

EASTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Email: clerk@eastington-pc.gov.uk ~ Tel: 01453 799616

Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 24th May 2018 at 6.00pm in Eastington Village Hall

- 1 **Attendance and apologies for absence** In attendance Cllrs Bullock (Chair), Corrie, Loveridge, Simmons and Wells. **Apologies:** Cllr Farnden. **Also present:** Acting Clerk and Planning Clerk.
- 2 **Declarations of interest in items on the agenda.** None.
- 3 **Approval of minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22nd March 2018:** RESOLVED to accept the minutes.
- 4 **Outstanding actions from previous meetings:** None.
- 5 Response about possible issues for a forthcoming Community Governance Review Council felt that none of the options were applicable.

Members of the Public were invited to address the meeting.

None

6 Planning

6.1 To consider the following planning applications:

Date received	Application No:	Address	Details	EPC Comments
10/5/18	S.18/0798/HHOLD	Northend House, Nupend	Construction of steel-framed storage building https://www.stroud.gov.uk/apps/planning?AppRef=S.18/0798/HHOLD	No comment
15/5/18	S.18/0259/REM	Land West of Stonehouse	Reserved matters approval for the development of 262 dwellings plus 8 self-build plots with associated infrastructure, parking, landscape, public open space and locally equipped area of play – Parcels H3 (Partial), H4 (Partial), H5 and H8-H10 The main changes to the proposal are: Changes to affordable housing distribution https://www.stroud.gov.uk/apps/planning?AppRef=S.18/0259/REM	Council approved the recommendations in the Planning Clerk's report to be submitted to SDC
15/5/18	S.18/0275/REM	Land West of Stonehouse	Reserved Matters for development comprising the erection of 138 dwellings and associated landscaping, access and drainage infrastructure - Parcels H1-H4 The main changes to the proposal are: Changes to roads and landscaping https://www.stroud.gov.uk/apps/planning?AppRef=S.18/0275/REM	Council approved the recommendations in the Planning Clerk's report to be submitted to SDC

Signed

- 27 -

Date

EASTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Email: clerk@eastington-pc.gov.uk ~ Tel: 01453 799616

17/5/18	S.16/0043/OUT	Land At M5 Junction 13 West Of Stonehouse,	<p>Amendment to outline planning application in respect of land at M5 Junction 13 West of Stonehouse, Eastington, Gloucestershire.</p> <p>Development now comprises a 5,000 capacity football stadium and other ancillary uses (Use Class D2); two full-sized grass pitches and a goal practice area (Use Class D2); car parking for cars and coaches and highways improvements to the A419 including a signalised site junction and combined cycle/footway. All matters are reserved save for access.</p> <p>Reconsultation following the submission of further environmental information dated 10 May 2018 comprising ten documents.</p> <p>https://www.stroud.gov.uk/apps/planning?AppRef=S.16/0043/OUT</p>	Council approved recommendations in the Planning Clerk's report and it will go on the June agenda to consider asking planning consultants to investigate noise and transport issues
17/5/18	S.18/1070/HHOLD	Ivydene, Newtown	<p>Single-storey extension</p> <p>https://www.stroud.gov.uk/apps/planning?AppRef=S.16/1070/HHOLD</p>	No comment

6.2 The Committee noted the following planning decisions made by Stroud District Council.

Application No:	Address	Details	EPC Comments	SDC Decision
S.17/2331/OUT	Land adjoining Oldbury Lodge, Pike Lock Lane	New hotel and pub	Object	REFUSE 12/5/18

There being no other business the meeting closed at 6.45pm.

Councillors are reminded that if a matter has not been specified in the public notice, no formally binding decision can be taken on it. Notice: The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be on Thursday 28th June 2018. Committee meetings will only be held when there is sufficient business.

Signed

Date

S.16/0043/OUT - Eco-Park Repts

Comments in respect of reconsultation about Further Environmental Information received by SDC 10/5/2018 and reconsulted on 17/5/2018 for 21 days (expiring 6 June 2018)

NB. it is understood that the application is now most likely scheduled for October 2018 SDC DCC. The application appears to be being assessed/overviewed in relation to Environmental matters by a company called SLR of Bristol (on behalf of Stroud DC) and FGR have sought to address their comments.

FEI 4 (Further Environmental Information 4) to is to be read in conjunction with Dec 2017 revised scheme, including the ES prepared under the T&CP (EIA) (England and Wales) Regs 2011. A formal Regulation 22 Request under the 2011 Regulations has not been made. However, a number of clarifications have been sought in relation to transport, noise, planning and LVIA (Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment) via Statutory Consultees, SDC or their appointed consultants. This FEI 4 therefore seeks to address those concerns in a single comprehensive submission.

Submitted are:

1 A Supplemental Planning Statement from Hunter Page Planning (HPP) providing a response to representations from CPRE and Eastington Parish Council;

2 A LVIA Report from Ecotricity providing a response to SLR's review (on behalf of SDC) of the relevant chapter of the Revised Scheme submission;

3 A Noise Report from Hoare Lea Acoustic Consultants providing a response to WYG's review (on behalf of SDC) of the relevant chapter of the Revised Scheme submission;

4 A revised Outline Travel Plan from PFA Consultants. This replaces RS Appendix 12.3;

5 A response prepared by PFA Consultants to the Helix Transport Consultants comments made on behalf of Eastington Parish Council;

6 A Revised Planning Conditions Document.

Further to this the following are also online since 10/5/2018:

- drawings showing the signalised site access and A419 Duelling/road layout and
- Drawing showing The M5 J13 proposed road markings

The revised FEI4 contains a document dated March 2018 on the issues requiring Further Consideration (by SLR on behalf of SDC) raised the following points. Notwithstanding that they have tried to address these, these seem to be valid points for us to use against the scheme:

4.1 The ES does not provide sufficient analysis of the impact of the proposals on the setting of the AONB, given that the proposals will be seen in the foreground and mid-ground of certain views from the west towards the Cotswold escarpment.

4.2 There is no specific 'valued landscape' assessment of the site and its immediate surroundings with reference to GLVIA3 Box 5.1 criteria, which are generally used by practitioners to assess the value of 'undesigned' landscape/site areas. Such an assessment has been acknowledged in Appeal Inspector's reports as being pertinent when a potential development site lies within the viewing area towards an important landscape area/feature such as the Cotswolds AONB escarpment.

4.3 The LVIA concludes that significant landscape and visual effects will be limited to either 250m or 500m distance from the site (depending on type of effect under consideration) in all compass directions, but provides no justification for this statement. Given the variation in landform height and vegetation cover across the study area, and scale of proposed development, the more reported variation in the geographical extent of significant effects is as expected. The reported distance limitation of significant cumulative effects does not seem probable, given that the footprint of the cumulative developments under consideration extend well beyond 500m distance from the proposed stadium and car parking within the site.

4.4 The Stroud District Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (2017) identifies the area (ST05) in which the site lies as forming a buffer between the M5 motorway and Stonehouse. The proposed development will effectively infill the remaining undeveloped corridor that will remain once Land West of Stonehouse (Permitted Application) has been developed (see ES Figure 18.1: Cumulative Schemes). The SALA (page 341) states that a built gateway into Stonehouse along the A419 may be acceptable, subject to the quality of the proposed development and associated landscape treatment. LVIA does not address the impact of built development on the character and functionality of the existing green corridor separating the M5 motorway from built edge of Stonehouse.

4.5 Conversely, there is no discussion on how the proposals have been specifically designed to deliver an acceptable built gateway feature and landscape treatment, in accordance with SALA recommendations.

4.6 Delivery of key landscape areas that will form the 'parkland setting' of the new stadium, a design concept promoted by the Applicant, is not currently secured through the Parameter Plans. Accordingly, Stroud District Council (SDC) may wish to discuss revision of the Land Use Parameter Plan with the Applicant to address this.

Further I noted the following at page 73 of the FEI4 LVIA that reference is made to Eastington Neighbourhood Plan (October 2016) and supporting Technical Studies...

Para 3.6 The submitted LVIA materials has paid particular regard to the supporting evidence base underpinning the adopted Stroud District Local Plan and made Neighbourhood Development Plan, as referenced in the main LVIA report at RS Chapter 10 and RS Appendices 10.2 and 10.9. These documents have informed / underpinned the design, landscape strategy and embedded mitigation to the proposal drawing on a review of supporting published materials. This review

focuses on elements within the made Neighbourhood Plan maps / supporting materials where specific references to value are made. **No local green spaces have been designated as part of the made Neighbourhood Plan. (Karen made this bold)**

KH suggested comments:

EPC Object

The proposal would harm the setting of the **AONB, listed buildings and conservation** area (concern raised in LVIA) and would be contrary to policies EP4 of the NDP.

The proposed **road layout** does not show the whole of Chipmans Platt roundabout and it is not clear how all the dual lane traffic will find capacity past the Chipmans Platt roundabout contrary to policies EP4 of the NDP and and ES3, E110 and E111 of the Local Plan.

The site is not considered to be a **local green space** nor a village facility as it is remote from the village settlements and as such does not serve the local communities. Contrary to policies EP4 of the NDP.

The site currently forms a **green buffer** between the built development on the character and functionality of the existing green corridor separating the M5 motorway from built edge of Stonehouse. This has become more precious given the removal of trees at WOS which has opened up that part of Eastington to intrusive development. Whilst SDC is considering the next round of strategic land allocations in the Issues and Options Paper October 2017, that process is in its very early stages and any considerations of such land allocations are a long way from being agreed formally by SDC members. As such negligible weight must be given to the initial consideration of the FGR site in that document and significant weight must be given to the fact that the site is not allocated for development. The proposal will therefore result in harm to the local landscape and is contrary to Policies CP14, CP15 and ES7 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2015 and Policy EP4 of the adopted Eastington Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016.

Despite apparent claims that the **stadium will be no noisier** than existing background levels relative to surrounding receptors the Parish Council finds it difficult to believe that noise nuisance will not occur given the likely fluctuations in volumes before, during and after games (this was the reason for relocating the stadium from beside William Morris House so it was acknowledged that noise was a factor then). Contrary to policies EP4 of the NDP and ES3 of the Local Plan.

There is **no substantive site selection report** demonstrating that the stadium could not be accommodated on other sites now that the business element of the proposal is removed. Failure to assess alternative sites was a material consideration with the Rugby Club appeal refusal. It is suggested that other sites will be sequentially more sustainable than this site with poor links to its fan base and little opportunity to use

existing public transport given its remote location. Contrary to EP1 of the NDP and CP15 of the Local plan.

The applicant calls the recently consulted upon draft NPPF an **emerging NPPF**. It should be considered no more than a consultation at present (May 2018) and given only negligible weight.

The applicant fails to recognize that the Development Plan is the starting point in any planning considerations and the fact that the application site is outside of the settlement conflicts with the development plan and must be attributed significant weight against the proposal. There is not a 'slight' conflict as put forward by the developer! The NPPF should be read in its current form not that which might come forward in due course. Further it is considered that the site is not a local or public facility but a proposal for a targeted club of people. This is likely to be overprovision of a 'local' facility if a needs assessment were undertaken given that both Eastington and WOS development have sports provision. This is not likely to be available to the general population and if it were there are no realistic means of getting to the site sustainably outside of match days. As such the Parish Council can see little weight in favour of the application to serve local communities.

Financial implications:

Suggest to EPC that Helix consider and comment on the transport matters raised in this reconsultation.

Suggest that TROY Planninghold off from drafting the letter to members of SDC DCC which is already agreed but consider the information submitted in respect of noise (unless use of the noise consultant from the CLT would be useful)

S.18/0259/REM

Parcel H3-H5 & H8-H10, Land West Of Stonehouse, Grove Lane, Westend.

Application Type: Reserved Matters Application

Description: Reserved matters approval for the development of 262 dwellings plus 8 self-build plots with associated infrastructure, parking, landscaping, public open space and locally equipped area of play - Parcels H3 (Partial), H4 (Partial), H5 and H8 - H10.

<https://publicaccess.stroud.gov.uk/onlineapplications/search.do?action=simple&searchType=Application>

The main changes to the proposal are:

Changes to affordable housing distribution. 10 day consultation DUE : 25/5/2018

KH suggested comments:

EPC Object

No comment to changes to affordable housing distribution but previous concerns of the Parish Council remain as set out below as they remain our concerns. SDC officers and members should also be aware that EPC have suggested that this site could be used to offset the houses in the field adjacent to Nupend Lane – to create a buffer and keep grassland and important hedgerows under the Hedgerows Regulations by exchanging the triangular POS for the housing currently shown in H2 of S.18/0275/REM.

Set out below is the previous comment of Eastington Parish Council for ease of reference and remains valid.

Regarding the agents response to the Parish's Report by EnvironmentalSolve it is noted that the agent is defensive of their position but we note that we have seen nothing which seeks to address the wider concerns of the report.

Environmental Statement Drawing H.0324_08-3F to S14/0810/OUT (Green Infrastructure Plan), the Area Masterplan as discharged under Condition 46, the plan STH.P.6.WS.01 rev A attached to the Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Management Plans all differ to what has been agreed and occurred at H6/7 and at the attenuation pond seen from the shell garage roundabout which is a shadow of what was envisaged in the original ES (now with significant tree removal/clearance) and the current proposals for land parcels H1-H4(S.18/0275/REM) and H3, H4+H5+H8-H10 (S.18/0259/REM). So whilst Pegasus don't see that they have deviated from the ES as submitted with the outline application S.18/0810/OUT the Parish Council would like to see clarification on what is expected of the progressively differing plans before officers conclude any recommendations to the Committee in June.

Strategic Buffer

Buffer to Nastend appears to have been widened and is better when read in relation to the spaces between other buildings at Nastend.

Footpaths

Loss of rural aspect of FPEEA24 which enters the site from Nupend and is diverted straight into the estate roads rather than following its existing hedgeline route. – contrary to policy EP9 of the NDP.

Green Infrastructure

Green Infrastructure Plan and Biodiversity Management Plan Drawing number STH.P.6.WS.01 rev A was agreed on 8/1/2018. However this varies from what the developers have done on the ground in the wider area of the outline planning permission and are now trying to achieve in this application. We cannot condone the loss of the old Oak trees, associated hedges and their inherent ecosystems but the Parish does expect to see how the 'measurable targets for each phase of the development' agreed under conditions 39 and 41 of the outline consent will mitigate for the losses. The mitigation may need to include additional planting over and above that which was already agreed or expected in the same area or in areas such as the current application.

S.18/0275/REM

Parcel H1 - H4 Land West Of Stonehouse, Grove Lane, Westend, Stonehouse.

Application Type: Reserved Matters Application

Description: Reserved Matters for development comprising the erection of 138 dwellings and associated landscaping, access and drainage infrastructure - Parcels H1-H4 (378604 - 206340)

<https://publicaccess.stroud.gov.uk/onlineapplications/search.do?action=simple&searchType=Application>

The main changes to the proposal are:

Changes to roads and landscaping.

10 day consultation DUE : 25/5/2018

KH suggested comments:

EPC Object

The only change appears to be a new path linking the road at H4 to H5. There may be alterations to the specific planting mixes but it does not look to significantly alter or alleviate our pre-existing concerns.

No change to depth of strategic buffer.

No change to the developers footpath strategy which shows the removal of 50m of footpath FPEEA35 which currently runs, in parallel, down the western side of bridleway BWEEA33. This causes walkers to have to switch to the bridleway and share surface with horses which is undesirable. Further south the path is acknowledged but relocated to the eastern side of the bridleway but this is not within the application site area and adequate space would need to be guaranteed between the bridleway vegetation and the top of the attenuation pond. A further footpath intersects with the bridleway from a separate point on Nupend Lane and heads directly to Grove Lane. This path is diverted into estate roads contrary to EP9 of the NDP. It is noted that no comments have been received from the GCC footpaths team but that the Ramblers Association raised concerns.

It is also noted that the SDC Senior Ecologist identifies more ecological value in the grassland and hedges which are to be removed from the scheme than was understood from the submitted ecology reports. EPC notes that the finding of native bluebells in all of the hedges to be removed (some contrary to the original Environmental Statement and Area Masterplan condition 46) together with other species makes the hedgerows 'species rich' and likely to qualify as 'Important Hedgerows' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 criteria. It is also understood that uprooting native bluebells is an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. This gives further weight to the Parish Council's desire to retain the whole of H2 field as a semi-improved grassland buffer with its hedges forming its boundaries.

EPC urge Members of SDC DCC to visit the site to see first hand the benefits of maintaining this species rich environment for its flora and fauna as well as its ability to be the strategic buffer required by the approved Masterplan under condition 46 and SA2 (specifically 6,7,8) of the SDC Local Plan 2015. The proposal would then be more able to comply with ES6 (Biodiversity and geodiversity and Trees) , ES8 (Hedgerows and woodlands) of the SDC local plan 2015, EP2 (protecting

biodiversity and the natural environment) of the Eastington NDP and paragraph 118 of the NPPF.

Recognising that the developer will seek to replace/displace housing - if that became necessary then the ploughed field (significantly less biodiversity value) between H8 and H9 could be considered for housing instead of POS (there is already proposed self build housing on part of it which is not in accordance with the Masterplan). This would displace a LEAP but there might be scope to install that on another POS or indeed as part of the H2 retained field forming a sensible strategic buffer with access as shown on the Masterplan.

Set out below is the previous comment of Eastington Parish Council for ease of reference and remains valid.

Regarding the agents response to the Parish's Report by EnvironmentalSolve it is noted that the agent is defensive of their position but we note that we have seen nothing which seeks to address the wider concerns of the report.

Environmental Statement Drawing H.0324_08-3F to S14/0810/OUT (Green Infrastructure Plan), the Area Masterplan as discharged under Condition 46, the plan STH.P.6.WS.01 rev A attached to the Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Management Plans all differ to what has been agreed and occurred at H6/7 and at the attenuation pond seen from the shell garage roundabout which is a shadow of what was envisaged in the original ES (now with significant tree removal/clearance) and the current proposals for land parcels H1-H4(S.18/0275/REM) and H3, H4+H5+H8-H10 (S.18/0259/REM). So whilst Pegasus don't see that they have deviated from the ES as submitted with the outline application S.18/0810/OUT the Parish Council would like to see clarification on what is expected of the progressively differing plans before officers conclude any recommendations to the Committee in June.

Strategic Buffer

Buffer appears to have been amended by the removal of three houses from the northern edge of the site and gardens to the relocated houses have been pulled away from the Nupend road which facilitates communal land planting as a form of buffer (it is noted that other houses within the plots are split into semi-detached units to compensate). However, in reality the houses which are central on the northern boundary have changed little in location and will remain visible above the hedge and do not prevent coalescence between WOS and Nupend. This is contrary in particular to EP4 of the NDP which advises that it supports development which:

- *demonstrates a high standard of design that respects and reinforces local distinctiveness and character through attention to matters of scale, density, massing, height, landscaping, layout, materials and access;*

Parish consider that the landscaping, layout and density fail to reinforce local distinctiveness and character of Nupend.

- *respects the natural environment and terrain and enhances the natural capital of the site through new features such as trees, hedges, protected wildlife habitats, wildlife corridors and watercourses;*

Parish consider that the new planting is insufficient to outweigh the loss of a significant hedgerow between H2 and H3 (running southwest direct from Sunnycroft and previously to be retained in the Environmental Statement and design Masterplan discharged under condition 46) let alone to make compensatory planting for the loss of Significant Oaks and other landscaping lost at the Chipmans Platt Roundabout.

The Parish Council considers the green areas and green infrastructure to be constrained and contrived by the development rather than being designed into the scheme from the start as set out in the Environmental Statement approved plan H.0324_08-3F, Area Masterplan as agreed under condition 46 and complying with SDC policy SA2 with the inclusion of a “strategic landscaping buffer” to retain the unique character and setting of these two hamlets to prevent coalescence with the WoS settlement. This is not achieved by the limited changes undertaken. This is contrary to the Environmental objectives of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and contrary to EP2 and EP4 of same.

Para 8:1:10 of the NDP advises that ‘The objective of the planning application is to deliver “a series of interlinked neighbourhoods providing housing, employment, social and recreational needs within an extensive landscaped framework. Green infrastructure physically separates and provides the setting for each neighbourhood, whilst preserving the setting of the existing communities, listed buildings and the network of green lanes”.’ The loss of hedges previously to be kept further amalgamates the housing into larger groups (ie H2 and H3 are no longer divided by the substantial hedge which was to be retained)

Footpaths

Loss of 50m section of existing footpath from Bridlepath Cottage to meeting point between H1 and H2 – user is expected to use the bridle path for the initial section when accessing the route from the north. Route continues in diverted form to north east and south west along estate roads – all contrary to policy EP9 of the NDP

Green Infrastructure

Green Infrastructure Plan and Biodiversity Management Plan Drawing number STH.P.6.WS.01 rev A was agreed on 8/1/2018. However this varies from what the developers have done on the ground in the wider area of the outline planning permission and are now trying to achieve in this application. We cannot condone the loss of the old Oak trees, associated hedges and their inherent ecosystems but the Parish does expect to see how the ‘measurable targets for each phase of the development’ agreed under conditions 39 and 41 of the outline consent will mitigate for the losses. The mitigation may need to include additional planting over and above that which was already agreed or expected in the same area or in areas such the current application.

OUTCOME OF HOTEL APPLICATION

S.17/2331/OUT

Land Adjoining Oldbury Lodge, Pike Lock Lane, Eastington, Gloucestershire

Description of Development Erection of new buildings for uses within use class C1 (Hotel) up to 1,908 Sqm (56 Beds), and use classes A3 / A4 Pub (Pub/Restaurant) up to 711 Sqm (Including ancillary manager's apartment) and associated access, servicing, parking, drainage and landscaping (outline application: all matters reserved except for access and scale) Eastington Parish Council 378491 206103

The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse permission are:

1. Due to the location, the site is outside of any town centre or settlement limit in a rural and countryside location. The proposed development is akin to a town centre use, however, the submitted sequential assessment has not fully assess other more sustainable sites which are more preferable within the settlement and retail hierarchies. No robust justification or a sequential assessment has been provided to demonstrate exceptional circumstances or a policy compliant reason to justify a rural tourism location ahead of potentially more sustainable locations within settlements. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Policies CP2, CP3, CP12, CP15 and EI10 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2015 and Policies EP1 and EP3 of the adopted Eastington Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016.
2. Due to the location, access and scale, the proposal will have an urbanising effect which will erode and cause unacceptable harm to the local green character, tranquillity, appearance and distinctiveness of this part of the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area, the setting of the Grade II listed Blunder Lock and the setting of the non-designated heritage asset, Pike Lock House. The wider cumulative impact on the IHCA would also be harmful. The limited benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the harm therefore the proposal is contrary to the policies and guidance contained in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF, Policies CP14 and ES10 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2015, Policy EP4 of the adopted Eastington Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016 and the adopted Industrial Heritage Conservation Management Plan of 2008.
3. Due to the rural green and open character of the area, which includes the landscape zone of the nearby West of Stonehouse allocation, the proposed development would erode the role of the landscape as a green buffer between Stonehouse, Eastington and the M5 and as a setting for the adjacent canal. The proposal will therefore result in harm to the local landscape and is contrary to Policies CP14, CP15 and ES7 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2015 and Policy EP4 of the adopted Eastington Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016.
4. Due to the scale and proximity to neighbouring residential properties, the proposed development will have a dominating and overbearing impact. The proximity of the sole proposed access to the neighbouring properties will also generate significant noise and disturbance from vehicle movements along with other activities within the site. Also no air quality assessment has been submitted to demonstrate

that the scheme will not have a potential impact on local air quality. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of nearby residents and would be contrary to Policies CP11, CP14 and ES7 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2015 and Policies EP4 and EP6 of the adopted Eastington Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016.

5. Whilst a contribution towards the adopted Strategy for Avoidance of Likely Significant Adverse Effects on the Severn Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar Site has been discussed, no legal agreement or formal offer has been submitted. Therefore, insufficient information as submitted to demonstrate that the scheme would not have potential significant effects and add additional recreational pressure at The Severn Estuary SAC which may indirectly affect the interest features for which this is designated. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CP14 and ES6 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan, November 2015 and Policy EP2 of the adopted Eastington Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016.