L4 Tranquility and dark night skies are a characteristic of the parish and should be maintained through measures to minimize light pollution both within settlements, and open countryside, removing or switching off existing lighting where appropriate (taking account of safety and crime prevention) and resisting further street lighting.
- L5 The availability of allotments should be protected, and the existing allotments and recreation grounds should be developed, through appropriate management, as buffer zones for wildlife whilst fulfilling their primary purpose.
- L6 Wildlife should be protected and biodiversity encouraged through the development of a strategic network of wildlife areas and corridors, including open common land and woodland.
- L7 Highway verges should be managed appropriately to maximize wildlife wherever possible
- L8 If the Cotswold Canal is restored to full navigation the existing high wildlife and landscape value should be maintained, together with the tranquil quality of the wider canal corridor. No new building or infrastructure would be supported within the section of Canal which passes through the parish, with the possible exception of some very limited expansion of facilities at Daneway. Associated design, eg signage, bridge restoration etc should be of the highest design, in keeping with both the canal, but also the landscape character through which it passes.
- L9 The public rights of way network should be safeguarded, properly maintained and permissive routes developed and new routes dedicated, where appropriate, to provide a useable network of linked routes.

L10 Existing outdoor play areas and formal sports facilities should be protected, and their appearance improved through appropriate choice of materials, eg new play equipment, landscaping and management. Where any new development takes place, additional open space should be provided, and the provision of ‘snickets’ (vegetated footways, bounded by drystone walls, that criss-cross settlements) and new prow, which are a feature of the main settlements, should be designed into the development

L11 Local community waste and recycling initiatives should be encouraged and appropriate land should be identified to support these projects, such as the Bisley composting scheme.

L12 Proposals to extract local stone on a small scale for local building use should be considered as part of encouraging sustainable development, and such extraction sites should receive appropriate treatment to maximize wildlife and landscape benefits in any approved restoration scheme.

<b>DRAFT BUILDINGS GUIDELINES: GENERIC</b>
--

- B3 New development, including extensions and adaptations to existing properties, should respect the traditional and vernacular in terms of proportion, scale, height, materials, and landscape patterns.
- B4 New extensions should be in proportion and scale to the original building, so that there is no adverse impact on local character, or loss of variety of house sizes in a rural area.
- B5 It is important to ensure positive opportunities for high quality contemporary architecture. Imaginative and original design can extend and renew distinctive character and traditions of the Villages' built environment.
- B6 Energy efficient installations including renewable will be supported in/on all existing and older buildings (including listed properties) so long as they are in proportion and scale to the building and do not adversely affect character.
- B7 New developments will be expected to integrate high energy efficiency standards and renewables which contribute to the character and appearance of the area, to minimise energy use.
- B8 Planning applications should retain existing curtilage boundary dry stone walls.
- B9 Extensions and adaptations to existing properties outside the Settlement Boundaries should comply with the guidelines above.
- B10 Affordable homes should be a priority in all new housing developments in accordance with the District and Regional Planning Policies.
- B11 Proposals for community driven low impact, affordable projects outside the Settlement Boundary will be regarded sympathetically.

**BUILDINGS GUIDELINES: BISLEY**

- B1 The Bisley Conservation Area Policy Document should be applied to properties within the Conservation Area boundary within Bisley Village.

<b>DRAFT HIGHWAYS GUIDELINES</b>
----------------------------------

- H1 A Transport Assessment or the Design and Access Statement for all new proposed developments should take into account the effect of additional car ownership upon the highway capacity within the wider parish and give that due credence within the Planning decision-making process.
- H2 The use of shared transport should be promoted and encouraged wherever it is practical to do so.
- H3 There should be liaison with transport providers (bus services) regarding timing and linking of services to encourage greater use of public transport, thereby consolidating the viability of the service.
- H4 Lower speed limits should be promoted on all roads in the parish, and 20mph limits through settlement areas and by schools.
- H5 Speed limits should be monitored and enforced through use of Police checks and also community usage of speed check equipment both static and hand-held.
- H6 Support should be given to the County Council (Highways) work to impose weight restrictions on roads throughout the Parish (except for Access purposes).
- H7 *Put guideline in about pavements in Bisley??*  
*(The aspect of speeding traffic is exacerbated by a lack of safe pavement areas for pedestrians. Neither Stroud Road or Cheltenham Road offers any protection, although a scheme is in hand as far as Stroud Road goes. In addition, the one pavement within the High Street is often unusable due to parked cars.)*
- H8 The amount of road/street signage should be reduced/minimised.

<b>DRAFT ECONOMY GUIDELINES</b>
---------------------------------

- E1 New employment sites in the parish within, and adjacent to the settlements will be supported where appropriate opportunities exist, in business sectors that can thrive in the rural environment. Transport links, noise and preserving the visual amenity of the Cotswold AONB will be sensitive considerations requiring careful analysis when reviewing proposals.
- E2 Small employment units outside the settlement boundaries would be supported particularly the reuse of redundant farm buildings that are capable of retention without extensive alteration and are of a quality to justify retention, and where appropriate transport links exist. Any employment units should be visually compatible with surrounding buildings and the landscape.
- E3 Renewable energy employment opportunities would be supported in forestry, linking woodland management and wood fuel production. The type and scale of any developments should not be detrimental to the landscape character or any wildlife interests.
- E4 A community scale wind turbine would be supported if the energy and the economy directly benefited the parish and it was carefully sited.
- E5 Improvement to telecommunication links would be supported where there is no adverse impact on landscape or amenity.
- E6 Proposals that would improve tourism and bring income from outside would be supported.

**APPENDIX C:**

**RECORD OF INFORMATION FROM SECOND PUBLIC**  
**CONSULTATION**  
**(September 2009)**

## SEPTEMBER 2009 PUBLIC CONSULTATION: PROCESSING OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT GUIDELINES

### **Record Of Responses Received:**

As well as the following written responses, many people were engaged in discussion at the Fetes to discuss what the Village Design Statement was, and some of the key issues associated with it.

**Bisley:** 8 Comments Forms & 13 “Post-Its” received, and subsequently a letter from R Utley (15 pages of detailed comments. Only the comments relating to the Draft Guidelines are presented below; the comments on other sections of the report will be considered separately).

**Oakridge:** 10 Comments Forms and 1 Feedback Form from the Parish Council Website.  
One comment said: “A well thought out and written plan”.

**Eastcombe:** 4 Comments Forms (Including one from the Eastcombe WI).

One overall comment: This will obviously be improved when all the ?? queries are resolved, but very strict copy-editing is needed for all the errors of grammar and punctuation which mar this document

SETTLEMENTS: PUBLIC CONSULTATION DETAILS			
VILLAGE	COMMENTS RECEIVED	POTENTIAL EFFECT ON GUIDELINES	STEERING GROUP’S DECISION ON THE WAY AHEAD

<b>BISLEY</b>		<b><u>Generic:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions raised for S2 &amp; S3.</li> <li>• Challenge made for S1</li> </ul>	<b><u>Generic:</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment on second/holiday homes retained, as this was a concern raised by a large number of Residents.</li> <li>• S1 kept as a general wish; other Guidelines do address further development.</li> </ul>
<b>OAKRIDGE</b>			
<b>EASTCOMBE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment about second and holiday homes is already out of date - current recession shows that the trend is easily reversed. What does affect the character of the villages is the fact that the populations are very fluid with properties changing hands frequently. (GL6 7DG)</li> <li>• 'Snicket' is a northern dialect word. I have asked several locally born people about this and they have never heard it used here. (GL6 7DG)</li> </ul>		
<b>R Utley (Bisley Resident)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• S1: NIMBYism? It is inevitable that, given the shortage of housing in this country, villages will come under increased pressure to accept new housing developments. Would it not be more appropriate for the Parish Council to offer guidance on the circumstances in which such developments might be accommodated?</li> <li>• S2: Where exactly in Bisley's dense core is the Parish Council proposing that development could take place. The sentence on Oakridge is purely descriptive and contains no guidance for planners.</li> <li>• S3: Agree with the editorial note here that any areas whose conservation is important should be listed. General statements such as this give the planners little ammunition to resist a determined developer.</li> </ul>		

LANDSCAPE & WILDLIFE: PUBLIC CONSULTATION DETAILS			
VILLAGE	COMMENTS RECEIVED	POTENTIAL EFFECT ON GUIDELINES	STEERING GROUP'S DECISION ON THE WAY AHEAD

<b>BISLEY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to be protected (Sue Korder)</li> <li>• Support all that's proposed (Caroline Cotterell GL6 7AE)</li> <li>• This aspect provides an ideal opportunity to incorporate community activities e.g. community orchard. In favour of preventing installation of street lighting (GL6 7AA)</li> <li>• I very much support the idea of a community orchard as a stimulus to wildlife and as a feature of the village and I'm disappointed with the lack of progress towards a goal that the village has already supported in a poll (Ian Plewis GL6 7AB)</li> <li>• Landscape managed for biodiversity</li> <li>• Agree with all (Lucy Burrows)</li> <li>• Conservation and improvement of trees, hedgerows, woodland etc in the Bisley Parish including Oakridge , Waterlane, Bournes Green and Tunley very important. Ideas to R. Mackie (01285 760 318)</li> </ul> <p><b>There were also comments on Sports and Children's Play Facilities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five years ago the field on Windyridge was built over and money given to the Council. It was decided that the money be used on a children's play area to replace the field they had played in. Nothing has been completed and now my children are too old to appreciate the outcome when it does happen! (Celia Monnish GL6 7DA)</li> <li>• Lack of structured or other activities for young children – no after school activities, especially no places to go and play that are easy to get to if you live in Windyridge (Hannah Hurst)</li> <li>• Skate ramps (Hadley Restall)</li> <li>• More sporting facilities to negate need to travel further afield (Mike Batten)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Generic:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments were generally supportive of the Guidelines, and were similar to those received from previous consultation.</li> <li>• Minor word improvements suggested for: L4 L8, L9 L11</li> <li>• Simplification suggested for L3.</li> <li>• Suggested deletion of: L2 L7</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Bisley:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More sports and play facilities required.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Generic:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word improvements generally carried out.</li> <li>• L3 simplified as suggested.</li> <li>• Decided to retain L2 &amp; L7 as they represented the views of a number of Residents.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Bisley:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement for free recreation space included in the VDS report.</li> </ul>
<b>OAKRIDGE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We live in a beautiful part of the country. The countryside is variable and we have species that are rare. We need to protect these for future generations</li> <li>• Valuable</li> <li>• Important to maintain as that's why people live here</li> <li>• Preservation of adequate green space and corridors for animals/insects within the village</li> <li>• Looking to the future wind turbines should be encouraged</li> <li>• Very important to our parish, though three different villages.</li> </ul>		

BUILDINGS: PUBLIC CONSULTATION DETAILS			
VILLAGE	COMMENTS RECEIVED	POTENTIAL EFFECT ON GUIDELINES	STEERING GROUP'S DECISION ON THE WAY AHEAD

<b>BISLEY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote the possibility of a (national) plan to allow a field on the edge of each village to allow individuals to build eco-houses with 2-4 bedrooms and sufficient land for a good sized garden and veg garden (H W Gibson GL6 8LY).</li> <li>I LONG for more innovative, ecological, sustainable architecture - not just pastiche – we’re NOT a museum. Also we need housing for ‘ordinary’ people- not poor boxes for retired professionals (Judy Howard GL67AG)</li> <li>Maintaining the integrity of buildings and environment as a whole, including vistas. Preserving the whole look of the village which must include small details such as edges, kerbs, gates and windows that constitute the whole look (Jo Curtin)</li> <li>Feel concerned that big houses have replaced small bungalows. This reduces the possibility of single/elderly/disabled people remaining in the village. I feel it is much better to build smaller houses to accommodate. It could be said to discriminate against the disabled/elderly (Sue Korder)</li> <li>Support all that’s proposed. Especially important to keep range of sizes of buildings. The detail is important – would be useful to see some of this too. Settings of houses within curtilage and boundaries are important too e.g. whether tend to have front gardens or houses built adjacent to the road. The Windyridge development show how front gardens, ‘wrong’ paving, kerb stones etc detract from the local character (Caroline Cotterell GL6 7AE)</li> <li>Planning should be more tightly controlled with the village outskirts being treated the same as the centre of the village (GL6 7AA)</li> <li>NICE low impact good quality housing</li> <li>Triple domestic rates for 2<sup>nd</sup> homes to pay for public transport</li> <li>Interested in general planning and demographic issues and the village life cycles and its impact on economic development (see Economy) (Diana Godding 771 034 / diana.robinson@btinternet.com)</li> <li>Agree with all (Lucy Burrows)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Generic:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments were generally supportive of the Guidelines, and were similar to those received from previous consultation.</li> <li>B11 needs to be clarified.</li> <li>Simplification suggested for B6.</li> <li>Suggested deletion of: B7 B10</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Eastcombe:</u></b> It is important that old people’s bungalows are only available for rent - not to be sold.</p>	<p><b><u>Generic:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B11 has been clarified.</li> <li>B6 simplified as suggested.</li> <li>B7 retained, as it reflects the view of a number of Residents.</li> <li>B10 changed from a “Guideline” to a “Local View” statement.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Eastcombe:</u></b> “Local View” statements included regarding housing for the elderly.</p>
<b>OAKRIDGE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I agree with the VDS except B10. The village in the past had affordable housing, but newcomers move in and expand the properties. Which means that the affordable housing has been</li> </ul>		

HIGHWAYS: PUBLIC CONSULTATION DETAILS			
VILLAGE	COMMENTS RECEIVED	POTENTIAL EFFECT ON GUIDELINES	STEERING GROUP'S DECISION ON THE WAY AHEAD

<b>BISLEY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways not yet free from damage/holes. Also material used to cover road (Farm Lane) is very slippery in icy weather (Sue Korder)</li> <li>• Better upkeep of rural roads needed (HW Gibson GL6 8LY)</li> <li>• Flooding and blocked potholes in Far Wells Road (before the Mansion )</li> <li>• Buses to be timed for school and work (see Economy)</li> <li>• Bicycle hire (shop?) (See Economy)</li> <li>• A bus service to Stroud Station would be very useful if it met the train times for the main commuting times</li> <li>• Introduce psychological traffic calming*</li> <li>• Triple domestic rates on 2<sup>nd</sup> homes to pay for better public transport</li> <li>• Ban cars from the main street! Have horses and carts and bicycles instead</li> <li>• Agree with all (Lucy Burrows)</li> <li>• Strictly enforced speed limits</li> <li>• More sporting facilities to negate need to travel further afield (Mike Batten)</li> <li>• A consultation/referendum on the different options to promote lower speeds/less traffic would be useful. Personally I am against the idea of a bypass as this would negatively impact on the area as a whole (GL6 7AA)</li> <li>• Re canal development: you cannot do all the locks in one day so they will have to build more roads or the one road will be overloaded. I am very concerned about developing the canal and oppose it (Also see Economy)(David Battison)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Generic:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments were generally supportive of the Guidelines, and were similar to those received from previous consultation.</li> <li>• Speeding is an issue, and some suggestions are made for addressing specific problems.</li> <li>• H5 is not a planning guideline?</li> <li>• Suggested deletion of H4.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Bisley:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• H7 needs to be developed</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Eastcombe:</u></b> The road surfaces are in a very bad condition. A lot of older WI members felt that we should have more street lighting.</p>	<p><b><u>Generic:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Local View” statement added for speeding issues.</li> <li>• H5 changed from a “Guideline” to a “Local View” statement.</li> <li>• H5 changed from a “Guideline” to a “Local View” statement.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Bisley:</u></b> H7 developed into a “Local View” statement.</p> <p><b><u>Eastcombe:</u></b> Request for more street lighting not included, as Public Meetings very stringly gave the view that additional lighting should be revisited (see Guideline L4).</p>
<b>OAKRIDGE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> <li>• Important</li> <li>• Control of speed important but difficult. Perhaps establish designated parking areas to help protect verges from encroachment</li> <li>• Limit street signs –some off road parking</li> <li>• to be specifically marked, otherwise stop parking on verge</li> <li>• Improvements can be made here. HGV and large lorries – the roads were not built for them.</li> <li>• More maintenance</li> <li>• Would like to know whether more speed control can be</li> </ul>		



ECONOMY: PUBLIC CONSULTATION DETAILS			
VILLAGE	COMMENTS RECEIVED	POTENTIAL EFFECT ON GUIDELINES	STEERING GROUP'S DECISION ON THE WAY AHEAD

<b>BISLEY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage quality crafts (Lucy Burrows)</li> <li>• Organic food in the shop</li> <li>• Community store</li> <li>• Supporting existing businesses should be the priority including the PO/shops/pubs (GL6 7AA)</li> <li>• Encourage local economy (Sue Korder)</li> <li>• Oppose canal development (See Highways)(David Battison)</li> <li>• Bicycle hire (shop?) (See Highways)</li> <li>• Buses timed for school and work (see Highways)</li> <li>• Buses to meet commuting trains (see Highways)</li> <li>• Interest in demography and local economy (see Buildings) ( Diana Godding)</li> <li>• I feel we should make ourselves a bit more tourist friendly. Signs for The Wells, the Old Prison, Overcourt House would help. I have battled for years for a road sign for Calfway Lane. If a car park could be arranged it would help and bring in more cash. Also if the Bear or Stirrup Cup could be persuaded to serve afternoon tea it would be great. (Walter Hayman GL6 7AT).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Generic:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments were generally supportive of the Guidelines, and were similar to those received from previous consultation.</li> <li>• Minor text modifications suggested for : E1 E3 E6</li> <li>• Revised text suggested for: E2 E5</li> <li>• Suggested deletion of E4.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Generic:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor text modifications for E1 &amp; E3 adopted, and E6 was developed.</li> <li>• Text modifications for E2 adopted, but E5 was not changed.</li> <li>• E4 to be kept, to enable comprehensive consultation to be carried out in the next phase of Public Consultation.</li> </ul>
<b>OAKRIDGE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> <li>• Hopeful</li> <li>• Encourage home-working where planning issues may discourage this</li> <li>• Small business welcome but restrict additional traffic</li> <li>• GCC has replaced stiles with metal swing gates which are an eyesore</li> <li>• Small businesses would be useful in the right area.</li> <li>• Make sure the businesses we have eg shop, pub, home businesses are encouraged and maintained. The canal when built will improve this.</li> <li>• Keep Post Office.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Bisley:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested that more signs should be installed, to be tourist friendly.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Bisley:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• E6 extended to cover signage.</li> </ul>
<b>EASTCOMBE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support local business. (GL6 7DN)</li> <li>• More village activities should be held, dog walks or fun runs, etc. More people encouraged to attend church. Swimming should be allowed in Toadsmoor lake. Encourage local employment. More shops equals more jobs. (GL6 7EA)</li> <li>• Despite my comments on the draft Parish Plan the parish's</li> </ul>		



**APPENDIX D:**  
**RECORD OF INFORMATION FROM FINAL PUBLIC**  
**CONSULTATION**  
**(March 2010)**

**VDS ANALYSIS - BISLEY**  
**(66 forms returned, out of 410 - 16%)**

**General Comments:**

- A 5-point scale would have been appropriate throughout to enable the expression of an undecided or neutral view.
- Parish to have much greater administrative power over all local matters. Stroud should be less important as we live here.

<b>SETTLEMENT PATTERNS: Bisley</b>							
Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>1</b>	The existing Village Settlement Boundaries should be maintained, to protect the rural character of the villages.	50	14	1	1	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>2</b>	New developments should respect the individual and historic settlement patterns in terms of the balance between infill and open space: <b>Bisley Village:</b> It has a dense core that will support development that enriches the character of the village. (The Bisley Conservation Area Statement presents details of the character of the centre of the village).	49	12	2	2	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>3</b>	The small green spaces and the web of public footpath links within the settlements should be conserved, to maintain their traditional character.	58	7	0	1	1.2	Supported by Residents
<b>4</b>	Proposals for community driven low impact affordable projects outside the Settlement Boundary will be regarded sympathetically. <i>(Further details can be seen in Section 3 of the VDS Report: see <a href="http://www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk">www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk</a>)</i>	20	26	7	10	2.1	Comments are generally supportive in the Parish. Retain, but have explanatory text in the VDS Document, and say that only very limited development is considered.
<b>5</b>	New development or infilling should not interrupt or obscure key views in/out or across the village.	50	11	2	0	1.2	Supported by Residents

Detailed Comments: Settlement Patterns - Bisley			
Guideline	For	Against	Steering Group's Response
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any proposal for expansion of “development” into green field areas (Population increase) must be strongly resisted – Note how “character” of many villages has been seriously damaged due to such extension of the built environment. There are many other communities which can better absorb increases (and benefit thereby).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If ever extended – provision should be to limit one house or bungalow to an agreed area.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more new build” – “Use and develop Pavilion site and around cricket pitch or site adjacent to the WI/Hall.</li> <li>Continuing development will SPOIL not enrich the character of the village – if Bisley has a “dense core” (which I agree it has) how can it support development there?</li> <li>Surely further development of the village of Bisley would destroy its integrity. Already the Manor Farm development is more than the village should have been made to endure – the traffic is already intolerable.</li> <li>I feel new developments have already compromised the village character.</li> </ul>	Comments noted, but concerns are covered by Guideline 1 above.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I really want to maintain <u>all</u> our traditional footpaths.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be a mixture – not just one type or could end up with another Windyridge.</li> </ul>	Comments are generally supportive in the Parish. Retain, but have explanatory text in the VDS Document, and say that only very limited development is considered.
5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approval of infill development needs close scrutiny. Approvals can so easily destroy the character of villages forever. Every village has this problem and over the years the inevitable, instead of of a “rural” description the “small urban” would be more accurate.</li> <li>Guideline 5 has already been overlooked as to new buildings as they do not keep up with the Cotswold stone colours/design.</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Are essentially covered by other Guidelines.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think this should be part of SDC Planning Dept now.</li> </ul>	
<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is a “multi-meaning” word. This village needs <u>no</u> development unless it is to <u>enhance</u> what is existing – it will <u>not</u> support more commercial development.</li> </ul>		In essence this issue is covered by the Guidelines.

**LANDSCAPE & WILDLIFE: Bisley**

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>a)</b>	<b>Bisley Village:</b> A piece of land accessible to the west side of the village should be sought, to provide free recreation space for young people.	17	24	11	5	2.1	Local View kept, as it is an issue that has been frequently raised by Residents over a long period.
<b>1</b>	The Parish lies wholly within the Cotswolds AONB and has two distinctive landscape character areas (High Wolds – Bisley Plateau, and the Toadsmoor and Frome Valleys). Essential elements of the landscape should be both conserved, and enhanced through sensitive management. Specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All new development, including where permission is granted outside of existing settlement boundaries, should be designed to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the landscape, and this character should influence the layout and form of any such development.</li> <li>The open landscape with wide vistas should be maintained.</li> <li>Land owners and managers should conserve and enhance existing woodlands, limestone grassland, hedgerows and drystone walls which are a particular feature within the Parish, and manage such features to develop wildlife corridors.</li> </ul>	45	20	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>2</b>	Land owners and managers should recognize and promote measures in landscape management and practices to adapt to changes in landscape character and appearance brought about by climate change.	27	23	5	1	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>3</b>	Tranquility and dark night skies are a characteristic of the Parish and should be maintained through measures to minimize light pollution both within settlements and open	49	13	2	1	1.3	Supported by Residents

	countryside, removing or switching off existing lighting where appropriate (taking account of safety and crime prevention) and resisting further street lighting.						
4	The availability of allotments should be protected, and the existing allotments and recreation grounds should be developed through appropriate management, as a buffer zones for wildlife whilst fulfilling their primary purpose.	45	18	2	1	1.4	Supported by Residents
5	Wildlife should be protected and biodiversity encouraged through the development of a strategic network of wildlife areas and corridors, including open common land and woodland.	43	20	1	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
6	Highway verges should be managed appropriately to maximise wildlife wherever possible.	44	19	1	1	1.4	Supported by Residents
7	If the Cotswold Canal is restored to full navigation the existing high wildlife and landscape value should be maintained, together with the tranquil quality of the wider canal corridor. No new building or infrastructure would be supported within the section of the Canal which passes through the Parish, with the possible exception of some very limited expansion of facilities at the Daneway. Associated design, eg signage, bridge restoration etc should be of the highest design, in keeping with both the canal and the landscape through which it passes.	38	25	1	2	1.5	Supported by Residents
8	The preservation and protection of archaeological sites and historic structures should be encouraged. Access, interpretation and educational use of such sites should be encouraged where appropriate to the site's accessibility and sensitivity.	35	28	2	1	1.5	Supported by Residents
9	The public rights of way network should be safeguarded and properly maintained. Where appropriate, permissive routes should be developed and new public rights of way dedicated so as to provide a usable network of linked routes.	39	22	2	3	1.5	Supported by Residents
10	Existing outdoor play areas and formal sports facilities should						

	be protected, and their appearance improved through appropriate choice of materials, eg new play equipment, landscaping and management. Where any new development takes place, additional open space should be provided and footpaths, which are a feature of the main settlements, should be designed into the development.	39	26	1	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>11</b>	Local community waste and recycling initiatives, such as the Bisley community composting scheme, should be encouraged and appropriate land should be identified to support these projects.	39	23	4	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>12</b>	Proposals to use local stone on a small scale for local building use should be considered as part of encouraging sustainable development, and such sites should receive appropriate treatment to maximize wildlife and landscape benefits.	39	22	2	0	1.4	Supported by Residents

#### Detailed Comments: Landscape & Wildlife - Bisley

Guideline	For	Against	Steering Group's Response
<b>a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But only if there is insufficient space now.</li> <li>It's about time the children's play area in Windyridge was reopened for safe use by our local young children.</li> <li>A section of the allotment field would be ideal as playspace.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 respondents said they didn't know what area was being proposed.</li> <li>Sufficient recreation space already exists.</li> <li>I thought they already had one, which got under-utilised.</li> <li>We have one already at the Rec. Perhaps a crossing is necessary? – Bisley had a recreation area to the west of the village and it was built upon. The agreement to retain a play area was reneged upon.</li> </ul>	Local View will be kept, as it is generally supported and it is an issue that has been frequently raised by Residents over a long period.
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The network of bridle paths should also be safeguarded &amp; properly maintained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All this is SDC Planning Policy! So no change.</li> <li>This is too complicated a question.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current verges should be protected and parking on them deterred.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Such as?</li> <li>Who knows what effects climate change will bring?</li> <li>Not a planning guideline!</li> <li>Gibberish.</li> </ul>	Examples will be included in the VDS document regarding what changes climate change may cause.
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an enormous amount of "security" lighting in the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The absence of street lights in Bisley fails to reduce light</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents

	village which is far too intrusive. Unfortunately this is usually on private dwellings. How can this possibly be reversed?	pollution because of the bright security lights used, especially by properties in the valley near the Wells.	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is International Year of Biodiversity (2010) – please do something positive this year.</li> <li>Community orchards &amp; similar should be encouraged to enhance biodiversity. Biodiversity loss is accelerating and climate change will further accelerate loss and change. Please <u>actually</u> commission the strategy for wildlife areas and corridors – we all need to know what and where these are.</li> </ul>		Minor text change will be carried out for the Guideline to say that wildlife should be managed where necessary.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should add “and be consistent with vehicular and pedestrian safety”.</li> <li>Please tell the County Council who seem opposed to good management.</li> <li>Preservation of significant trees and hedgerows especially on verges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a planning guideline!</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Golden and Toadsmoor Valleys are a <u>disgrace</u>. The Plan should encourage demolition of redundant former industrial units. The mills should be converted to housing. New tourist attractions &amp; leisure premises should be encouraged. It is currently an unfortunate mess. You should be ashamed.</li> <li>Central sentence of 7 conflicts with Economy Guidelines 1,2,3 &amp; 6.</li> </ul>	Guideline will be retained as it was generally well supported.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specifically for horse riding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Think there is no need for any more public rights of way</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management is key here as vandalism is a real challenge to the success and safety of such areas. I accept this is a social issue but it should not blight such areas.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not likely to be practical or economical.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines 4-6 &amp; 12 “Protection of wildlife – doubtful considering the damage done by badgers, foxes, rabbits, mice etc in vegetable gardens etc.</li> <li>Convert suitable footpaths to bridleways. Clear green lanes for use by motor vehicles.</li> <li>The general public and dog walkers should stick to public footpaths when crossing from farmland. The wildlife is disturbed on a regular basis. Why are verges being cut back when farmers are being told to leave land undisturbed for wildlife!!</li> <li>Landowners and managers have made Bisley what it is today – they already have the right ideas. More thought given to those</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

who live and work in Bisley. Public Rights of Way are misused – don't need any more. More thought to traffic before increasing sports and play facilities. Dog fouling – fines should be imposed – Dog Warden needed.”	
--	--

**BUILDINGS: Bisley**

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>a)</b>	Affordable homes should be a priority in all new housing developments.	32	18	8	5	1.8	Supported by Residents
<b>b)</b>	Some existing small dwellings should be kept to provide both an affordable and suitable (whole life) mix of housing for the community, particularly the elderly.	43	20	2	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>c)</b>	Buildings should use lime mortar, lime render and lime wash or stone as appropriate.	30	24	6	4	1.8	Supported by Residents
<b>d)</b>	Tiles should preferably be in natural slate or stone.	30	22	10	3	1.8	Supported by Residents
<b>e)</b>	Windows should preferably be painted timber, or left to colour naturally.	21	24	14	5	2.0	Generally supported, but text modified.
<b>f)</b>	Sympathetic use of local materials and sustainable sourcing should be encouraged.	26	38	2	0	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>g)</b>	Property owners should be encouraged to maintain their drystone walls.	38	28	0	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>h)</b>	Details of a genuine and intrinsic part of the building structure add to the overall character of the village.	34	23	0	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>i)</b>	<b>Bisley Village:</b> Provision for young people should continue to be pursued. This will include support of the Pavilion development that will create internal facilities for youth activities.	31	31	2	1	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>1</b>	New development, including extensions, garages and adaptations to existing properties, should respect the	40	25	0	1	1.4	Supported by Residents

	traditional and vernacular in terms of proportion, scale, height, materials, and landscape patterns.						
2	New extensions should be in proportion and scale to the original building, so that there is no adverse impact on local character, or loss of variety of house sizes in a rural area.	36	30	0	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
3	Proposals for high quality contemporary architecture would be supported. Imaginative and original design can extend and renew distinctive character and traditions of the villages' built environment.	22	24	11	7	2.0	Supported by Residents
4	Energy efficient installations including renewables should be supported in/on all existing and older buildings (including listed properties) so long as they are in proportion and scale to the building.	25	34	4	0	1.7	Supported by Residents
5	New developments will be expected to integrate high efficiency standards and renewables which contribute to the character and appearance of the area, to minimise energy use.	34	30	0	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
6	Planning applications should retain existing curtilage boundary drystone walls and iron railings.	32	31	2	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
7	Extensions and adaptations to existing properties outside the Settlement boundaries should comply with the guidelines above.	34	30	0	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
8	1) <b>Bisley Village:</b> The Bisley Conservation Area Policy Document should be applied to properties within the Conservation Area boundary within Bisley Village. (Details of the Bisley Conservation Area policies can be viewed on <a href="http://www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk">www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk</a> )	38	21	2	0	1.4	Supported by Residents

**Detailed Comments: Buildings - Bisley**

Guideline	For	Against	Steering Group's Response
-----------	-----	---------	---------------------------

a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For developments above a certain size – say 5/6 homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When affordable houses are built, which I thought the ones on Windyridge were, they are still too expensive for young people.</li> <li>Affordable homes did not work in Windyridge – most went for Buy to Let.</li> <li>The numbers should be limited.</li> </ul>	Comments noted but no changes proposed as the Local View was generally supported.
b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But not for young people from towns.</li> <li>There is a desperate need for low-cost bungalows for the elderly. Town house designs should be avoided</li> </ul>		
c)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New buildings should be encouraged too, for example, use wood as well as stone. The priority should be energy efficiency.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
d)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is this viable?</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>So long as timber is sourced from sustainable woodland.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Style is clearly important but wooden frame maintenance <u>can</u> prove expensive.</li> <li>Windows could also be metal-framed.</li> </ul>	Generally supported, but text modified.
h)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commission local crafts people for replacement/new details.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6 respondents said that they didn't understand this item.</li> </ul>	Examples of what is meant will be put into the VDS report.
i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But want different plans to what's been suggested.</li> <li>Provision for youth in Bisley should become the Parish Council's top priority.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is room for innovative 21<sup>st</sup> Cent design alongside the vernacular (as Guideline 3).</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing the design is in keeping with more traditional properties in the area.</li> <li>"New" isn't undesirable but it should be in keeping with our beautiful village.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contemporary architecture would be the end of Bisley as we know it.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>But only if appearance of the buildings is not ruined.</li> <li>Please encourage SDC to consider permitting double-glazing of listed buildings – conservatory-standard double-glazing is very sympathetic. Energy- saving <u>is</u> important.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No wind turbines – please on roofs of buildings in the village, or solar panels that are visible.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not understand what is intended by this which is not already covered by Building Regs and Planning Policy.</li> <li>This is probably an impossible objective.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy efficient installations are expensive and need grants.</li> </ul>	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity to do something better.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidelines 1 &amp; 3 are mutually contradictory.</li> <li>• The policy document needs to be reviewed/revised to accommodate new and acceptable building materials/standards.</li> <li>• Building developments, extensions etc need to respect wildlife and ecology. Biodiversity loss is accelerating and will be increasingly affected by climate change. All development should consider how to attract and sustain wildlife, especially birds, particularly vulnerable when old buildings and barns are restored. The EU has recently agreed a new biodiversity target and this needs to be understood and respected at all levels of activity.</li> <li>• All public buildings (eg new pavilion) should be as energy independent as possible and not have any element of potential drain on local rates. E.g the lift in the pavilion is an ongoing cost; a ramp would not. Redesign for common sense, not just spend parishioners money because you can".</li> <li>• Pavilion Development: - "The village cannot support both a WI/Village Hall and a "developed" Pavilion. The Pavilion should be upgraded but not substantially increased in size.</li> <li>• Outside the boundary the "historic" emphasis should take a less dominant role over the sustainable and innovative."</li> <li>• Parish Council should be mindful of restrictions on young people's access to buildings such as village hall. In some areas, management committees restrict access through rules thus excluding young people from facilities.</li> <li>• Young people should be encouraged to work for the community – snow clearing, errands etc then maybe they won't vandalise what is given to them.</li> <li>• Traffic on Van der Breen is bad now, don't make it worse with Pavilion development. Try being disabled and living in Van der Breen St when your door opens onto the road!</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

### HIGHWAYS: Bisley

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>a)</b>	The amount of road signage should be reduced to an acceptable/effective level.	38	18	5	2	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>b)</b>	The use of shared transport should be promoted and encouraged wherever it is practical to do so.	20	43	0	0	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>c)</b>	There should be liaison with transport providers (bus services) regarding timing and linking of services to encourage greater use of public transport, thereby consolidating the viability of the service.	34	32	0	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>d)</b>	Lower speed limits should be promoted on all roads in the Parish, and 20mph limits through settlement areas and by schools.	40	17	5	4	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>e)</b>	Speed limits should be monitored and enforced through use of Police checks and also community usage of speed check equipment both static and hand-held.	42	18	4	1	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>f)</b>	Support should be given to the County Council (Highways) work to impose weight restrictions on roads throughout the Parish (except for Access purposes).	54	11	0	0	1.2	Supported by Residents
<b>g)</b>	<b>Bisley Village:</b> The Section 106 conditions in respect of the Little Close development need to be implemented by the Stroud District Council.	31	16	1	0	1.4	This item will be taken out, as it has been completed.
<b>h)</b>	<b>Bisley Village:</b> Pavements should be provided down the Cheltenham Road from its junction with Windyridge to the junction of Van der Breen Street. This will help pedestrians using the village shop and other amenities (churches, public	43	17	3	2	1.4	Supported by Residents

	houses) and youngsters accessing the play area at the King George V Playing Field.						
<b>1</b>	A Transport Assessment or the Design and Access Statement for all new proposed developments should take into account the effect of additional car ownership upon the highway capacity within the Parish.	37	26	0	1	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>Detailed Comments: Highways - Bisley</b>							
<b>Guideline</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>				<b>Steering Group's Response</b>	
<b>a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Including the sensitive positioning of publicity signs. Far too many.</li> <li>All signs in rural areas should be removed in a long-term strategy to bring in digital signage, thus reducing excessive clutter in the countryside. <u>Efficient</u> SATNAV systems should help.</li> <li>Too many signs already on the roads in Bisley and they are driving too fast to read them anyway.</li> <li>The signage in this village is piecemeal and needs sorting out and rationalizing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proper signs to be used on outskirts of village especially for HGVs at moment signs are deceiving.</li> <li>The Give Way by the Stirrup Cup should be changed to a "Stop" – it is a speeding point Yellow lines outside the Stirrup Cup would stop queues forming. Signs needed further out regarding maximum lorry lengths and widths.</li> </ul>				Generally supported by Residents	
<b>b)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not always practical.</li> </ul>				Generally supported by Residents	
<b>c)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The buses are mostly empty!!</li> </ul>				Generally supported by Residents	
<b>d)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can't we have residents only down the High St ? – "20mph by schools and in villages only.</li> <li>Agree that there should be 20 mph through settlement areas and near schools but think speed limits should stay as they are on all other roads</li> </ul>					Supported by Residents	
<b>e)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speeding along the Eastcombe-Bisley Road is an accident waiting to happen – speed limit of 50 mph please.</li> <li>With respect to Police speed checks, the only road the Police appear to concentrate on is the Cheltenham Rd – Windyridge.</li> <li>Van der Breen St to the rest of the village needs consideration – crossing the road is very dangerous. Speed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surely enforcing the speed limits within <u>any</u> village is a Police issue and does not need to be a policy issue for the local council.</li> </ul>				Generally supported by Residents in Bisley	

	restrictions vital 20 mph doesn't work. Traffic all day now. Does anybody consider the elderly and disabled".		
<b>g)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 respondents said they didn't understand this item.</li> </ul>	This item will be taken out, as it has been completed.
<b>h)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bisley has been trying to have a pavement down Cheltenham Rd to my knowledge since 1964, nothing has been done about it. My local councillor has informed me that they have it on the list for improvements and have done nothing. I hope that the Parish Council can put pressure on GCC to obtain this facility.</li> <li>Cheltenham Road footpath essential.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there sufficient verge?</li> <li>Just less traffic and slower!</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The practice of making grips in the verges should cease (except in the very few places where there is standing water in the road after a storm). They are mostly useless; ugly and dangerous. Money saved could go to better road maintenance.</li> <li>There should be a crossing near the School via Bear Inn to the School as people do not slow down!. Bigger 20mph signs needed or speed humps.</li> <li>Pavements should be provided further on Cheltenham Road towards Ivy Cottage incorporated in traffic calming measures. The speed limit is ignored and un-enforced thus traffic calming measures are needed to break the flow of vehicles and slow them down. Access to the footpath is dangerous.</li> <li>Notion of by-pass should be revisited. Speed limits are not whole solution as often it is inappropriate speeds not excess speeds. Traffic calming measures are needed as walking outside our house is dangerous negating quality of life. Situation has got worse over 24 years of residence.</li> <li>There is a need to manage thoughtfully parking on the High St as currently this can obstruct refuse collections and access by emergency vehicles. It also detracts from the appearance and character of the central areas of the village.</li> <li>The common (unlawful) practice of residents parking on pavements should <u>NOT</u> be condoned. On many occasions it is not possible to take a child's push-chair down the High Street in Bisley!</li> <li>The time has come when the highways serving the village a practical SAFE passage thro' our village. Serious attempts and lobbying needs to be in place to ensure Bisley is not a permanent vehicle lock-up. It will not disappear.</li> <li>The field adjacent to the village hall should be returned for village use, as originally intended. A new village hall is needed – not just an extension grafted on to a dilapidated shed built in 1910. Use part of the allotment field as good access &amp; parking.</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

**ECONOMY: Bisley**

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>1</b>	New employment sites in the Parish within, and adjacent to the settlements will be supported where appropriate opportunities exist, in business sectors that can thrive in the rural environment. Transport links, noise and preserving the visual amenity of the Cotswold AONB will be sensitive considerations requiring careful analysis when reviewing the proposals.	23	35	4	3	2.1	Will be retained, as there is general support in the Parish. Will add text to say that light pollution should be assessed when a proposal is being considered.
<b>2</b>	Proposals for small employment units outside the settlement boundaries should be supported (particularly the reuse of redundant farm buildings) where appropriate transport links exist. Any employment units should be visually compatible with surrounding buildings and landscape.	27	34	4	1	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>3</b>	Renewable energy employment opportunities should be supported in forestry, linking woodland management and wood fuel production. The type and scale of any developments should not be detrimental to the landscape character or any wildlife interests.	27	36	1	1	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>4</b>	A large community scale wind turbine would be supported if the energy and the economy directly benefited the Parish and it was carefully sited.	24	15	10	17	2.3	Will be taken out of the VDS report. Deep divisions within the community, and no clear support.
<b>5</b>	Improvement in telecommunication links would be supported where there is no adverse impact on landscape or amenity.	30	27	2	3	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>6</b>	Existing and future tourism attractions and facilities which bring economy to the villages should be effectively promoted. Sensitive located “brown signage” will be beneficial to this aim.	19	33	10	4	1.9	Generally supported by Residents. Text on “brown signage” will be deleted.

Detailed Comments: Economy - Bisley			
Guideline	For	Against	Steering Group's Response
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very, very few such sites will preserve the rural peace and wildlife within the AONB.</li> <li>Light industrial units similar to those constructed should be OK provided they do not bring the village down.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No light industrial units please.</li> <li>Employment for whom?</li> <li>The creation of new jobs is no guarantee that those jobs will go to local people – in fact where new jobs have been created they have mostly gone to outsiders.</li> </ul>	Will be retained, as there is general support in the Parish. Will add text to say that light pollution should be assessed when a proposal is being considered.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small employment units would be welcome but careful consideration needs to be given to the amount of traffic generated. For example, there are constant problems with huge, heavy &amp; long lorries visiting Graduate Gardeners. Perhaps developments should be conditional on these employment units forcing their suppliers to use appropriate delivery vehicles.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May require a change of landscape.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need to become more self-sufficient into the future, energy-wise. There must be some locations where a turbine would be acceptable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contradicts Landscape &amp; Wildlife guideline (1).</li> <li>A wind turbine is more than likely to cost the consumer a premium tariff. It is a myth to believe that it will reduce costs to consumers in the village unless there are substantial subsidies – which would be a burden on the tax payer!</li> <li>The apparently favourable economics of such a project should be carefully investigated.</li> <li>Wind turbine – waste of time and money. Digester more reliable and far more likely to produce energy for the community and surplus to sell to the National Grid.</li> </ul>	Will be taken out of the VDS report. Deep divisions within the community, and no clear support.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mobile phone mast please.</li> <li>Improvement in telecommunications links should be supported without reservation to prevent the rural community's economic marginalization.</li> <li>Really a need for telecommunications as people with mobile phones have a job to get signals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Telecommunication aerials bring illness in their wake and should be resisted at all costs.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tourism should not result in any additional properties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sat Navs tend to render signs redundant.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents.

	<p>becoming second homes or holiday homes if at all possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion is good providing we have the road infrastructure in place to ensure the village is protected. Facilities? Yes but until the road, dare I say “by pass” is promoted the economy will struggle to support &amp; strengthen our village and its community.</li> <li>• Only if parking is available.</li> <li>• Historic sites should be promoted to encourage visitors. However there are no facilities other than public houses for people. Need to encourage café/restaurant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce signage use websites digital signage.</li> <li>• No more sign posts!! Aagghh!</li> </ul>	<p>Text on “brown signage” will be deleted.</p>
--	---	--	---

**VDS ANALYSIS - EASTCOMBE**  
**(43 forms returned, out of 310 - 14%)**

**General Comments:**

- Thank you for all your work on this document.

SETTLEMENT PATTERNS: Eastcombe							
Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
1	The existing Village Settlement Boundaries should be maintained, to protect the rural character of the villages.	37	3	0	0	1.1	Supported by Residents
2	New developments should respect the individual and historic settlement patterns in terms of the balance between infill and open space: <b>Eastcombe Village:</b> The village green and other open spaces in the centre of Eastcombe should be protected from development.	39	1	0	0	1.0	Supported by Residents
3	The small green spaces and the web of public footpath links within the settlements should be conserved, to maintain their traditional character.	37	3	0	0	1.1	Supported by Residents
4	Proposals for community driven low impact affordable projects outside the Settlement Boundary will be regarded sympathetically. <i>(Further details can be seen in Section 3 of the VDS Report: see <a href="http://www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk">www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk</a>)</i>	8	21	6	4	2.2	Comments are generally supportive in the Parish. Retain, but have explanatory text in the VDS Document, and say that only very limited development is considered.
5	New development or infilling should not interrupt or obscure key views in/out or across the village.	31	8	1	0	1.3	Supported by Residents

**Detailed Comments: Settlement Patterns - Eastcombe**

<b>Guideline</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Steering Group's Response</b>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Bussage development has been a disaster in terms of increased traffic and impact on the environment - this must never be allowed to happen again.</li> <li>We believe that the existing village boundaries should be rigidly maintained. There is sufficient affordable housing already in Eastcombe &amp; Bussage. The local infrastructure cannot cope (is not adequately coping) with the present level of development in the area.</li> <li>No more large developments like Bussage!</li> <li>The rural character of the villages should be protected at all costs.</li> <li>Existing road infrastructure is hopelessly over burdened - future development should be restricted.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care should be taken that small green spaces do not become parking spaces.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
<b>4</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not know what a 'community driven low impact affordable project' would be, and I do not think referring to a website helps all parishioners.</li> </ul>	Comments are generally supportive in the Parish. Retain, but have explanatory text in the VDS Document, and say that only very limited development is considered.
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guideline 5 is a fine thought, but 'nobody owns a view'.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents

LANDSCAPE & WILDLIFE: Eastcombe							
Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
1	<p>The Parish lies wholly within the Cotswolds AONB and has two distinctive landscape character areas (High Wolds – Bisley Plateau, and the Toadsmoor and Frome Valleys). Essential elements of the landscape should be both conserved, and enhanced through sensitive management. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new development, including where permission is granted outside of existing settlement boundaries, should be designed to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the landscape, and this character should influence the layout and form of any such development.</li> <li>• The open landscape with wide vistas should be maintained.</li> <li>• Land owners and managers should conserve and enhance existing woodlands, limestone grassland, hedgerows and drystone walls which are a particular feature within the Parish, and manage such features to develop wildlife corridors.</li> </ul>	33	7	0	0	1.2	Supported by Residents
2	Land owners and managers should recognize and promote measures in landscape management and practices to adapt to changes in landscape character and appearance brought about by climate change.	17	18	4	0	1.7	Supported by Residents
3	Tranquility and dark night skies are a characteristic of the Parish and should be maintained through measures to minimize light pollution both within settlements and open countryside, removing or switching off existing lighting where appropriate (taking account of safety and crime prevention) and resisting further street lighting.	34	6	1	0	1.2	Supported by Residents
4	The availability of allotments should be protected, and the						

	existing allotments and recreation grounds should be developed through appropriate management, as a buffer zones for wildlife whilst fulfilling their primary purpose.	29	12	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>5</b>	Wildlife should be protected and biodiversity encouraged through the development of a strategic network of wildlife areas and corridors, including open common land and woodland.	27	13	1	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>6</b>	Highway verges should be managed appropriately to maximise wildlife wherever possible.	28	12	1	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>7</b>	If the Cotswold Canal is restored to full navigation the existing high wildlife and landscape value should be maintained, together with the tranquil quality of the wider canal corridor. No new building or infrastructure would be supported within the section of the Canal which passes through the Parish, with the possible exception of some very limited expansion of facilities at the Daneway. Associated design, eg signage, bridge restoration etc should be of the highest design, in keeping with both the canal and the landscape through which it passes.	26	14	1	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>8</b>	The preservation and protection of archaeological sites and historic structures should be encouraged. Access, interpretation and educational use of such sites should be encouraged where appropriate to the site's accessibility and sensitivity.	24	15	1	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>9</b>	The public rights of way network should be safeguarded and properly maintained. Where appropriate, permissive routes should be developed and new public rights of way dedicated so as to provide a usable network of linked routes.	30	10	1	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>10</b>	Existing outdoor play areas and formal sports facilities should be protected, and their appearance improved through appropriate choice of materials, eg new play equipment, landscaping and management. Where any new development takes place, additional open space should be provided and footpaths, which are a feature of the main settlements, should be designed into the development.	29	13	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents

11	Local community waste and recycling initiatives, such as the Bisley community composting scheme, should be encouraged and appropriate land should be identified to support these projects.	26	15	0	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
12	Proposals to use local stone on a small scale for local building use should be considered as part of encouraging sustainable development, and such sites should receive appropriate treatment to maximize wildlife and landscape benefits.	19	19	1	1	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>Detailed Comments: Landscape &amp; Wildlife - Eastcombe</b>							
<b>Guideline</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>				<b>Steering Group's Response</b>	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preserve our open fields / woodland &amp; village greens for future generations.</li> </ul>					Supported by Residents	
2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guideline 2 would benefit from examples - I cannot imagine what it means.</li> </ul>				Examples will be included in the VDS document regarding what changes climate change may cause.	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could we not campaign against garden lighting such as up-lighters in trees?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>				Supported by Residents	
5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think there is a need to clarify the term 'wild life'. There are those who hate foxes, badgers, deer, jackdaws, magpies, squirrels and there are those who encourage the same. Rats are 'wild life' too.</li> <li>Some wildlife is not welcome on allotments.</li> <li>It should be noted that deer and grey squirrels can be very damaging to woodland.</li> </ul>				Minor text change will be carried out for the Guideline to say that wildlife should be managed where necessary.	
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At present there is too much strimming of highway verges.</li> <li>We are concerned at the hit &amp; miss approach to verge management - strimming is carried out by both Parish Council &amp; Glos highways at the wrong time, severely inhibiting species such as cow parsley and allowing weeds such as nettles to run riot in the space left. This is contrary to any biodiversity policy. Verges are also allowed to be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highway verges need to be maintained so as to provide good visibility, hence safety, to all road users. 'Weed' trees in particular should be removed, and road signs kept clear of obstructing vegetation.</li> </ul>				Supported by Residents	

	damaged by vehicles & utility companies repeatedly as is the village green. Other areas are left untouched & become a hindrance to safe driving eg by allotment entrance.		
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How about Woodchester Roman Pavement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing arrangements with landowners are adequate.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More bridleways should be opened.</li> <li>The current network is good.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restricted Byeways should be limited to form more networks for riding and mountain biking.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
12		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does guideline 12 mean permitting limited quarrying? If so, why not say so?</li> <li>What does Guideline 12 mean?</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tone of some questions appears to concede future development outside the existing development boundaries. We strongly recommend that this is wrong and should not be permitted. The scale of development in the Eastcombe/Bussage/Brownhill area is already far to high. Further expansion is to be resisted.</li> <li>Unfortunately deer, badgers, etc already consider our gardens to be wildlife corridors. How about organizing wildlife control?</li> <li>I do not think you should put more than one proposition in a box, unless you are prepared to accept more than one answer per box.</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

**BUILDINGS: Eastcombe**

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>a)</b>	Affordable homes should be a priority in all new housing developments.	11	19	5	5	2.1	Generally supported by Residents. The average across the Parish supported this Local View.
<b>b)</b>	Some existing small dwellings should be kept to provide both an affordable and suitable (whole life) mix of housing for the community, particularly the elderly.	23	15	3	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>c)</b>	Buildings should use lime mortar, lime render and lime wash or stone as appropriate.	15	21	4	1	1.8	Supported by Residents
<b>d)</b>	Tiles should preferably be in natural slate or stone.	19	12	8	0	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>e)</b>	Windows should preferably be painted timber, or left to colour naturally.	6	16	14	5	2.4	Text modified to reflect the concerns raised.
<b>f)</b>	Sympathetic use of local materials and sustainable sourcing should be encouraged.	21	19	2	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>g)</b>	Property owners should be encouraged to maintain their drystone walls.	29	10	2	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>h)</b>	Details of a genuine and intrinsic part of the building structure add to the overall character of the village.	21	14	2	1	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>1</b>	New development, including extensions, garages and adaptations to existing properties, should respect the traditional and vernacular in terms of proportion, scale, height, materials, and landscape patterns.	30	11	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>2</b>	New extensions should be in proportion and scale to the						

	original building, so that there is no adverse impact on local character, or loss of variety of house sizes in a rural area.	29	12	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
3	Proposals for high quality contemporary architecture would be supported. Imaginative and original design can extend and renew distinctive character and traditions of the villages' built environment.	15	16	6	3	1.9	Supported by Residents
4	Energy efficient installations including renewables should be supported in/on all existing and older buildings (including listed properties) so long as they are in proportion and scale to the building.	20	18	3	0	1.6	Supported by Residents
5	New developments will be expected to integrate high efficiency standards and renewables which contribute to the character and appearance of the area, to minimise energy use.	23	17	0	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
6	Planning applications should retain existing curtilage boundary drystone walls and iron railings.	25	13	2	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
7	Extensions and adaptations to existing properties outside the Settlement boundaries should comply with the guidelines above	27	13	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
8	<p><b>Eastcombe Village:</b> The Bisley Conservation Area Policy Document (Local Plan Policies B3 to B13), and Policy &amp; Design Guidance P1 to P13 should be applied to properties in the Conservation Area boundary within EastcombeVillage, with the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P2 shall not apply, as it addresses a particular traffic problem in Bisley Village.</li> <li>• Proposals affecting “Neutral Zones” do not apply, as such areas are not encountered in the Eastcombe Conservation Area.</li> </ul> <p><i>(Details of the Bisley Conservation Area policies can be viewed on <a href="http://www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk">www.bisley-with-lypiatt.gov.uk</a>)</i></p>	8	18	0	0	1.7	Supported by Residents

Detailed Comments: Buildings - Eastcombe			
Guideline	For	Against	Steering Group's Response
c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stone should be first priority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is economically unrealistic. There is a good choice of artificial alternatives.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tiles should preferably be in natural slate or stone but would need grant to return damage done by Stroud DC!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Type of tiles depends on type of house.</li> <li>The majority of homes/cottages in Eastcombe have concrete tiles, many installed with the help of re-roofing grants from Stroud Council in the 1980's. Would grants be available to replace these?</li> <li>This is economically unrealistic. There is a good choice of artificial alternatives.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do you mean replacement double glazed windows? In which case wood is definitely preferable to PVC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Metal windows are a listed feature!</li> <li>Many cottages have original metal windows or simple glazing bars in mullions. People in listed buildings are encouraged to keep original windows.</li> <li>Painted timber is a continuous maintenance problem.</li> <li>A lot of cottage windows were metal when built. Modern timber windows and paint have a short life, irrespective of guarantees and are a long term problem, especially for elderly people who cannot afford repairs or replacement.</li> </ul>	Text modified to reflect the concerns raised.
f)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How about grants or VAT exemption as the best way to encourage sympathetic use of local materials and sustainable sourcing?</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
g)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grants should be available for maintenance of any dry stone walls.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who can afford it?</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
h)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 Respondents said that they didn't understand what this item meant.</li> </ul>	Examples of what is meant will be put into the VDS report.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People are still being allowed to build houses, garages and extensions that are an eyesore and not in keeping. Natural materials (or good copies) and traditional designs need to</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents

	be maintained. • And, above all, <u>FORM</u> .		
2	• No flat roofs.		Supported by Residents
3	• Contemporary architecture would be supported if built in natural materials like the original buildings in the area.	• We are not totally against new styles of architecture but any new styles should fit well with existing buildings. • Traditional character and local features need to be respected rather than 'quirky' modernist 'enlightened' ideas. • Only if in keeping with character.	Generally supported by Residents
4		• I agree with energy conservation but some modern designs and technologies (double glazing) can be an eyesore.	Generally supported by Residents
5		• What about renewables? Are we going to see a rash of wind farms?	Generally supported by Residents
6		• If a planning application suggested demolishing walls to get parked vehicles off the village streets and into gardens I would support the idea	Generally supported by Residents
8		• Do not have any information on Bisley Conservation Area policies.	Generally supported by Residents
<b>General</b>	• Local views (a)-(h) Muddled thinking. Stone, etc, does not make 'affordable' possible. Who gets to decide which small dwellings are kept small? Who will subsidize use of all these natural materials? • Local view (c) - Local view (d) - Local view (e) - If you <u>are</u> insistent on vernacular, use of stone, etc, then wooden window frames are inappropriate. Mullions are the thing. • Roads in area cannot take more traffic from housing developments! • Planning permission granted should take into account access to the site and the welfare of residents on the route. Lanes and property are being badly damaged by construction traffic, much of which is unsuitable for narrow lanes. • After any planning consent checks should be made to ensure building relates to plans - checks by building regs should also check any planning restrictions to be adhered to. • A firmer approach needs to be taken by Stroud District Council on those who build not in accordance with approved plan and subsequently retrospectively submit a further planning application. In my view this should not be allowed. Until a firm line is taken this abuse will continue and effectively builders/developers are 'getting away' with it.		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.



### HIGHWAYS: Eastcombe

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>a)</b>	The amount of road signage should be reduced to an acceptable/effective level.	16	8	1	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>b)</b>	The use of shared transport should be promoted and encouraged wherever it is practical to do so.	5	18	2	0	1.9	Supported by Residents
<b>c)</b>	There should be liaison with transport providers (bus services) regarding timing and linking of services to encourage greater use of public transport, thereby consolidating the viability of the service.	18	7	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>d)</b>	Lower speed limits should be promoted on all roads in the Parish, and 20mph limits through settlement areas and by schools.	10	6	4	3	2.0	Generally supported by Residents
<b>e)</b>	Speed limits should be monitored and enforced through use of Police checks and also community usage of speed check equipment both static and hand-held.	6	10	5	3	2.2	Local View removed for Eastcombe.
<b>f)</b>	Support should be given to the County Council (Highways) work to impose weight restrictions on roads throughout the Parish (except for Access purposes).	17	9	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>1</b>	A Transport Assessment or the Design and Access Statement for all new proposed developments should take into account the effect of additional car ownership upon the highway capacity within the Parish.	17	5	0	0	1.2	Supported by Residents

<b>Detailed Comments: Highways - Eastcombe</b>						
<b>Guideline</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Steering Group's Response</b>			
<b>b)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How could item (b) be done?</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents			
<b>d)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly agree with 20 &amp; 30 mph limits in built up areas - strongly disagree with lower speed limits outside built up areas.</li> <li>20 or 30 mph in built up areas but <u>not</u> on the open roads.</li> <li>Speed limits by schools should be 10 mph 8.30 - 9.15, 3-3.30.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed humps are a much more effective way of speed reduction near schools.</li> <li>Inappropriate speed kills!! but speed limits only contribute to the nanny state.</li> <li>I'm not party to statistics on the matter of road accidents but most accidents round here I know about have been due to bad driving rather than speed - and many due to runaway cars on the village green - why no warning signs there?</li> <li>I cannot agree with it. 60 mph is perfectly OK in some places, and few people obey 20 mph signs. There should be speed controls outside schools at the beginning and end of the school day, and a <u>strong</u> campaign to encourage driving appropriately for the existing conditions.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents			
<b>e)</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hand-held speed check equipment is notoriously inaccurate and can lead to unjust accusations of speeding.</li> </ul>	Local View removed for Eastcombe.			
<b>f)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weight limits should apply on deliveries / surplus excavations in the village where new building work occurs.</li> <li>Large lorries should be stopped going through Bisley. The road is not suitable and not wide enough and the traffic is ruining the walls and verges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	Supported by Residents			
<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road humps for traffic calming should be replaced by squeezes.</li> <li>Telegraph poles should be made safer where appropriate - many have torn metal 'protection' round base which is jagged &amp; unsightly. Complaints to BT have no effect. Some are worse than others and are a danger to children and animals.</li> <li>Nothing more needs to be said about the disgraceful state of our lanes and roads. Weather has been only part of the problem: heavy vehicles and traffic have also taken their tolls.</li> <li>FAR TOO MUCH traffic on Toadsmoor &amp; Eastcombe to Birdlip roads now - damaging roads and dangerous driving! Great problems in icy/snowy weather.</li> </ul>			Comments noted, but no changes proposed.		



**ECONOMY: Eastcombe**

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>1</b>	New employment sites in the Parish within, and adjacent to the settlements will be supported where appropriate opportunities exist, in business sectors that can thrive in the rural environment. Transport links, noise and preserving the visual amenity of the Cotswold AONB will be sensitive considerations requiring careful analysis when reviewing the proposals.	18	22	0	1	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>2</b>	Proposals for small employment units outside the settlement boundaries should be supported (particularly the reuse of redundant farm buildings) where appropriate transport links exist. Any employment units should be visually compatible with surrounding buildings and landscape.	18	20	2	1	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>3</b>	Renewable energy employment opportunities should be supported in forestry, linking woodland management and wood fuel production. The type and scale of any developments should not be detrimental to the landscape character or any wildlife interests.	22	18	1	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>4</b>	A large community scale wind turbine would be supported if the energy and the economy directly benefited the Parish and it was carefully sited.	12	7	11	10	2.5	Will be taken out of the VDS report. Deep divisions within the community, and no clear support.
<b>5</b>	Improvement in telecommunication links would be supported where there is no adverse impact on landscape or amenity.	20	18	1	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>6</b>	Existing and future tourism attractions and facilities which bring economy to the villages should be effectively promoted. Sensitive located “brown signage” will be beneficial to this aim.	18	17	4	1	1.7	Supported by Residents

<b>Detailed Comments: Economy - Eastcombe</b>							
<b>Guideline</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Steering Group's Response</b>				
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I should like SDC to understand that small businesses should be <u>retained</u> within the villages (and that includes unsightly ones).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not sure I understand this emphasis on 'transport links'. If this means buses it should be remembered that most of our lanes are too small for them.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents				
<b>2</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support conversion of existing buildings (Farm, etc) but <u>not</u> new development outside village boundaries.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents				
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Burning wood is not carbon neutral.</li> <li>OK, but check noise envelope!</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents				
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A wind turbine only if it provided enough energy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wind turbine - qualifications in terms of scale of development and extent / scope of energy provision would need to be carefully considered.</li> <li>Wind turbines may be part of the answer but they destroy the character of an area.</li> <li>Wind turbines are not effective, only giving 10-20% availability.</li> <li>These installations are very costly, unsightly, and, much of the time, fail to produce any electricity due to lack of wind. Can you guarantee that as the climate continues to change the wind will be more constant?</li> </ul>	Will be taken out of the VDS report. Deep divisions within the community, and no clear support.				
<b>6</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is enough traffic in this area already without encouraging tourism.</li> <li>As far as this is concerned, brown signs are as unsightly as any other signs.</li> <li>Tourism in Bisley/Lypiatt will only improve if something is done about Stroud!</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents. Text on "brown signage" will be deleted.				

**VDS ANALYSIS - OAKRIDGE**  
**(65 forms returned, out of 300 - 22%)**

**General Comments:**

- This Design Statement will be agreed by the majority of residents, but the Parish Council has no influence with SDC and therefore is probably a complete waste of time and money.
- I wouldn't call this a "Village Design statement".
- This is hardly a design statement. There is no mention of a school, church, Village hall, shop/post office or a public house. Nothing about transport/roads etc.

<b>SETTLEMENT PATTERNS: Oakridge</b>							
Guideline:		1 "Strongly Agree"	2 "Agree"	3 "Disagree"	4 "Strongly disagree"	Average	Steering Group's Response
1	The existing Village Settlement Boundaries should be maintained to protect the rural character of the villages.	51	5	5	1	1.3	Supported by Residents
2	New developments should respect the individual and historic settlement patterns in terms of the balance between infill and open space:  <b>Oakridge Village:</b> The village has developed with a higgledy-piggledy layout, crisscrossed with a warren of footpaths and narrow roads that should be maintained.	56	6	1	0	1.1	Supported by Residents
3	The small green spaces and the web of public footpath links within the settlements should be conserved, to maintain their traditional character.	58	5	0	0	1.1	Supported by Residents
4	Proposals for community driven low impact affordable projects outside the Settlement Boundary will be regarded sympathetically.	17	26	7	5	2.0	Comments are generally supportive in the Parish. Retain, but have explanatory text in the VDS Document, and say that only very limited development is considered.
5	New development or infilling should not interrupt or obscure key views in/out or across the village.	51	10	0	0	1.2	Supported by Residents

**Detailed Comments: Settlement Patterns - Oakridge**

<b>Guideline</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Steering Group's Response</b>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The boundaries of the village should be strictly adhered to, otherwise no green belt will exist.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could be development outside the village boundary where suitable. eg. Along the top road opposite the pub, thereby continuing the line of houses from the "Crescent".</li> <li>Village and surrounding hamlets have scope for growth whilst maintaining rural nature.</li> <li>Some limited expansion of the boundaries should be permitted, to avoid stagnation.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with 2, but it is necessary to look at altering the village boundary to allow some development outwards. Infilling spoils the village.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with 4, as long as many other expensive houses are not built. Need to make them affordable.</li> <li>Agree with 4, but not only affordable; also need to consider more houses to keep the village viable.</li> <li>For 4, agree if inside or attached to the village. Do not agree outside of the village boundary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal in 4 is unclear.</li> <li>Not outside the village boundary.</li> <li>For 4 Oakridge Lynch will lose its identity completely if there is any building (be it time or estate) to any other settlement. It's uniqueness is marked by its separateness; this is true of many other settlements.</li> <li>4 should <u>NOT</u> apply to Oakridge as the infrastructure <u>CANNOT</u> cope with any more additional housing.</li> </ul>	Comments are generally supportive in the Parish. Retain, but have explanatory text in the VDS Document, and say that only very limited development is considered.
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 is a good idea, but legislation doesn't allow for this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 should <u>NOT</u> apply to Oakridge as the infrastructure <u>CANNOT</u> cope with any more additional housing.</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Are essentially covered by other Guidelines.
<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with affordable houses if can see the need for them, otherwise "no need" except for maybe small houses for the elderly. We have a social need to look after our own.</li> <li>Nationally, why do we need so many more houses? Has the birth rate risen, has our social situation changed? Maybe we need to look at what we really need, and how necessary the need is.</li> <li>Not enough emphasis is placed on encouraging more people to live here, thus making the shop, school, church, pub and Village hall viable. These are so important to the village. Infilling is spoiling the village. Some alteration to the fictitious boundary to allow more housing would be the most sensible solution. This should be at the northern end of the village where access roads are very good. No infilling in the heart of the village is a good idea, as this leads to many difficulties with transport and delivery amongst other things (eg. snow &amp; ice).</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

LANDSCAPE & WILDLIFE: Oakridge							
Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
1	<p>The Parish lies wholly within the Cotswolds AONB and has two distinctive landscape character areas (High Wolds – Bisley Plateau, and the Toadsmoor and Frome Valleys). Essential elements of the landscape should be both conserved, and enhanced through sensitive management. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new development, including where permission is granted outside of existing settlement boundaries, should be designed to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of the landscape, and this character should influence the layout and form of any such development.</li> <li>• The open landscape with wide vistas should be maintained.</li> <li>• Land owners and managers should conserve and enhance existing woodlands, limestone grassland, hedgerows and drystone walls which are a particular feature within the Parish, and manage such features to develop wildlife corridors.</li> </ul>	47	11	1	0	1.2	Supported by Residents
2	Land owners and managers should recognize and promote measures in landscape management and practices to adapt to changes in landscape character and appearance brought about by climate change.	27	25	4	0	1.6	Supported by Residents
3	Tranquility and dark night skies are a characteristic of the Parish and should be maintained through measures to minimize light pollution both within settlements and open countryside, removing or switching off existing lighting where appropriate (taking account of safety and crime prevention) and resisting further street lighting.	51	9	1	0	1.2	Supported by Residents
4	The availability of allotments should be protected, and the						

	existing allotments and recreation grounds should be developed through appropriate management, as a buffer zones for wildlife whilst fulfilling their primary purpose.	45	15	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>5</b>	Wildlife should be protected and biodiversity encouraged through the development of a strategic network of wildlife areas and corridors, including open common land and woodland.	46	13	0	0	1.2	Supported by Residents
<b>6</b>	Highway verges should be managed appropriately to maximise wildlife wherever possible.	40	19	0	2	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>7</b>	If the Cotswold Canal is restored to full navigation the existing high wildlife and landscape value should be maintained, together with the tranquil quality of the wider canal corridor. No new building or infrastructure would be supported within the section of the Canal which passes through the Parish, with the possible exception of some very limited expansion of facilities at the Daneway. Associated design, eg signage, bridge restoration etc should be of the highest design, in keeping with both the canal and the landscape through which it passes.	46	10	1	2	1.3	Supported by Residents
<b>8</b>	The preservation and protection of archaeological sites and historic structures should be encouraged. Access, interpretation and educational use of such sites should be encouraged where appropriate to the site's accessibility and sensitivity.	35	26	1	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>9</b>	The public rights of way network should be safeguarded and properly maintained. Where appropriate, permissive routes should be developed and new public rights of way dedicated so as to provide a usable network of linked routes.	37	22	0	3	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>10</b>	Existing outdoor play areas and formal sports facilities should be protected, and their appearance improved through appropriate choice of materials, eg new play equipment, landscaping and management. Where any new development takes place, additional open space should be provided and	43	19	0	0	1.3	Supported by Residents

	footpaths, which are a feature of the main settlements, should be designed into the development.						
<b>11</b>	Local community waste and recycling initiatives, such as the Bisley community composting scheme, should be encouraged and appropriate land should be identified to support these projects.	40	20	2	1	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>12</b>	Proposals to use local stone on a small scale for local building use should be considered as part of encouraging sustainable development, and such sites should receive appropriate treatment to maximize wildlife and landscape benefits.	37	24	2	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>Detailed Comments: Landscape &amp; Wildlife - Oakridge</b>							
<b>Guideline</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>				<b>Steering Group's Response</b>	
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First bullet point in 1 is a good idea but we are not a conservation area with Article 4, therefore decisions should be based upon good design and appropriate materials.</li> <li>2<sup>nd</sup> &amp; 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet points in 1 are a good idea but are beyond remit and jurisdiction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limestone Grassland: Naturally conserved by sheep grazing, eg. stopping invasive species by close cropping. The high number of horses in this area is having a detrimental effect on this aspect of limestone grassland and hedgerows.</li> <li>No additional housing should be granted in or around Oakridge.</li> </ul>				Generally supported by Residents	
<b>2</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not susceptible to planning control.</li> <li>It is unreasonable to expect landowners to maintain stone walls without financial assistance.</li> </ul>				Examples to illustrate this Guideline will be included in the VDS document regarding what changes climate change may cause.	
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Street lighting would not be welcome in Oakridge: it not only causes light pollution but contributes to global warming. Where possible, Oakridge should remain as it is: a delightful old Cotswold neighbourhood not blighted by unruly youths.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not susceptible to planning control.</li> <li>Lighting should be solar panel.</li> </ul>				Generally supported by Residents	
<b>4</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The encouragement of wildlife is not always compatible with allotments used for growing food. Scrub encourages wildlife but harbours rabbits, as in Waterlane allotments.</li> </ul>				Generally supported by Residents	
<b>6</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highway verges should not be left in a natural state for wildlife where road safety is disregarded.</li> <li>Verges should be maintained for the safety of pedestrians.</li> </ul>				Generally supported by Residents	

7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with 7, but if the canal is restored fully, the existing wildlife will be lost. The area will be changed completely to its detriment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There may need to be some infrastructure work, eg. access roads will be necessary to allow construction to take place. Also, the Bakers Mill bridge, which has been recently strengthened, is already not in keeping with the canal heritage.</li> <li>The Canal should not be returned to full navigation.</li> <li>Do not support the rebuilding of the canal. It would be impossible to maintain wildlife and landscape value if the scheme went ahead. The tranquil quality of the canal corridor would be lost. Would not support any expansion of the facilities at Daneway.</li> <li>Much wildlife would be lost if the canal was restored. There would be a shift to different wildlife; less diverse.</li> <li>Should recognise that the Gloucestershire Wildlife Trust is against the canal being restored through the Golden Valley.</li> <li>No canal development.</li> <li>No “floating community” on the canal.</li> <li>Too many points on item 7.</li> </ul>	Guideline will be retained as it was generally well supported.
8		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not keen on the idea of disturbing areas of wildlife for visits to historic sites. However a small informal pamphlet of information would be interesting, and those interested could visit areas without signs, parking, paths etc.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing public rights of way should be protected. New rights of way (whether to link up existing paths or not) should be subject to the existing stringent procedures to avoid encroachment on private land. Where land is subject to a right of way, that should be accepted by the owners; no owner should be forced to accept new rights of way with all the responsibility that would entail.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly agree that the sports field should be maintained. New play equipment should be sensitively placed, and not placed so near to people’s property due to noise and privacy.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It would enhance the approach to the village if action was taken to clear up the rubbish at Lillyhorn. Rubbish is now developing on both sides of the road. The other eyesore is on the Waterlane to Oakridge road which has been a rubbish tip for years; the road is continually covered in mud.</li> <li>Representation should be made to BT to either maintain the red kiosks properly or remove them, as they are a disgrace.</li> <li>Please clarify the County Council law regarding the use of stones/posts outside domestic dwellings to protect the dwellings.</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Our past and our present should be well maintained for the future. Hope that it will be appreciated, and so maintained.</li></ul> |  |
|--|---|--|

**BUILDINGS: Oakridge**

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>a)</b>	Affordable homes should be a priority in all new housing developments.	24	26	8	4	1.9	Supported by Residents
<b>b)</b>	Some existing small dwellings should be kept to provide both an affordable and suitable (whole life) mix of housing for the community, particularly the elderly.	35	24	4	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>c)</b>	Buildings should use lime mortar, lime render and lime wash or stone as appropriate.	29	25	7	0	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>d)</b>	Tiles should preferably be in natural slate or stone.	30	17	13	1	1.8	Supported by Residents
<b>e)</b>	Windows should preferably be painted timber, or left to colour naturally.	19	26	14	1	2.0	Generally supported, but text modified.
<b>f)</b>	Sympathetic use of local materials and sustainable sourcing should be encouraged.	27	32	3	0	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>g)</b>	Property owners should be encouraged to maintain their drystone walls.	35	26	2	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>h)</b>	Details of a genuine and intrinsic part of the building structure add to the overall character of the village.	30	27	1	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>i)</b>	<b>Oakridge Village:</b> Trees of significant value to the village setting should be safeguarded whilst balancing the need for adequate light, maintenance and safety.	34	22	3	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>1</b>	New development, including extensions, garages and adaptations to existing properties, should respect the	45	17	1	0	1.3	Supported by Residents

	traditional and vernacular in terms of proportion, scale, height, materials, and landscape patterns.						
2	New extensions should be in proportion and scale to the original building, so that there is no adverse impact on local character, or loss of variety of house sizes in a rural area.	43	17	3	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
3	Proposals for high quality contemporary architecture would be supported. Imaginative and original design can extend and renew distinctive character and traditions of the villages' built environment.	17	31	5	9	2.1	Generally supported by Residents
4	Energy efficient installations including renewables should be supported in/on all existing and older buildings (including listed properties) so long as they are in proportion and scale to the building.	29	26	4	3	1.7	Supported by Residents
5	New developments will be expected to integrate high efficiency standards and renewables which contribute to the character and appearance of the area, to minimise energy use.	32	25	2	2	1.6	Supported by Residents
6	Planning applications should retain existing curtilage boundary drystone walls and iron railings.	40	16	4	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
7	Extensions and adaptations to existing properties outside the Settlement boundaries should comply with the guidelines above	37	21	1	1	1.4	Supported by Residents

#### Detailed Comments: Buildings - Oakridge

Guideline	For	Against	Steering Group's Response
a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>And homes – affordable as well – for elderly residents (or newcomers coming to be near carers/family).</li> <li>We need more small affordable homes in the village – somehow to be made available to the elderly and young who have grown up in the village. Site? Old common?</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>So why allow bungalows to be converted to houses?</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The practice of converting existing bungalows for older people to large executive type homes should be curtailed. It destroys the balance of the community.</li> </ul>		
c), d) & e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferable, but should not be compulsory.</li> <li>The use of lime render and mortar can be unduly expensive and it is not always successful. In general modern buildings should use modern materials.</li> <li>Painted timber windows have a very limited life in an exposed area.</li> <li>Should be left to the individual.</li> <li>d) &amp; e) – the nature of the building and the position/visibility of the roof/windows should be taken into account.</li> <li>d) - Reconstituted tiles are fine and are in keeping with local character.</li> <li>d) The high cost can be prohibitive.</li> </ul>	Generally supported, but text for Local View (e) modified.
g)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drystone walls are expensive to maintain. Local grants would help this process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can be expensive.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
i)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trees that grow to great heights should be discouraged (eg. sycamore that obscures or cuts out light from other people's property). Those that are already in existence should be maintained and be sympathetically cut so that neighbours' light is taken into consideration.</li> <li>Good idea, but we are not in a Conservation Area.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
1 & 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with 1, but not to be of a cheap design</li> <li>Should be suitable for the area of land they are sited on. (eg. The old Oakridge shop development is far too big for the land it is sited on.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion, scale &amp; height was a part of the Village Plan, but was totally disregarded by SDC Planning &amp; Appeals Inspector!</li> <li>Where the plot size is adequate, extensions could exceed the area of the existing building or its footprint. This should be a decision for normal planning consideration. This should not be limited by an artificial consideration not relevant to plot size.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In appropriate locations.</li> </ul>		Generally supported by Residents
4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These were the same words that were used for the new Stroud Cinema!</li> <li>Who will pay for energy efficient installations in older cottages/properties?</li> <li>There is little evidence of the efficiency of wind turbines. It is not necessarily possible to justify their intrusiveness and</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents

		potential for noise, and cost especially if fixed to properties.	
<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, subject to “reasonable” rather than “high” - it all costs money.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little evidence of the efficiency of wind turbines. It is not necessarily possible to justify their intrusiveness and potential for noise, and cost especially if fixed to properties.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oakridge is too small, and the roads and existing infrastructure CANNOT cope with any more housing. Planning for new housing in Oakridge should NOT be granted under any circumstances.</li> <li>We need to look at the whole way in which the village is kept and maintained as a fervent, and throbbing place to live. It must be kept as a lively village by ensuring that the School is maintained, and people of all ages are encouraged to live here. We need some growth.</li> <li>There should be an aggressive policy to ensure septic tanks and any sewage systems are of the most up to date standards. Consideration should be given to mains sewage in Oakridge.</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

### HIGHWAYS: Oakridge

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>a)</b>	The amount of road signage should be reduced to an acceptable/effective level.	45	15	1	2	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>b)</b>	The use of shared transport should be promoted and encouraged wherever it is practical to do so.	21	34	3	0	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>c)</b>	There should be liaison with transport providers (bus services) regarding timing and linking of services to encourage greater use of public transport, thereby consolidating the viability of the service.	30	33	0	0	1.5	Supported by Residents
<b>d)</b>	Lower speed limits should be promoted on all roads in the Parish, and 20mph limits through settlement areas and by schools.	25	26	8	2	1.8	Supported by Residents
<b>e)</b>	Speed limits should be monitored and enforced through use of Police checks and also community usage of speed check equipment both static and hand-held.	17	24	9	10	2.2	This item will be taken out for Oakridge
<b>f)</b>	Support should be given to the County Council (Highways) work to impose weight restrictions on roads throughout the Parish (except for Access purposes).	42	17	3	0	1.4	Supported by Residents
<b>1</b>	A Transport Assessment or the Design and Access Statement for all new proposed developments should take into account the effect of additional car ownership upon the highway capacity within the Parish.	36	22	2	1	1.5	Supported by Residents

Detailed Comments: Highways - Oakridge			
Guideline	For	Against	Steering Group's Response
a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimise road signs in country lanes. There is no need for repeat "30" limit signs, nor even any speed restriction signs in the lanes. There is particularly no need for "no limit" signs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In our area signage could not be reduced.</li> </ul>	Supported by Residents
c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bus service is a vital factor for such an isolated and remote village. It is very important for it to be promoted and retained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural public transport is much encouraged but unlikely to ever be viable or widely used.</li> <li>Should discontinue the bus service between the crossroads in Oakridge and the village school. It is almost never used and it is a hazard to school users.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>20 by Schools; 30 ok elsewhere.</li> <li>Agree, without using speed humps, bumps, or tweetsie gates at village entrances.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due care and attention at all times should be the criteria for speed, not artificial limits.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Speed limits must be enforced as they are widely disregarded.</li> <li>Police checks only.</li> <li>As for speed limits and the upholding of them, possibly the image of a Traffic policeman in his yellow outfit would be much cheaper than the use of actual police at the entrance of each village.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This would be very difficult to monitor, and Police time could be spent better combating crime.</li> <li>No objection to police checks – but the use of "community" implies control by non-police persons which is not legal.</li> <li>Speed restrictors (ie. Humps or other) are an unsightly disgrace and environmentally a disaster. Let the community be responsible, with regular liaison with the police.</li> <li>Just another example of local/central government treating its citizens as imbecils. Nanny state monitoring all aspects of an individual's life. Not needed – start treating citizens as adults.</li> </ul>	This item will be taken out for Oakridge
f)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Like where there are bridges/narrow roads.</li> <li>Our rural roads are not in danger of reaching capacity. The problem is large vehicles that are inappropriate for narrow lanes.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be a by-pass for Bisley Village.</li> <li>Existing known road names should be signed to aid delivery vehicles.</li> <li>Care should be taken to ensure that the maintenance of hedgerows and verges should include the regular clearing of litter.</li> <li>There should not be pavements in new developments, as they create an urban feel and take away the rural character of the villages. Where kerb stones are necessary, use rough, natural looking stones.</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

**ECONOMY: Oakridge**

Guideline:		1 “Strongly Agree”	2 “Agree”	3 “Disagree”	4 “Strongly disagree”	Average	Steering Group’s Response
<b>1</b>	New employment sites in the Parish within, and adjacent to the settlements will be supported where appropriate opportunities exist, in business sectors that can thrive in the rural environment. Transport links, noise and preserving the visual amenity of the Cotswold AONB will be sensitive considerations requiring careful analysis when reviewing the proposals.	28	27	5	2	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>2</b>	Proposals for small employment units outside the settlement boundaries should be supported (particularly the reuse of redundant farm buildings) where appropriate transport links exist. Any employment units should be visually compatible with surrounding buildings and landscape.	26	30	2	4	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>3</b>	Renewable energy employment opportunities should be supported in forestry, linking woodland management and wood fuel production. The type and scale of any developments should not be detrimental to the landscape character or any wildlife interests.	29	28	3	2	1.6	Supported by Residents
<b>4</b>	A large community scale wind turbine would be supported if the energy and the economy directly benefited the Parish and it was carefully sited.	18	12	6	28	2.7	Will be taken out of the VDS report. Deep divisions within the community, and on balance it is not supported
<b>5</b>	Improvement in telecommunication links would be supported where there is no adverse impact on landscape or amenity.	29	28	4	3	1.7	Supported by Residents
<b>6</b>	Existing and future tourism attractions and facilities which bring economy to the villages should be effectively promoted. Sensitive located “brown signage” will be beneficial to this	18	30	8	8	2.1	Generally supported by Residents. Text on “brown signage” will be deleted.

aim.

### Detailed Comments: Economy - Oakridge

Guideline	For	Against	Steering Group's Response
1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be limitations on light pollution.</li> </ul>	Will add text on light pollution
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, but not the bit about farm buildings. This should be wider – business incubation units.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of an AONB why should you want to introduce mini-industrial estates? The infrastructure cannot support it.</li> <li>There should be limitations on light pollution.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care should be taken not to justify reducing wooded areas by reference to “wood fuel production”. [In Nepal only fallen wood can be burnt; no trees can be cut down for fuel].</li> <li>There is much biomass lying in the settlement area. Hedge laying instead of tractor cutting will provide more, etc etc.</li> </ul>		Supported by Residents
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Must be of a size, design to fit with the landscape. Ie. NOT a 2MW turbine.</li> <li>A large single community oriented wind turbine would be preferable to a multitude of small household based ones.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wind turbines are not efficient and they have only proliferated because of subsidies!</li> <li>Wind turbine would need thorough research as evidence regarding turbine efficiency and environmental credentials is conflicting.</li> <li>Wind speed not sufficient.</li> <li>In our hilly landscape any wind turbine would dominate. Large scale turbine development would RUIN the area.</li> <li>We do not need a windmill. There are articles in the national press that they are inefficient and often inappropriately sited in ANOB areas.</li> <li>A wind turbine is the most <u>ridiculous</u> method of providing energy to this area, given the <u>appalling visual</u> impact and <u>possible health risks</u> associated with this.</li> <li>The alternative of several smaller turbines for individual properties might be more visually acceptable.</li> </ul>	Will be taken out of the VDS report. Deep divisions within the community, and on balance it is not supported
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree, subject to balance with residential nature of villages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tourism in villages is a <u>disaster</u> for residents who already have car parking issues. Additional cars on the small rural roads is not to be encouraged.</li> </ul>	Generally supported by Residents. Text on “brown signage” will be deleted.
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The AONB should be retained as a residential area.</li> <li>Economic profiles of rural and urban areas are exactly the same: retail, manufacturing etc. Stop going on about just farming and</li> </ul>		Comments noted, but no changes proposed.

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>other similar industries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Should maintain the local post offices.</li></ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

**APPENDIX E:**  
**RECORD OF FINAL COMMENTS MADE BY STROUD DISTRICT**  
**COUNCIL**

**Dawes Phil**


---

**From:** Dawes Phil  
**Sent:** 29 July 2010 08:56  
**To:** 'derekh4'  
**Subject:** FW: Bisley-with-Lyplatt Village Design Statement  
**Attachments:** FW: Bisley-with-Lyplatt Village Design Statement

Derek,

We have agreement now to complete the VDS report.

Could you please update the report in line with Conrad's comments below, and his comments in the attached e-mail (except for the original comment on the text on Guideline E1, which I have turned yellow).

Have you been given the Bisley & Oakridge Green Spaces Maps yet so that everything is complete?

Could you then please let me see the updated version as a final check before we get it printed.

Thanks, Phil  
 (PS. I will update the Public Consultation Record Document shortly, so that it is also ready for printing)

---

**From:** Dawes Phil  
**Sent:** 28 July 2010 16:21  
**To:** 'brooks@cx.co.uk'; 'derekh4'; 'Lesley Greene'; 'Roger Budgeon'; 'Peter Thorp'; 'Nick Holliday'  
**Subject:** FW: Bisley-with-Lyplatt Village Design Statement

Dear all,

Can you please let me know if Conrad's proposal for Guideline E1 text is now acceptable (it looks close to what we initially suggested), and if you agree with adding his suggested paragraph to Section 5, in the General Overview for Buildings (highlighted in blue below).

Thanks, Phil

---

**From:** Conrad.Moore@stroud.gov.uk [mailto:Conrad.Moore@stroud.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 28 July 2010 14:38  
**To:** Dawes Phil; Cllr.Daniel.LeFleming@stroud.gov.uk; admin@bisley-with-lyplatt.gov.uk  
**Cc:** Peter.Gilbert@stroud.gov.uk; Barry.Wyatt@stroud.gov.uk; Phil.Skill@stroud.gov.uk  
**Subject:** Bisley-with-Lyplatt Village Design Statement

Thank you for your response.

*We are happy with your definition of low impact development and its source. I think your explanation of how it would be interpreted in the planning sense is useful and should be added to the supporting definition text for clarity.*

In respect of Section 7 – Economy, Guideline E1. I have discussed your response with colleagues and suggest now the following wording:

New employment sites which provide local employment opportunities in the Parish - within the recognised settlements will be supported where appropriate opportunities exist. New employment sites for small scale, low impact enterprises which provide local employment opportunities adjacent to the recognised settlements will be supported where appropriate opportunities exist in business sectors that can thrive in the rural environment. Transport links, noise and preserving the visual amenity of the Cotswold AONB will be important considerations requiring careful analysis when reviewing any proposals.

29/07/2010

*The split between within and adjacent is required as different circumstances exist in planning policy terms within or outside identified settlements. The examples you quote we empathise with which is why we have had the further discussion. Our concern lies in the fact that the current guideline wording is too open ended. The trades you quote are small scale and this can fit with national policy in a number of respects. However National policy statement 7 is clear that the countryside should be protected "for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and so it may be enjoyed by all." The fact that a business can thrive in a rural area should not outweigh this national objective. To do so could create a loophole that developers could seek to exploit in saying employment and buildings outweigh other sustainability objectives. Many larger scale businesses could argue they could thrive there and it has the added incentive that greenfield is low cost to develop. The revised wording we believe limits the development to that which is within the spirit of policies and national planning statements and should also compliment your wording and policy intent. It also has a common thread with your low impact developments section as well.*

Also you may wish to add a line on Section 5 – Buildings, General Overview first paragraph, after the last sentence that:

The recently published PPS5 – Planning for the historic environment refers now to heritage assets which is defined as a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape positively identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage assets are valued components of the historic environment. They include designated heritage assets (such as listed buildings) and assets identified by the local planning authority during the process of decision-making or through the plan-making process (including local listing). You should contact the Conservation Team within Development Control at Stroud District Council regarding any potential heritage asset matters.

*This text is then in conformity with the new policy statement and should assist the reader. The implications of this change in policy (bringing together listed buildings, scheduled ancient monuments, historic parks and archaeology are being considered by the District in conjunction with English Heritage.*

Any problems with these revisions please contact me to discuss.

Finally can we please have the five paper copies of each document to place in our members room or at least a final electronic version of the two documents.

**Conrad Moore MRTPI, MIFM, ALGE.**

**Principal Planner.**

**Planning Strategy.**

**Development Services.**

Tel: (01453) 754328

Fax: (01453) 754945

E-mail: [conrad.moore@stroud.gov.uk](mailto:conrad.moore@stroud.gov.uk)

The information included in this e-mail is of a confidential nature and is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, copying or distribution by you is prohibited and may be unlawful. Disclosure to any party other than the addressee, whether inadvertent or otherwise is not intended to waive privilege or confidentiality.

**Dawes Phil**


---

**From:** Dawes Phil  
**Sent:** 21 July 2010 15:28  
**To:** 'bbrooks@cix.co.uk'; 'derek4'; 'Lesley Greene'; 'Peter Thorp'; 'Roger Budgeon'; 'Nick Holliday'  
**Cc:** 'Martin Radcliffe'  
**Subject:** FW: Bisley-with-Lypiatt Village Design Statement

Dear all,

Almost at the finishing post.

Could you please look at Conrad's few comments and let me know whether you are happy to take them on board.

We will then need to up-date the VDS Report & the Public Consultation Record accordingly.

Also, have the Bisley & Oakridge Green Spaces Maps been produced yet, so that the VDS report can be completed?

Thanks, Phil

---

**From:** Conrad.Moore@stroud.gov.uk [mailto:Conrad.Moore@stroud.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 19 July 2010 15:07  
**To:** Dawes Phil; Cllr.Daniel.LeFleming@stroud.gov.uk  
**Cc:** Cllr.Barbara.Tait@stroud.gov.uk; Peter.Gilbert@stroud.gov.uk; Barry.Wyatt@stroud.gov.uk;  
**Subject:** Bisley-with-Lypiatt Village Design Statement

I have looked over the policies and text with John Baile (whose experience in development control is extensive). I'd observe that some parts probably miss opportunities to add value and detail to existing Local Plan policies, but I am conscious that you wanted to keep the document short for usability. Our comments (in italics) and suggested changes are set out below. With these changes I believe I could progress a recommendation for adoption.

Section 1 – Introduction  
*Second paragraph of third bulleted area could usefully be highlighted in a text box. This should avoid tensions between local aspirations and wider planning policy reality.*

**"Low Impact Developments"**

*Your suggested text here appears confusing and contradictory. The text requires a clear definition of what you mean by low impact development – is it sustainable construction, low visual impact, carbon footprint and/or renewable energy or is it a combination of these aspects? Can we agree a suitable definition by e-mail and then I suggest the following text is also added to comply with PPS1 and PPS7. (There remains a potential issue with "saved local plan policies" but the following text with links should enable us to overcome this difficulty and the bottom up approach appears to be supported by recent Government statements). Let me know your thoughts if there is a problem. If agreed I recommend that the changes be added to your accompanying audit trail document.*

Replace section post definition of low impact with:

"PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas seeks to strictly control development in the countryside. Only development within or next to rural settlements to meet business and community needs could be considered where it contributes to the viability of those communities. Exceptional low impact development outside a settlement boundary will be considered only if the design is demonstrated and proven to be truly outstanding and ground breaking in the national context. Any such development for uses beyond those needed for agriculture and forestry would have to be advertised as a departure from the Local Plan saved policies and may result in intervention by the Secretary of State. The Parish will also require the following criteria to be addressed and complied with:

- The proposal will have positive environmental, social and/or economic contributions to public amenity and achieving diverse and sustainable rural enterprises.

29/07/2010

- The development and activity associated with it shall be low impact (as defined earlier) and be consistent with their rural location in terms of environmental quality and countryside character.
- Opportunities to reuse buildings that are available in the locality should be reported on and preferentially used or adapted for any new development proposed. Such a building should have architectural or historic merit in the countryside and contribute positively to local character.
- The development shall conserve specific features and sites of landscape and wildlife value.
- The development should support countryside-based activities and activities which contribute to rural economies and promote recreation in and enjoyment in the countryside
- The proposal should provide sufficient livelihood for and functionally meet the needs of occupiers of the site."

#### Section 3 – Settlement

- *Why is guideline S3 in bold?*

#### Section 5 – Buildings *Delete policy B7 (not needed by your earlier guidelines and Local Plan policy).*

#### Section 6 – Highways

- H1 Delete "all" and insert "relevant". *Factual correction as not applicable in all cases.*

#### Section 7 – Economy

- E1 after "in business sectors that" insert "are associated with and support countryside-based activities and activities which contribute to rural economies and promote recreation in and enjoyment in the countryside." Delete "can thrive in the rural environment." *Many businesses could thrive in a rural environment but may not be needed to be located there.*
- E5 Delete existing policy and replace with "Rural businesses (including tourism) will support the viability and vitality of rural communities. Any development (and associated promotion of that use or activity) will need to take account of the built and/or natural environment character within the sensitive the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty." *Not sure what was meant by sensitively promoted in your guideline? Planning can control some uses and can control advertisements in terms of highway safety and public amenity. This wording tries to capture this and links more clearly with PPST and saved policies in Local Plan.*

#### Appendix H

*The concern here was that there were policy gaps and where policies were quoted, they were not saved from the Local Plan. I advise you to use this link to saved policies - [http://www.stroud.gov.uk/info/table\\_save\\_deleted\\_policies.pdf](http://www.stroud.gov.uk/info/table_save_deleted_policies.pdf) I have updated the table and would add supporting text to say that "Our guideline linkages and policy context will be reviewed and updated in line with policies adopted as part of the Stroud District Local Development Framework."*

Guideline	National Planning Statements	Stroud District Local Plan saved policies	Other Planning Advice Documents
S1	PPS7	HN8, HN10, EM2, NE8 & BE16	
S2	PPS1, PPS5 & PPS7	HN8 & BE5	
S3		RL4	
S4	PPS1 & PPS7		
S5		NE10	
L1		NE5, NE8 & NE10	
L2	PPS1 &		

	<i>Companion Guide</i>		
L3		GE2	CPRE Light Pollution & Tranquillity: <a href="http://www.cpre.org.uk/campaigns/landscape/light-pollution">http://www.cpre.org.uk/campaigns/landscape/light-pollution</a> <a href="http://www.cpre.org.uk/campaigns/landscape/tranquillity/national-am">http://www.cpre.org.uk/campaigns/landscape/tranquillity/national-am</a>
L4	PPS9	RL9	
L5		NE6, NE7 & NE8	Gloucestershire Nature Map <a href="http://www.gloucestershirebap.org.uk/projects/nature-map.php">http://www.gloucestershirebap.org.uk/projects/nature-map.php</a> Natural England Green Infrastructure <a href="http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/planningtransportlocalgov">http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/planningtransportlocalgov</a>
L6	PPS9	NE5 & NE8	County Highways Biodiversity Plan <a href="http://gloucestershire.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=13190">http://gloucestershire.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=13190</a>
L7	PPS7 & PPS9	RL8, NE5 & NE8	
L8	PPS5	BE8-12 (inclusive)	
L9	PPS7, PPG17 & Companion Guide		
L10	PPG17 & Companion Guide	RL1	Supplementary Planning Guidance <a href="http://www.stroud.gov.uk/info/plan_strat/outdoor_play_space_provis">http://www.stroud.gov.uk/info/plan_strat/outdoor_play_space_provis</a>
L11	PPS1 & PPS10	Waste Local Plan Policies	
L12	PPS1		
B1	PPS1	HN16 & HN17	
B2	PPS1	HN8 & HN16	
B3	PPS1 & PPS7		
B4	PPS1, PPS5, PPS22 & PPS7		
B5	PPS1 & PPS22		Renewable Energy SPA <a href="http://www.stroud.gov.uk/info/plan_strat/renewable_energy.pdf">http://www.stroud.gov.uk/info/plan_strat/renewable_energy.pdf</a>
B6	PPS7		Cotswolds Management Plan <a href="http://www.cotswoldsaonb.org.uk/management_plan/">http://www.cotswoldsaonb.org.uk/management_plan/</a>
B7	<b>RECOMMENDED DELETION</b>		
B8	PPS5	BE5-7 (inclusive)	SDC Conservation Area Statements <a href="http://www.stroud.gov.uk/docs/planning/conservation_area_apprais">http://www.stroud.gov.uk/docs/planning/conservation_area_apprais</a>
B9	PPS5	BE5-7 (inclusive)	
H1	PPG13	TR1	<b>SEE RECOMMENDED WORD CHANGE above</b>
E1		BE16, EM6, EM7, EM8, NE8 & RL7	<b>SEE RECOMMENDED WORD CHANGE above</b>
E2		BE16, EM7 & EM8	
E3	PPS1 & PPS7		

29/07/2010

E4	PPS7 & PPG8		
E5	PPS7 & PPG19	NE8, EM9 & EM10	Outdoor Advertisement Control <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planning/planni">http://www.communities.gov.uk/planningandbuilding/planning/planni</a>

Hope this feedback is positive and the recommended actions can be supported.  
Finally well done on completing the design document with your community input over the last few years.

**Conrad Moore MRTPI, MIFM, ALGE.**

Principal Planner.

Planning Strategy.

Development Services.

Tel: (01453) 754328

Fax:(01453) 754945

E-mail: [conrad.moore@stroud.gov.uk](mailto:conrad.moore@stroud.gov.uk)

The information included in this e-mail is of a confidential nature and is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, copying or distribution by you is prohibited and may be unlawful. Disclosure to any party other than the addressee, whether inadvertent or otherwise is not intended to waive privilege or confidentiality.