

## Piper Homes/ERHA proposal to build 11 affordable & 11 open market homes on a rural exception site, Hillesley

Public Consultation 2 December 2015 attended by approximately 90+ people. The following is a summary of the 38 written responses made by residents during and after the consultation.

Theme	Number of comments on this issue (links in brackets)	Types of comments	Response
<b>General but positive</b>	11 (4,5,9,11,14,18,19,21,23,31,33)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal should not have any significant adverse effect on the village or the local environment. The scheme appears to be well planned &amp; conceived with good design principles. Happy to support it.</li> <li>• I believe that the proposal for housing is excellent as there isn't enough at the moment, especially affordable. I have lived in Hillesley for 13 years and have hoped that someone would build a few affordable houses. I back the proposal 100%, good luck with it all.</li> <li>• Proposals like this are always divisive. As long as it is not profit driven this should not preclude the development</li> <li>• Personally I agree with Site 1 and with the housing types – try to induce young families with kids – think Hillesley school</li> <li>• Generally in favour – seems like a good mix of house types</li> <li>• It seems to be an essential development.</li> <li>• Generally well considered &amp; mix of house types good</li> <li>• I moved from the village where my family still live because there were no affordable homes and have been private renting for over 20 years. I would love to come back – I work locally and my wife is a nurse in the local community and the children at local schools.</li> <li>• I believe that a development of this size is a very positive initiative for the village. The school would welcome new families and affordable housing is much needed in order to attract young families with children as well as young adults who wish to live in the area.</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looks well thought out although maybe could have started with a smaller scheme. Despite slight concerns about access and parking, overall support for the development.</li> <li>If additional parking is provided the development will be an enhancement to Hillesley, if not it will be detrimental to village life.</li> <li>In my view this village needs this development. However this represents a singular opportunity for the village to grow sustainably to the benefit of its existing institutions: church, school, pub. If the development is designed to foster employment and the improvement of the village as an entity it must be welcomed. If however, the development is carried out in isolation from other medium to long-term issues, this unique opportunity will have been squandered and should not be supported</li> </ul>	
<b>General but negative</b>	3 (13,35,37)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I totally oppose this scheme</li> <li>We are of the opinion that the proposal is flawed and should not proceed.</li> <li>This development is inappropriate and not a suitable project for the village (likely to flood, increased traffic, parking requirements, lack of infrastructure and lack of demand).</li> </ul>	
<b>Number of houses/density</b>	7 (1,3,24,34,35,38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many</li> <li>The number of houses proposed could stop Hillesley from feeling like a little village</li> <li>The proposal is twice the anticipated number of houses and twice the size of the 2 previous developments in the last 25 years. Its size is disproportionate &amp; not in the spirit of the Stroud Local Plan</li> <li>22 dwellings is too many for this site. There is possibly room for 15 dwellings, particularly if the 2 facing outwith are turned around to face in. The affordable housing is crammed into a small space. This should be amended by removing M10 and M11 and re-siting some of the affordable housing to the other side of the road.</li> <li>A village should be allowed to expand but not such a big increase as this</li> <li>This is a small village &amp; the proposed development appears to be excessive in size considering the only facilities are a church &amp; a pub.</li> </ul>	The aim of an exception site is to meet a proven affordable housing need. The 2013 housing need survey found a need for 11 affordable homes which is therefore the starting point for the number of units in this development. Each open market unit has to be justified in terms of the funding it provides towards the affordable units. This information is provided by the developer in the form of a viability statement which will be examined by the District Valuer on behalf of the local planning authority.
<b>Sizes of houses</b>	4 (1,2,12,38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4beds not needed in village</li> <li>4beds + guest room clearly 5 bed houses</li> </ul>	The size and tenures of the <b>affordable homes</b> will be decided by the Housing Association in

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hillesley needs smaller, 1<sup>st</sup> time buyer homes which seem to sell straightaway unlike the larger properties</li> <li>What market research was done to prove the need for larger OM homes?</li> <li>The village does not need any more 4bed houses. The existing ones are hard to shift. Permission for 3 large houses has been given at Farmcote and to build more large houses in the village will be an act of sheer folly, particularly when mixed with affordable housing. Any 4beds should be reduced to 3beds.</li> </ul>	<p>conjunction with Stroud District Council, taking into account the current need from the Housing Need Survey whilst also assessing the potential future need.</p> <p>The sizes of the <b>open market homes</b> are decided by the developer who must justify each unit in terms of the cross-subsidy they will provide. At the request of Hillesley &amp; Tresham parish council the open market units include 3 bungalows and 2 x 3bed homes to meet anticipated need for such properties. However, smaller properties provide less subsidy than larger ones.</p>
<b>Demand/justification for providing houses</b>	8 (2,7,12,13,17,24,34,36)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient demand – lots of houses have been up for sale for long periods of time</li> <li>Where is the demand when there are currently lots of 2-3 bed houses available within 6-8miles under £300k yet not selling.</li> <li>On what basis 11 affordable homes &amp; how was the number &amp; sizes of additional OM homes decided? It would seem that smaller 1<sup>st</sup> time buyer homes are needed more</li> <li>Who are the young people looking for affordable houses? Most younger people move into cities &amp; your plans show a majority are exec homes not affordable.</li> <li>The proposal to increase from 11 to 22 homes due to the withdrawal of government funding is a concern. I accept the need for affordable homes but see no evidence of a need for large detached executive homes which will only perpetuate the problem of ‘unaffordable’ houses.</li> <li>Although a village should be allowed to expand this is too big an increase. A ‘proper’ survey should be carried out to find out EXACTLY how many locals want to live in the village.</li> <li>Hillesley has had several houses on the market for months which is evidence that there is no shortage of houses in general here and means the village does not need a further 11. If there is a proven rather than speculated need for houses for rent, then any new development should</li> </ul>	<p>The need for the 11 affordable homes was identified in the Housing Need Survey carried out by GRCC in February 2013. This survey was commissioned by Hillesley parish council and the report can be read on the parish council website. GRCC has been carrying out surveys for parish councils in Gloucestershire for 15 years. Their methodology is considered robust and accepted by the rural local planning authorities in the county. The provision of open market homes on exception sites follows guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework and reflects both the introduction of cross-subsidy by the government in 2012 and the reduction of public funding for affordable housing.</p> <p>It is for the developer to decide whether there is sufficient demand for the market homes and to take on the risk of this proposal.</p>



		<p>be scaled down to that proven need plus a few private houses to make the construction viable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the smaller units might sell I cannot see a market for 11 OM units</li> <li>• Where does the demand come from? The OM houses are priced too high. No 2bed houses have sold in Hillesley for £275k</li> </ul>	
<b>Issues relating to affordable housing</b>	8 (9,10,19,25,34,36,37,38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have concerns about the local lettings nomination</li> <li>• There should be strict criteria to ensure that tenants of the affordable homes have a genuine and long standing local connection and should be in work and in a position to get to work/health services etc</li> <li>• Would the rental properties be guaranteed to remain affordable in perpetuity? (2 comment)</li> <li>• The 2011 survey identified 11 households in need of affordable housing but there is a world of difference between could and will – I would estimate the demand as 5-6 units</li> <li>• I do not agree with the level of demand for the proposed numbers of affordable homes.</li> <li>• I agree with the proposed housing types to try to induce young families with kids –think Hillesley school</li> <li>• Some shared ownership housing should be included for local people who want to part buy their home.</li> <li>• There is a real need for shared ownership homes aimed at young people in the village but no need for social rented bungalows as there are some already which are often empty. Poor transport links make the village unviable for many elderly/disabled.</li> </ul>	<p>Affordable homes on exception sites are allocated with priority to local people. Applicants’ local connection will be verified by Stroud District Council Housing Team and the Housing Association at the time of allocation. Under current government legislation these homes will remain affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>In response to the need identified by the housing need survey, it is proposed that 2 shared ownership homes be included amongst the affordable units. The affordable rented units may include a 1-bedroom bungalow and a 1-bedroom flat but these can be allocated to single people or a couple of any age.</p>
<b>Parking &amp; roads</b>	18 (1,2,4,,8,11,12,13,15,16,19,22,26,28,32,34,36,37,38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seating area should be a car park</li> <li>• Roads and village facilities insufficient as it is. Parking is horrendous</li> <li>• In addition to the parking shown on plans there should be an additional 20 spaces to be managed by the Parish Council which would relieve parking problems across the whole village &amp; in particular of Hawkesbury Rd.</li> <li>• There must be provision for parking as part of the any approval - maybe the development could be sited further west to allow for a walled parking area and parking to be provided.</li> </ul>	<p>The parking issues along the Hawkesbury Road are an existing problem. All of the proposed new homes will have a minimum of 2 parking spaces so this development should not add to these problems. A proposal to provide a 9-space public car park within the landscape area at the entrance to the site by is currently being considered by the parish council.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please include extra parking for Hawkesbury Rd residents</li> <li>• Please ensure enough visitor parking &amp; ensure garages are large enough to 4x4 cars to be parked inside</li> <li>• Visitors may park along already busy road</li> <li>• The development itself looks fine. My concern is the access and parking situation. Could diagonally arranged parking spaces be provided on the nearby 'green'?</li> <li>• If the parking along the road was changed to incorporate the outer pavement then cars could park facing the bungalows &amp; doubling the capacity</li> <li>• The issue of parking must be addressed if any more houses are to be built in Hillesley. Some public parking should be provided to provide incentive for residents of Hawkesbury Rd.</li> <li>• Already problems with parking. A development will need overspill parking and should be encouraged to provide some civic parking for other hard pressed residents (residents parking permits at reasonable cost?)</li> <li>• The seating area could be a car park which is a priority for current residents.</li> </ul>	
<b>Road traffic</b>	16 (1,20,6,7,12,13,17,20,23,30,33,34,35,36,37,38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road in development should be extended to create a one-way flow &amp; the houses moved back from the Hawkesbury Rd to widen this road</li> <li>• How will site vehicles cope with narrow access road &amp; with turning left from Hawkesbury Upton hill road – poor vision?</li> <li>• Increased traffic along Hawkesbury Rd will cause traffic problems &amp; problems with access for emergency vehicles &amp; farm vehicles</li> <li>• Access to site is restricted with no means of expanding</li> <li>• Very poor state of road surface &amp; danger of increased no of vehicles along this narrow road</li> <li>• Could the potholes in roads be filled in whilst tarmacking is done? An access road could be created between Hawkesbury Rd and Greenfield Farm through the development that would provide scope for light industrial use (discussed in past with planners &amp; Mr &amp; Mrs Goscombe) &amp; parking for residents of Hawkesbury Rd</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic safety and related issues fall under the jurisdiction of Gloucestershire County Council Highways Department who will be consulted as part of the planning process. This process will require traffic survey data to be collected and submitted with the planning application.</p> <p>It would be expected that the road will be inspected by Highways Department prior to and then following the build process and the road restored to the satisfaction of the Highway authority.</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If road traffic increases how will it be safe for children to play on the green?</li> <li>• There is no industry here and little farming which means that with only occasional buses, residents need cars to go to work and even to exist living here, which produces increasing issues with cars parked on the narrow roads and more traffic and commuters. Extra traffic along Hawkesbury Rd will impact on the dogwalkers, pram pushers, horseriders and cyclists who use it regularly.</li> <li>• 40 additional cars in the village will cause problems. Access for the 2 plots opening out separately onto the road is dangerous</li> <li>• An additional 22-30 cars will be a massive increase to a single track road. One entrance close to the residents' parked cars is going to lead to many problems of access and egress. One ameliorating suggestion is to extend the road inside the village to form an ox bow to give access and egress to the Estate making a clockwise or anticlockwise system along the road. It is perverse that the internal road will be double the width of the existing road. The 2 separate dwellings car parking arrangements and access are completely unworkable. Turning them round and reducing their size to 3 beds would provide space along the single track road for an essential pavement which would run the length of the estate and join up with the existing pavement. The speed limit in the village needs to be dropped to 20mph due to the additional traffic.</li> </ul>	
<b>Choice of site</b>	3 (6,9,12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unhappy site 4 not being used as access is better off the main road – Hawkesbury Rd is overcrowded with cars blocking access for emergency and farm vehicles.</li> <li>• Were any other sites put forward if so, why were they rejected over site 1?</li> <li>• Personally I agree with Site 1</li> </ul>	A comprehensive site identification process was followed by the GRCC Rural Housing Enabler working with Hillesley parish councillors, and in consultation with SDC planning department. This resulted in a shortlist of 4 sites which were both available and considered suitable in planning terms. The site under consideration here was indicated by SDC planning department to be the preferred site in planning terms from the shortlist and is being brought forward by the developer, Piper Homes, and partnered by English Rural Housing Association to manage the affordable



			homes. A map indicating all of the sites on the shortlist was displayed at the public consultation.
<b>Sewerage &amp; drainage</b>	8 (1,12,13,24,25,36,37,38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Hugely contentious issue’.</li> <li>• Will system cope?</li> <li>• My concern is sewerage as the road already floods</li> <li>• The site is low lying to both sides and this area gets very waterlogged. Drainage from this area is poor and causes flooding down the valley towards Dayhouse Lane. If built over the problems will be exacerbated. The sewers will not cope with 22 additional homes.</li> <li>• The existing sewerage system is wholly inadequate. It is essential that new modern sewerage systems be provided connected to the existing system and a detailed inspection of how this it connected must be undertaken. The site floods regularly. Placing so many more houses onto the site and the attendant concreting over the area will increase at least 100 fold the risk of more seriously flooding affecting particularly the houses opposite. Residents will want to be assured that all measure are being taken to put in a comprehensive drainage system and that they be guaranteed that the new development will not increase (rather it should decrease) the risk of flooding.</li> <li>• Has an assessment of the sewer capacity been made as it was installed in 1970’s and has already accommodated 2 new estates?</li> </ul>	It is anticipated that the sewerage from the proposed new homes be directed into the existing sewer system. However, as statutory consultees the drainage authority will be consulted and they will dictate the means by which this development would be allowed to connect to the existing drainage.
<b>Design</b>	6 (10,18,26,33,34,36)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would prefer a more contemporary eco design to show each era of development since C17th to C21st, not more boring boxes.</li> <li>• The housing needs to fit the eclectic nature of the village</li> <li>• It would be more aesthetically pleasing if more brick rather than render was used as this needs constant maintenance</li> <li>• Issues with ‘fake’ brick lintels and lack of chimneys for affordable houses</li> <li>• Although the Bradstone roof tiles will look appropriate, building in natural rather than reconstituted stone does not need to be prohibitive and should be included (along with render) on the new houses.</li> <li>• Bradstone is a poor substitute for stone. This a high density development in an AONB area will shriek out whether viewed from the top of the escarpment or from Kingswood and the Vale.</li> </ul>	Design and design-related issues such as materials are planning considerations to be decided by SDC planning department. Hilllesley & Tresham parish council requested that the design and materials for the affordable and market homes be consistent so as to ensure that the homes are ‘tenure blind’ and the development has a cohesive appearance.



<p><b>Layout in general</b></p>	<p>5 (1, 13,15,19, 22)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2 separate OM plots should be incorporated into the development (2 comments)</li> <li>• As the plans do NOT show a large percentage of affordable housing, the majority are executive homes I believe this is a profit exercise.</li> <li>• Please integrate the affordable homes with the OM homes.</li> <li>• Landscaped amenity area at entrance overly generous</li> <li>• I am surprised at the size of the development which extends much deeper into the field than expected – it seems too big and generous an area for affordable housing</li> <li>• The affordable housing is crammed into one position and not truly integrated into the estate, being on the fringe. This could lead to a ghetto feeling where the residents who are letting do not feel part of the development. The affordable housing is the requirement of this project NOT the extension of the village to include new private residencies.</li> <li>• Generally well considered, the mix of house types good</li> </ul>	<p>The layout of the development has been agreed between the developer and the housing association. It may change as it proceeds through the planning process. ‘Pepperpotting’ on such small sites is not considered advantageous by the housing association ERHA.</p>
<p><b>Village facilities</b></p>	<p>8 (2,12,13,19, 34,35,36,37)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roads and village facilities are insufficient as it is.</li> <li>• Lack of amenities – infrequent bus service, no shop &amp; all new residents will need a car</li> <li>• Hillesley has an excellent village school &amp; a community pub, which might or might not benefit from more housing. We have not had a shop for 20 years and there is no industry &amp; nowadays little farming which means that residents need cars to go to work and to exist living here.</li> <li>• Hillesley does not have the infrastructure to accommodate affordable housing. There is no public transport, each property would need one or two cars...there are no jobs within a reasonable radius of the village.</li> <li>• No infrastructure apart from a pub to support the proposal</li> <li>• Does school have capacity for additional children (2 comments)?</li> <li>• The lack of public transport will not help families with teenage children and school leavers looking for future jobs and there is little for them to do here at present.</li> <li>• The experience of Kingswood shows that new residents tend to be commuters who have to use a school with extra-curricular activities –</li> </ul>	<p>Hillesley is a Tier 5 settlement. According to the Stroud Local Plan Tier 5 settlements have <b>‘scope for very limited development, should this be required to meet a specific need identified by these communities’</b>. Delivery Policy HC4 of the Stroud Local Plan states that rural exception sites ‘should be located adjoining an identified accessible settlement with limited facilities, <b>unless specific local need and environmental considerations indicate that provision should be met at 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> tier settlements.</b>’</p>





		not offered by Hillesley school. Most younger people with mortgages, commuting costs and childcare are unlikely to have spare cash to spend in the pub.	
<b>Loss of view</b>	5 (3,16,20,22, 24)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are strongly against the site due to loss of view and quiet way of life/privacy</li> <li>I am not happy about this proposal as we will lose our fantastic view plus our road is hard to park in</li> <li>Why would you want to drive existing villagers out by building houses outside the view that we love clearly? The site needs reconsideration</li> <li>Concerned about change to outlook/uninterrupted country view</li> </ul>	Unfortunately the loss of a view is not a planning consideration.
<b>The build process</b>	3 (12,18,38)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What will happen if there is any structural damage to houses along Hawkesbury Rd eg Nos 3 &amp; 4 which do not have outside ground dug away from lower storey &amp; may be susceptible to road tremor etc from heavy vehicles. Can Piper Homes offer any compensation (not necessarily financial) to residents for the upheaval brought about by this development?</li> <li>What do the developers plan to do through the building phase about the size and disruption to the local community? This will go on for some time. I would have thought compensation for residents in Hawkesbury Rd for distress and inconvenience must be considered.</li> <li>The build process needs to be integrated into the village life by minimising disruption (noise/traffic); letting residents have a look eg school children could enhance their knowledge of building &amp; development issues; giving future residents of the new homes have a say in the final fitting out; good advice for budgeting to take on the housing costs for the affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<p>Should planning permission for this proposal be granted by SDC then conditions will be imposed on the hours and days of the week on which building can take place. There will also be restrictions on the use of power tools etc as required by Noise Nuisance Acts 1993 &amp; 1996 in order to minimise the impact on neighbours.</p> <p>The developer has suggested a potential joint project with the school to educate the schoolchildren about the build process and about site safety as well as a school competition to choose a suitable name for the new development.</p>
<b>Footpath reinstatement</b>	2 (26,36)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unresolved footpath issue needs sorting</li> <li>The diagonal footpath has fallen into disuse and 'disappeared'. The plans do not reflect this public access.</li> <li>I would like the footpath suitably diverted</li> </ul>	The parish council have suggested 2 potential re-routings of the lapsed footpath and requested that the landowners be consulted as to their preferences on these options. The formal process of reinstating a footpath may involve a public consultation.
<b>Broadband improvement</b>	3 (9,27,36)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hillesley has poor broadband and adding 22 houses will denigrate reception in the rest of the village. Existing residents will be aggrieved</li> </ul>	Broadband access will be expected by the occupiers of the new homes. Piper Homes have

		<p>by this (especially those working from home). If the developers could magic up fibre optic speeds for the village that would be welcome!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this development lead to an improvement in the internet connection?</li> <li>• Get better wifi in – I’m hoping for fibreoptic – it attracts buyers!</li> </ul>	<p>been asked to inform the parish council about any information gained from the broadband supplier about how internet service can be improved within the village.</p>
<b>Other</b>	3 (17,25,30)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this the start of opening the floodgates for more extensive extensions of housing beyond the village boundary?</li> <li>• Good idea to have affordable housing for local, employed young people but concerned about people moving into the village without jobs on benefits who cannot afford transport to look for jobs. They could become isolated and if not enough local people, people could move in from outside the area on benefits without jobs.</li> <li>• Can more energy saving measures be provided eg solar panels?</li> </ul>	<p>A rural exception site is one that would not usually secure planning permission for market housing. As such, once the need for affordable housing has been met, there is no possibility of any further development without proof of additional affordable housing need.</p> <p>None proposed at present although the homes will be built to comply with current building regulations on insulation etc</p>

**Communities which have supported the provision of affordable housing are encouraged to apply for funding from the SDC Community Infrastructure Reward Scheme. The following suggestions were received for infrastructure projects which could be of benefit to Hillesley & Tresham parish:**

- Improvement to road/pedestrian facilities/road safety on the junction of the Hawkesbury Road/High Street.
- Improve the pavilion/changing rooms
- Broadband – better service needed (3 requests)
- Village car park
- Better road in and out of village and better public transport

*Summary compiled by Karen Phimister, GRCC Rural Housing Enabler for Stroud District. Email: [karenp@grcc.org.uk](mailto:karenp@grcc.org.uk) & Tel: 01452 528491*