



**CHRIS ASHTON**



P Crysell Esq  
Planning Inspector  
c/o The Programme Officer  
South Gloucestershire Council

4 February 2013

Dear Sir,

**South Gloucestershire Core Strategy – Additional Hearing**

**Potential Development Land at 92 Wotton Road, Charfield, South Gloucestershire, GL12 8SR**

I have made written representations regarding the Core Strategy in the past and participated in the Inquiry during June/July 2012.

I act for the Owners of the land at Charfield in the north east sector of the South Gloucestershire District bordering the Stroud District Council area. The land is in two parts being land of approx 15 acres and an industrial building on a site of 0.34 acres and then a cleared site used for car parking having an area of 0.20 acre. This land has been identified to South Gloucestershire Council in my previous representations.

I have read your Notes of 17 December 2012 and 10 January 2013 regarding additional Housing sites and the five year supply.

It would seem that the Council is in some disarray on this matter and is unable to show that there is an actual 5 year housing land supply. I think this, however, has been the case for many years and the issue has never been properly addressed. In my meetings and discussions with the Council regarding the land at Charfield I have always been fobbed off with the excuse that the majority of the land is just outside the settlement boundary. I am sure this has happened in many locations elsewhere in the District. The Council has for many years been against carrying out a complete review of settlement boundaries within the District despite the fact that they have not been reviewed for over twenty years. Surely such a review would inform the Council and the Public as to where there are opportunities to provide new housing on a much more positive basis for the Plan period up to 2026 rather than "clutching at straws" in a "knee jerk reaction" just to satisfy an urgent request. It would also provide a much more even spread of housing throughout the District.

In my view a District wide settlement boundary review should have been undertaken at the very start of the current Core Strategy process before the first drafts were published for consultation. However we are where we are |

Many of the sites that the Council have identified for housing during the life of the Plan have inherent difficulties in transportation/highway issues as well as flood issues. I have mentioned before in my representations that the majority of the Council's hopes for housing sites are in the North fringe of Bristol area where traffic congestion is already a major problem. It may well be that these sites are not in fact deliverable within the life of the Plan hence blasting a big hole in the Council's Plan and numbers for the period up to 2026.

I have also studied the information regarding the "extra 594 dwellings found" by the Council which they think contributes to the 5 year supply. Many of these are questionable as to whether they are deliverable in the timescale and in fact as I read their listing many are being brought forward in timescale and I am not sure whether that is the correct way of assessing housing numbers.

I can see no justification for the inclusion of the land East of Morton Way, Thornbury. This is very definitely an intrusion into open countryside and which does not fit well with the Town development area.

If this Plan is to have any credibility a thorough undertaking of the housing prospects in the District as a whole needs to be undertaken and this must include a proper review of all settlement boundaries so that a more even distribution of housing throughout the District can be achieved thereby taking the pressure off certain already overdeveloped areas. Presumably the Council will undertake this through the Policies, Sites and Places DPD/Neighbourhood Planning but I feel that a strict timescale for this needs to be agreed and adhered to.

Yours faithfully

**Chris Ashton**  
