

Appendix S Consultation (Reg 14) responses

S



Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
1a	GL16 8BY	d = 61+	-	Introduction	Questions the future of Coleford and the NDP area but values the salient features as per the Plan.	No	Agreement noted.
1b	"	"	-	5.1 Town Centre	Disagrees with extra funding for town centre upkeep as not good value for money. Would prefer money spent on projects related to Forest wide products.	No	Noted but not in conformity with consensus of responses.
1c	"	"	-	5.2 Economy	Sees tourism as important but further marketing required. The rest of this comment focusses on wider Forest issues not relevant for this NDP area.	No	Issues of tourism promotion addressed within the NDP, eg Historic and Natural Environment sections.
1d	"	"	-	5.3 Housing	Not in favour of sharing the countries need for large numbers of new developments due to lack of employment, services and infrastructure.	No	In general conformity with the NDP vision.
1e	"	"	-	5.4 Communities	Supports community facilities	No	Noted.
1f	"	"	-	5.5 Historic Env	Supports caring for historic nature of the NDP area.	No	Noted.
1g	"	"	-	5.6 Natural Env	Supports green ring and necklaces of villages with their identity. Opposes further housing developments eg Poolway Farm which would urbanise Coleford's rural environment.	No	Noted but the original Poolway Farm allocation has been accepted by FoDDC. NDP agrees that the expansion of Poolway Farm in the further modification of the FoDDC AP is not supported.
1h	"	"	-	5.7 Infrastructure	Agrees with the need for infrastructure and services to be improved due to a steadily increasing population.	No	Noted.
2	GL16 7LQ	d = 61+	-	5.3 Housing	Against the development of the Ellwood Road site for various reasons, eg iron ore mining, water extraction, green ring, demarcation of villages and lack of infrastructure.	Yes	Changes to wording in 5.3.2
3	GL16 7LQ	d = 61+	-	5.4 Communities	Disagrees with the NDPs further support for tourist attractions and residential facilities, eg Bells Field development.	No	Comment noted but against general consensus.
4a	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	Introduction	Generally supportive but requests more detail of historical background of the area.	Yes	Additional information on historical background added to 1.3.5
4b	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	5.1 Town Centre	General agreement with a suggestion for improving the roundabout adjacent to the District Council offices.	Yes	Additional project regarding enhancing gateways added at 7.1.5
4c	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	5.2 Economy	General agreement. Possible tourism improvement suggested of green spaces in CTC5 or CTC1.	Yes	Changes made to Policy CTC5.
4d	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	5.3 Housing	Disagrees with large scale developments through unwanted and unsustainable growth. Request modification of table 3,4,and 9.	Yes	Tables 2, 3, 8 and 9 revised.
4e	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	5.4 Communities	Agreed.	No	Noted agreement with NDP.
4f	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	5.5 Historic Env	Agreed.	No	Noted agreement with NDP.
4g	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	5.6 Natural Env	Agreed.	No	Noted agreement with NDP.
4h	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	5.7 Infrastructure	Agreed.	No	Noted agreement with NDP.
4i	GL16 8HX	d = 61+	-	General	Comment made on the lack of strategic overview coverage for Coleford's future.	No	Covered in the Vision.
5a	Not given	Not given	-	5.1 Town Centre	Agrees with the historic Town Centre.	No	Noted.
5b	Not given	Not given	-	5.2 Economy	Agrees with the tourism stance of the NDP.	No	Noted.
5c	Not given	Not given	-	5.3 Housing	Agrees with the control of new builds, style and design. Disagrees with some new builds, eg cramping and overmassing (Blakes Way and Bank Street).	No	Noted agreement with NDP policies.

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
5d	Not given	Not given	-	5.4 Communities	Agrees with listing of green space provision, eg Walnut Close, Coalway.	No	Noted agreement.
5e	Not given	Not given	-	5.5 Historic Env	Agreement with the need to market Coleford's aspects of history and leisure.	No	Noted agreement.
5f	Not given	Not given	-		Commented on traffic , especially HGV increase. Buses could be smaller than the standard ones. Commented on problems with the board. Considers lack of education provision a problem.	No	All comments noted but in general conformity with the NDP Vision and policies.
6a	GL16 7AT	d = 61+	Dot Sharp	Introduction	Figure 4 duplicated.	Yes	Duplicate figure removed.
6b	GL16 7AT	d = 61+	"	5.2 Economy	Noted a lack of policy detail concerning connectivity issues.	Yes	New connectivity background information (5.2.12) and policy added (CE3).
6c	GL16 7AT	d = 61+	"	5.3 Housing	Notes an error in the designation of Christchurch and Edge End in the Coleford NDP and FoDDC AP.	Yes	Christchurch and Edge End village titles from relevant tables and figures removed.
6d	GL16 7AT	d = 61+	"	5.3 Housing	Comment on the detail and layout of Tables 9 and 10.	Yes	Layout of tables 8 and 9 changed and information amended.
6e	GL16 7AT	d = 61+	"	5.7 Infrastructure	Notes lack of inclusion of health and other services in the policies of this section, even though raised during community consultations.	Yes	New background information added (5.7.12.) and new policy written. (CITP3).
6f	GL16 7AT	d = 61+	"	Glossary	Inclusion of terms not used in the main document, eg FANS.	Yes	Glossary reviewed and amendments made.
7	GL16 7HX	c = 45-60	Dina Jenkins	Introduction	Requests the addition of The Tump, adjacent to Parkend Road, Coalway - Potential Green Spaces.	no	Reviewed. The Tump added as 37.Map 8, Table 11 addition and Appendix H altered.
8a	GL16 8AS	d = 61+	-	5.1 Town Centre	Agrees with the historic look of the Town Centre and also the lack of seating and green spaces to attract and keep people in the town. Suggests the Lawnstone site for this use. Comments on the unattractive appearance of the vacant Marshes site. Decries the loss of finance to the area for retail and hence diminished local economy and poor quality employment.	No	Comment noted but in general conformity with the Town Centre and Economy policies other the NDP.
8b	"	"	-	5.3 Housing	Comment on the opposition of houses on the St John's church site. Favours the site for community use.	No	In general conformity with community consultations and the NDP options for this site.
9	GL16 8QE	c = 45-60	-	5.3 Housing	Objection to expansion of housing on Poolway Farm	No	In general conformity with housing policies and Tables 8 and 9.
10a	GL16 8DW	c = 45-60	-	5.7 Infrastructure	Suggest ways to preserve historic buildings and traffic management within the Town Centre.	No	In general conformity with NDP aims to improve traffic flow.
10b	GL16 8DW	c = 45-60	-	5.3 Housing	Notes the lack of affordable housing within the area.	No	Has been highlighted in the NDP and therefore in general conformity.
11a	GL16 8DU	d = 61+	-	Introduction	Need for more local shops highlighted	No	Noted but covered in Town Centre and Economy policies.
11b	GL16 8DU	d = 61+	-	5.1 Town Centre	Suggest the redevelopment of the St John's site for community use.	No	Noted but in general conformity with the NDP.
11c	GL16 8DU	d = 61+	-	5.2 Economy	Attraction of work for local employment needed.	No	Noted but in general conformity with the NDP.
11d	GL16 8DU	d = 61+	-	5.3 Housing	Need for more 1 and 2 bedroom housing.	No	Noted but in general conformity with the NDP.
11e	GL16 8DU	d = 61+	-	5.6 Natural Env	Suggests list of contacts for help with specific environment issues, eg bees	No	Covered by other agencies, eg FoDDC and eg Gloucestershire Bee Keepers Association.
11f	GL16 8DU	d = 61+	-	Communities	Suggests aiming for Britain in Bloom type competition.	Yes	Suggestion passed on to Coleford Town Council
11g	GL16 8DU	d = 61+	-	5.6 Natural Env	Suggests planting more trees and gardens schemes to maintain and attractive environment.	No	Covered by the NDP.

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
11h	GL16 8DU	d = 61+	-	5.7 Infrastructure	Addition of a community buses service, eg twice weekly supermarkets/supermarket shuttle service.	No	Supported under existing policies if any specific scheme is proposed
12	GL16 8DF	d = 61+	-	5.1 Town Centre	Improve the appearance of the Town Centre and show historical background, Provided photographs of an example of a town centre in South Wales.	Yes	Added as part of Project 7.1.5.
13	GL17 8DE	Not given	r&Mrs Clark	5.3 Housing	Objection to any housing development on Poolway Farm due to numerous reasons, eg mines, traffic, infrastructure, health provision, flooding, protection of green ring and loss of countryside.	No	Existing allocation cannot be changed but further allocations fails NDP policies.
14	GL16 7LB	Not given	-	5.1 Town Centre	Suggestion for the use of St John's church.	No	Community use suggestions in conformity with the NDP and supports community based project.
15	Not given	Not given	-	5.1 Town Centre	Suggests a community meeting centre for St John's church.	No	Community use suggestions in conformity with the NDP and supports community based project.
16	Not given	Not given	-	5.1 Town Centre	Suggests a community meeting centre for St John's church.	No	Community use suggestions in conformity with the NDP and supports community based project.
17	GL16 8AS	Not given	-	5.1 Town Centre	Suggests a community meeting centre for St John's church, including a café mornings, centre for youth and a safe meeting place.	No	Community use suggestions in conformity with the NDP and supports community based project.
18	GL16 7LB	Not given	-	5.1 Town Centre	Use of St John's church for community use, eg arts, music, health, youth, history and or cultural activities. Use of Coleford House site for community centre for mental health, the elderly, children and or a cultural centre as an alternative development to St John's church.	No	In general conformity with the NDP . St John's site suggested for community use, with multiple uses. Coleford House for housing with some potential for cultural/community too.
19	GL16 8AN	Not given	-	5.1 Town Centre	Suggests the use of St John's church for community and a music centre due to acoustics.	No	In general conformity with the NDP.
20a	GL16 7QS	c = 45-60	-	5.1 Town Centre	Attractiveness of Town Centre and new shop variety appreciated.	No	In general conformity with the NDP.
20b	"	"	-	5.3 Housing	Addition of housing at Worcester Walk and also questions the total number of houses required all the whole area. "Needs, not developers wants" raised.	No	Supports proposals in NDP housing policy section.
21a	GL16 7QT	c = 45-60	-	5.1 Town Centre	Mixed retail needed, comments on too many takeaways, hairdressers, estate agents and empty shops.	No	In general conformity with the NDP.
21b	"	"	-	5.3 Housing	Supply exceeds demand, eg Worcester Walk should remain as a green area. "Keep Coleford Forest of Dean not Houses Dean". Need small, 1 and 2 bedroom and starter home developments to keep young families in the area.	No	In conformity with the NDP housing policies and shown by amber sites for Tables 8 and 9.
22	not given	not given		5.7 Infrastructure	The town is "lovely" but some areas need maintenance attention, trees/verges eg top of Sparrow Hill	No	Covered by tidying of appearance and notes improving Gateways. Comments passed on to Coleford Town Council.
23	not given	not given	reen Cleme	5.2 Economy	Supports extra retail, supermarket	No	in line with NDP
24	GL1 2EB	c = 45-60	Canal Trust		replied with no comments registered	No	nothing to action
25	NG18 4RG		Authority Mark Harrison	5.3 housing	Generic comment re process to investigate historic mining legacy and remediate sites appropriately in the NDP area.	No	As NDP must be in general conformity with Local Plan, the reference to CSP1 and to the NPPF covers this issue
26a	SN1 3EF		Homes, Conor Lee	5.3 housing	Suggested no. of houses for Ellwood Rd in document is corrected to 48 to be consistent with emerging AP	yes	Adjusted tables 8 and 9 to read 48 For Ellwood Rd.

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
26b	SN1 3EF		Hannick Homes, Conor Lee	5.3 housing	The sustainability of Ellwood Rd site is greater than all other sites in the AP. It is the only site not in the Locally Valued Landscape designation AP64. Allows for provision of 40% affordable housing (19) along with range of other types such as starter homes. Note high level of support in 2016 consultation	no	Revisited the 2016 consultation in detail, the NDP policy allowed for housing and green area so specific support for housing is unclear. No alteration.
26c	SN1 3EF		Hannick Homes, Conor Lee	5.6 natural environment	Fundamentally disagree with Ellwood Rd site being in the Green Ring: southern section not designated in AP. Adequate protection for sensitive landscape in AP64 and CSP1	Yes	Southern Green Ring is still valid. See Map 10. Ellwood Rd site is excluded from Green Ring, in order to be in general conformity with with the emerging AP and subsequent revision of the settlement boundary.
26d	SN1 3EF		Hannick Homes, Conor Lee	5.6 natural environment	CNE3 Ref for green living roofs needs clarification, suggest insert "where appropriate" at end of the first sentence	no	Policy states "such as" ie that is an example
26e	SN1 3EF		Hannick Homes, Conor Lee	5.7	Future contributions in planning obligations will need to be compliant with 122 in CIL regulations and 123 in S106,	no	NDP notes developmmnt would have to comply with regulations
26f	SN1 3EF		Hannick Homes, Conor Lee	5.7	Flood risk assessment will accompany any application. Soakaways will deal with surface water	no	Flood risk assessments will be investigated as part of the individual application where groundwater and local sources of extraction for potable use will be considered.
27a	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings	Introduction	Supporting NDP including objective 3. This should also specify numbers required.	no	See detail in 5.3 and requirement of NDP to be in general conformity with Local Plan.
27b	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.1	Support CTC2, new housing will increase local economy and thus town centre	no	This is in line with vision and policies within NDP
27c	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.2	Consider the relevance of residents in new housing contributing to the economy eg 48 dwellings at Kings Meade	no	NDP accepts that local economy will be dependent on many factors, only one of which will be income from new housing.
27d	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.3.7	Kings Meade site would supports local housing need	yes	Kings Meade site is excluded from Green Ring, in order to be in general conformity with with the emerging AP and subsequent revision of the settlement boundary.
27e	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.3.7	Potential application for Kings Meade could be submitted by the end of 2017 calendar year	no	Noted
27f	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.4	Map 12 should be updated to show future residential development at Kings Meade	yes	See renumbered Map 6, site identified.
27g	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.5 Historic Environment	Policy CHE2 wording: wants addition of "where there are harmful impacts to heritage assets this should be assessed and balanced against the public benefit of the proposal" from NPPF.	yes	Reword policy reference: replace "damage" in second paragraph with "harmful impacts".
27h	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.6 Natural Environment	Object to wording of CNE1: "conserve the landscape setting of Coleford including the Green Ring" Thinks conserve is too high a level of protection and will prevent development.	no	Conserve is not preserve, and arguments for any development will be pusued through applications, taking nto consideration the landscape setting.
27i	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.6 Natural Environment	CNE2 map 12 amend to include Kings Meade as settlement	yes	see 27d

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
27i				5.6	Update map 12 to reflect additional homes at Kings Meade	yes	see 27d
27j	BS32 4QL		C Bath, Kings Meade	5.7 Infrastructure	Amend wording of CITPA4 "flooding will not be supported" without clear evidence provided of there being no unacceptable flood risk"	yes	Wording to CITPA5 amendment.
28a			Gladman		General comments regarding the nature of NDP process and changing interpretation	no	noted
28b			Gladman		Specific comments regarding AP which the NDP cannot take into consideration until after the Inspector's report	no	Noted
28c			Gladman	5.3 Housing	CH2: policy lacks clarity: unclear what would be considered "over development of the site" nor "robust pedestrian elements"	Yes	Amendments made to policy CH2.
28d			Gladman	5.3 Housing	CH3: fails to define what is outside the town centre	no	Sites outside of the town centre and within of the settlement boundary are already covered by CH3. There are no sites proposed outside of the settlement boundary.
28e			Gladman	5.4 Communities	CC4: Local Green Spaces note the guidance in NPPF:	yes in part	See CC3 and Appendix H which includes NPPF references and the reasons they are valued spaces (para 77).Revised. Included 4 areas of 17 Angus Buchanan Trust, rest Green Ring Locally Valued Landscape
28f			Gladman	5.4 communities	Local Green Spaces policies cannot be used to protect extensive tracts of land	yes in part	LGS are different to Green Ring, and that is noted para 5.4.10 Policies CNE2 and CNE3 are in a completely different section deliberately. Reviewed and changed wording on specific LGS in Appendix H items 14,16 . Retained in CC4 with reference included in CNE2
28g			Gladman	5.5 Historic Environment	CHE2: see para 132-135 of NPPF re designated and undesignated heritage assets. Undertake a more detailed assessment of heritage assets and that it aligns with NPPF.	No	Valued Heritage Assets , not designated in2017, sites have been fully assessed. See also comments by Historic England (HRA, SEA).
28h			Gladman	5.6 Natural Environment	CNE1 See para 006 of PPG updated guidance on statutory protection for valued landscape.	no	Policy CNE1 is not stating statutory protection but giving guidance on design considerations of any new development
28i			Gladman	5.6 Natural Environment	Green Ring as a separation of Town Centre from surrounding settlements is beyond the remit of the NDP. Blanket restriction on development. See PPG 074	no	The AP designates as Locally Valued Landscape that area which separates the Town Centre from surrounding settlements. The NDP is in general conformity: see AP64.
28j			Gladman	5.3 Housing	Lower Lane is submitted as a site, with reasons for development of housing. This includes eg services in close proximity.	no	After a legal challenge, the rejection of this site by the Sec of State in Dec 2016 has been quashed and referred back to the Sec of State for reconsideration.
29	CW1 6GJ		Natural England Tom Amos, SEA and HRA		Received document, FODDC will use comments for revised HRA/SEA	yes	see final FoDDC HRA /SEA

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
30a	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	Introduction	See comments 27a (identical)	no	as per 27a
30b	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.1	See comments 27b (identical)	no	as per 27b
30c	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.2	See comments 27c (identical)	no	as per 27c
30d	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.3.7	See comments at 27d except note Poolway Farm site (140 total dwellings)	no	The original 80 houses for Poolway Farm is accepted, however, the further 60 (Poolway Extension) is not allocated by the NDP and the numbers substituted in order to be in general conformity with the Local Plan.
30e	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.3	Confident will submit planning application later in 2017.	no	noted
30f	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.3	Submission re changes to existing settlement boundary made to FODDC which will extend site to encompass whole field west of Poolway farmhouse.	no	See 30d.
30g	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.4	Map 12 should be updated to show future residential development at Poolway Farm	no	Map 6 identifies two parts of this site, but not the full site area as received in consultation. Cannot update what we do not know, and as not notified, then no opportunity to include this in consultation
30h	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.5 Historic environment	as per 27g	no	already revised see 27g
30i	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.6	as per 27h (except Poolway Farm is referred to)	no	as per 27h
30j	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.6	as per 27i (except Poolway Farm is referred to)	no	See 30d.
30k	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.7	as per 27j	no	as per 27j
31a	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	Introduction	as per 27a, 30a (identical)	no	as per 27a, 30a
31b	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.1 Coleford Town Centre	as per 27b, 30b	no	as per 27b,30b

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
31c	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.1 Coleford Town Centre	additional new site for housing at Poolway Rd, Broadwell (though they use Coalway). This growth will enhance the potential of the Town Centre .	no	As a completely newly proposed site, no consultation possible at this stage. Thus apply current principles and policy so object as in the Green Ring.
31d	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.2 Economy	as per 27c, 30c	no	as per27c,30c
31e	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.3Housing	as per 27d, 30d	no	as per27c,30c
31f	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.3Housing	Site adjoins settlement and is bounded by residential dev't north and south and Broadwell Football Club to east. Represents logical infill site in a sustainable location with excellent links to the rest of Coalway and nearby Coleford. Residential development supported by comprehensive landscaping to mitigate impact	no	The settlement boundary is the other side of the Football Club, and the threat to the Green Ring is significant. Plot is 2.32ha, could be 60+ houses, certainly not infill. The location is in Broadwell not Coalway, which has no shop, just halls and a church ie not sustainable. The impact on the B4226 near to the bend approaching a difficult junction at B4432 is high, with visibility issues toward site direction from Coalway especially.
31g	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.4 community	Object to policy CC4 surrounding settlements and Green infrastructure. Fails to allow sufficient flexibility for development which may have net beneficial impact. They suggest adjust wording to "ensure that separation from Coleford Town is not unacceptably eroded and that any harmful visual impacts on the separation are suitably mitigated"	no	See above - this is part of the Green Ring and the AP Locally Valued Landscape.
31h	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.5 Historic Environment	as per 27g, 30h	no	as per 27g, 30h
31i	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5..6 Natural Environment	as per 27h and 30i	no	as per 27h and 30i
31j	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5..6 Natural Environment	as per 27i and 30j	no	as per 27i and 30j
31k	BS32 4QL		Pegasus MF Freeman	5.7 Infrastructure	as per 27j and 30k	no	as per 27j and 30k
32	GL16 7LQ		Allan Walasey Dean Properties	5.3	Potential development plot Ellwood Rd, location SO5808NE. Noted this is outside settlement boundary, register this for Allocations Plan assessment and possible incorporation.	no	Infill plot outside defined settlement boundary and in the Green Ring. Policy of no development in Green Ring applies.
33a	GL2 8EG	d=61+	David Ball Garden Trust	5.5, 5.6	Broad implications of dealing with change in the built, historic and natural environment have been taken on board. Local Plan and planning application process will cover rest.	no	noted

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
33b	GL2 8EG	d=61+	David Ball Garden Trust	5.5, 5.6	Every effort should be taken to ensure design quality and creativity is secured in future development, respiration and landscaping proposals. Particular regard should be given to site analysis that might help identify Historic landscape and garden features and cross-referenced with the Gloucestershire sites and monuments record.	no	Covered in principle in the Plan, concurs with Historic England response
34a	GL1		Niblett Glos	5.6	Vision and objectives result in policies CNE1 and CNE2 are welcomed.	no	noted
34b	GL1		Robert Niblett		Green Spaces, landscape character, ecological networks and SUDs are being given high value.	no	noted
34c	GL1		Robert Niblett		Map 13 should be in previous section 5.5	yes	Amended Map 13 in new position
34d	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos		Appendix A p 92 frog crossing on B4228 should be toad crossing on A4136	yes	Changes made to relevant sections.
34e			Robert Niblett Glos County Council		If possible, reference to NDP by adding to Map 14 Great Lambsquay Wood	yes	See new map 13 Gt Lambsquay Wood is shown, Little Edie's Field Wood is NOT a key wildlife site ref GCER and omitted
34f	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos County Council	5.7 Infrastructure	The Lead Flood Authority will fulfil its statutory duty to provide service to LPA when requested to do so regarding the management of surface water relating to major planning applications with the aim of ensuring related flood risk is managed as effectively as possible.	yes	Enquired of FoDDC who asks for remaining work to be done (CITPA). Coleford TC to request FoDDC at alert County to possible works required.
34g	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos County Council	5.3 Housing	Concerns with CH2:" involves a prior satisfactory infrastructure impact survey and provides a robust pedestrian elements on the ground within its access statement. Unclear. Define infrastructure impact survey." Change wording to facilities rather than elements	yes	Defined infrastructure impact survey in glossary. Changed elements to facilities in policy.
34h	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos	5.7 developer contribution list	Neither S38 or Glos County Council Local Transport Plan are not funding opportunities, .	no	Noted, but funding not mentioned in list
34i	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos County Council	5.7 Infrastructure	CITPA1: reword a) as publicise does not work;	yes	Amendments made to policy CITPA1
34j	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos County Council	5.7 Infrastructure	CITPA1: not sure enough certainty that a safe and suitable traffic management scheme is achievable at the junction	no	investigate options further with Highways
34k	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos County Council	5.7 infrastructure	More clarity needed to properly interpret and apply policies CITPA1 and 2	yes	Amendments made to wording to clarify meaning

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
34l	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos County Council	5.5	commends the inclusion of numerous refs to archaeological refs in section 5.5, policy CHE2 and Appendix M	no	noted
34m	GL1		Robert Niblett Glos County Council	5.5	Site 11 includes part of Whitecliff SAM. Check and correct boundary of planning permission if still valid.	yes	Checked boundary of site. Does not match with SAM land as on database. Includes some of SAM. Relates also to legal agreement dated 14.5.93 with Bluedyne re DF9752/A . SEE https://publicaccess.fdean.gov.uk/online-applications/files/63729A8990ED0C90994A29F429B1324B/pdf/P0807_17_FUL-ILLUSTRATIVE_SITE_LAYOUT_PLAN_-_PROPOSED_LODGE_LOCATIONS-542092.pdf for recent application
34n	GL1		Niblett Glos County Council		NDP area falls within Glos Minerals Safeguarding and Mineral Consultation Areas (MSAs and MCAs). For completeness add ref to these in suite of development policies. See Proposals map A at link given	yes	The NDP area falls within the Glos Minerals Safeguarding and Minerals Consultation Areas (MSAs and MCAs). The relevance of new development taking into account mining in the NDP area has been added as 4.6.
35a	BS1 4ND		David Stuart Historic England		We are impressed with the scope of the plan and the depth of information informing content. Pleased with underpinning desire to protect and reinforce locally distinctive character. Policies such as CTC1, CC4, CHE1, CHE2, CNE1 and CNE2 are particularly welcome.	no	noted
35b	BS1 4ND		David Stuart Historic England		Table 1a, Table 4, Table 1b, Table 9 as well as individual site assessments are useful. The latter possess a fine degree of analytical understanding of the role of the historic environment which is rare in our experience of NDPs.	no	Thank you very much
35c	BS1 4ND		David Stuart Historic England	5.1 Town Centre	Police hub, Marshes, Lords Hill and Lawnstone are already allocated. Principle of developing these sites has been established and that any potential for harm can be prevented by complementary policies	no	noted
35d	BS1 4ND		David Stuart Historic England	5.1 St Johns	St Johns Church. We endorse the presumption to retain the building with provisions for the historic environment in the NPPF. The "if at all possible" qualifier should be removed to ensure conformity and unambiguity.	yes	"if at all possible" removed from CTC4 1. St John's Church
35e	BS1 4ND		David Stuart Historic England	5.1 Coleford Hou	Coleford House; redevelopment needs to be more precisely defined ie retention, conversion and possibly some new build to avoid the suggestion that demolition would be acceptable	yes	changes to the wording of CTC4 2. Coleford House
35f	BS1 4ND		David Stuart Historic England	5.3 Housing	Ellwood Rd site: identified as "a last resort" allocation as against existing policy. We are not sure if such an allocation can demonstrate conformity but as it is outside the development boundary and in the protected Green Ring it may generate significant environmental effects. The site assessment confirms that there are "listed building comments" but it is not clear what these might be. Ref made to Dark Hill SAM, but unsure that relationship with Ellwood Rd site. It may be useful to make more explicit what if any the heritage considerations and potential for impact might be.	yes	Checked and amended appropriately the site assessment, with Valued Heritage Assets, not designated in 2017 and scheduled ancient monuments

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
35h	BS1 4ND		David Stuart Historic England	5.3 Housing	Tufthorn Ave: existing allocation with planning consent granted	yes	noted
35i	BS1 4ND		David Stuart Historic England	5.7 Infrastructure	Schedule of positive and detracting elements page 37 could be used for developer contribution list P 128 more obviously	yes	Changes made to 5.1.4 Negative features, and Developer Contribution List 5.7.11.
36a			Natural England	5.6	welcomes the inclusion of a specific policy on green infrastructure	no	noted
36b			Tom Amos Natural England	5.7	Development in the Plan should be designed to avoid excessive lighting and to prevent lightspill avoiding impacts on the BATs SAC	yes	Changes to policy CNE3 to include reducing impact of light levels on bats. Also changes made to CH2 in terms of impact on residents.
36c			Tom Amos Natural England	5.6	Green infrastructure policy should commit to the retention, maintenance and creation of dark corridors for bats within the plan area	yes	See 36b. Changes made to CNE3 to include reducing impact of light levels.
36d			Tom Amos Natural England	5.2, 5.3, 5.6	Green Infrastructure can be required for new developments as part of a commitment to sustainable development as a whole, not only for protected species	yes	Change made to wording in first para of CNE3.
37	LE11 3QF		Sport England		received response , no specific comment re Coleford NDP	no	noted
38a	GL16 8AS	C=45-60		5.2 Economy	would like larger Friday market	no	noted
38b	GL16 8AS	C=45-60		5.4 Community	use the library a great deal, keep	no	noted
39			GC Warren	5.3 Housing	Been made aware of Poolway Farm 140 houses: asks for NDP to review that and recommend abandon them permanently. Gives 8 reasons including impact on hospice, infrastructure improvements needed - traffic, doctors, schools, drainage, green field site and lack of local jobs.	no	See 30d.
40a	GL16 8BY		d=61+	5.3 housing	Poolway Farm: small development and affordable housing supported; large development will start encroachment towards Berry Hill; tranquility required.	no	See 30d.
40b	GL16 8BY		d=61+	5.3 housing	Foot and Mouth : large number of animals burnt and buried against boundary hedge	no	Risk of infection following burning in the case of foot and mouth is nil.
40c	GL16 8BY	d=61+		5.3 housing	ROW on two sides of site. Site may be developed further, which could take roads right through between Sunny Bank Rd and Gloucester Rd ie a rat run to avoid the town centre.	no	Covered by second bullet of CH2
40d	GL16 8BY	d=61+		5.3 housing	When Greenfield Rd moved in concern about mining issues including in the bowl were raised and advice was that no development would happen on Poolway site because of mining. What has changed?	yes	All developments must conform to planning requirements relating to mining. The NDP area falls within the Glos Minerals Safeguarding and Minerals Consultation Areas (MSAs and MCAs). The importance of new developments taking into account the existence of mining in the NDP area has been added as point 4.6.
41	GL15 4TV	d=61+		5.3 Housing	Against Lower Lane development	no	Supports NDP position (in Green Ring and Locally Valued Landscape).
42	GL16 8BY	d=61+		5.3 Housing	Poolway Farm: impact on hospice, infrastructure improvements needed - traffic, doctors, schools, drainage, mining issues, foot and mouth and lack of local jobs.	no	Covered by actions pursuant to answers 39 and 40

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
43	GL16 8DF	d=61+		5.3 Housing	Poolway Farm:sewage issues, increased potential for flooding and traffic management.	no	Covered by actions pursuant to answers 39 and 40
44	GL16 8BY				PETITION RE EXTENSION No specific reg 14 comments	no	Already agreed to extend time period to 3 July
45	GL16 8AU		S Spencer	5.3housing	opposed to devt Poolway	no	See 30d.
46	GL16 8BY		G Harden	5.3housing	Poolway Farm: hospice, primary schools	no	See 30d.
47	GL16 8AY		Mr & Mrs Bidmead	5.3housing	opposed to devt Poolway	no	See 30d.
48	GL16 8BY		Mr & Mrs Kear	5.3housing	Poolway Farm ; precious green field sites	no	See 30d.
49	GL16 8AU		B Hiley	5.3housing	WANT EXTENSION	no	See 30d.
50	GL16 8AU		G Hiley	5.3housing	WANT EXTENSION	no	See 30d.
51	GL16 8BY		N Harden	5.3housing	Poolway Farm: noted the original site in 2016,and refers to 2015 version of AP: raised issues re drainage but thought they may be mitigated. Objects to doubling of size raising further issues:drainage; primary schools and hospice	no	See 30d.
52	GL16 8DE		Mrs Woodwar d	5.3housing	Poolway Farm; traffic especially onto Poolway Rd; effects on birds and wildlife, needs further infrastructure and services;the 140 is too large scale; feeling safe now, but not with the development.	no	See 30d.
53	GL16 8BY	d=61+	Mr & Mrs Weston	5.3housing	Poolway Farm: they say about the number of failed applications over last 20-30 years. Sewerage, electricity supply, mine shafts, access from Bakers Hill; lack of employment,	no	See 30d.
54a	GL16 8DF	d=61+		5.3housing	Coleford to Berry Hill gap should not narrow: see contrary to 5.3.3	no	Noted - supports CNE2 in Plan
54b	GL16 8DF	d=61+		5.6 Natural environment	Stream flows through low-lying Poolway Place so concerned that covering green fields with buildings will increase run off to neighbouring properties	no	Noted - supports CNE2 in Plan
54c	GL16 8DF	d=61+		5.7 Infrastructure	Frequent sewer smell in Poolway Place will be exacerbated by further developments	no	covered by actions in 39
55	GL16 7DR		St Johns Next Generation Steering	5.1	Emerging group supports use of St Johns as a multipurpose community facility. Gives vision and start-up plan.	yes	7.2.1 Example of St Johns Church reuse. This may require further additions following discussion with the Next Generation Group.
56a	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC		Generally happy with NDP but queries the level of conformity with the emerging Allocations Plan: review of the narrative to separate out the proposed allocation eg Marshes	yes	Changes made to NDP housing site allocations in order to be in general conformity to the Local Plan.
56b	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.2 Emploment	FODDC policies allow for a wider range of uses, rather than that specified in the NDP. Review B1,2 and 8 and replace with employment generating uses	yes	Changes made to wording of Policy CE2.
56c	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	Lot of evidence and justification which is useful, but does not make it easy to identify the policies.Use CH3: to identify land listed in one place	yes	Reviewed and amended.
56d	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	CH2 refers to Map 2 should it be map7 with further change	yes	CH2. Changes made to map references and wording clarified in the first paragraph.

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
56c	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	CH2, CH3: to be in conformity, the housing numbers will include those for the sites specified in the Further Changes. If alternative sites are proposed then the 5 year deliverability is significant.	yes	Changes made to NDP housing site allocations in order to be in general conformity to the Local Plan.
56d	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	SAC sentence move to end rather than start of CH3	yes	First sentence moved to the end of the policy.
56e	GL16		Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	The Executive Summary needs to reflect the final allocations and how they are in general conformity.	yes	Reviewed and amended
56f	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	Design is covered by APMM policies 4 and 5, which may be useful for ref in NDP	yes	Reviewed and amended
56g	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	Lower Lane site will be subject of High Court Hearing 26 September	no	noted
56h	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.1 Town Centre	Key issue is coping with change and bringing forward improvements, the NDP is seen to be useful in this.	no	noted
56i	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC		Maps: Map1 include settlement boundary; Map 7 update available; Map 13 gives a partial coverage only	yes	Reviewed maps and obtained some FODDC better copies at A3. Another map added to extend area and renumbered to 11 and 12 to start at 5.5. Also added new map 13 natural designated areas in place of SACs only and in new position.
56j	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.6 Natural Environment	Open space:ref to CSP9 may be useful as this protects Forest Waste	yes	Additional references made to 5.4.9 and 5.6.6.
56k	GL16		Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.6 Natural Environment	CNE1: reword the policy to show that any new development in order to gain support has to comply with this policy as well as other policies	yes	Change of wording at start of CNE1.
56l			Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.6 Natural Environment	Green Ring: it would be useful to refer to this as Locally Valued Landscape. The protection of the areas should take into account any housing sites supported by the NDP	yes	Changes made to Map 12 to note NDP housing site allocations in order to be in general conformity to the Local Plan. Whilst much of the Green Ring mirrors the Locally Valued Landscape (LVL), the area known as Green 3, to the south, is considered to have the same status as LVL.
56m			Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	Background comments:explains why AP has further modifications to account for the 5 year deliverability, with Lydney and Cinderford having little capacity, Coleford and Newent having some	no	noted
56n			Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	Mindful of Para 184 NDP must be in general conformity: it is in conformity with Core Strategy and saved policies from Local Plan, but it needs to show how it accords with the emerging AP or will risk being out of date.	yes	Changes made to NDP housing site allocations in order to be in general conformity to the Local Plan.
56o			Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	para 2.10 Housing White Paper hints at how NDPs could be out of date as LP not in place. This is the case in FOD.	yes	Reviewed and amended

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
56o			Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	Housing numbers and thus the level of conformity is the query. If the OAN is 300 per annum or 6000 over 20 years plus undersupply penalty ie 330 pa for Forest, then does Coleford meet the numbers needed. NPPF guidance note 5% extra when meet, but 20% for persistent under delivery. Suggest meeting and discussing this further.	yes	Changes made to NDP housing site allocations in order to be in general conformity to the Local Plan.
56p			Nigel Gibbons FODDC	5.3 Housing	Projects is a useful section. FODDC looks forward to be included in further consultation and involvement. Add mesne/ meend into glossary.	yes	Meend added into glossary
57	GL16 7LR		d=61+	5.3 Housing	Ellwood Rd site:opposed as a)last remaining significant green field in Milkwall b) adjacent to open wild green areas of the Forest; c)adjacent to Undesignated Heritage Assets (Colour Works) and Dark Hill (hisoric sites); d) outside defined settlement boundary; e) poorly connected; f) when viewed from Gorsty Knoll is a part of the green space g) geology - 4 iron ore shafts, 2 which are still open- one in the top corner of site; h) water extraction significanti) infrastructure needed primary schools, shops j) traffic and non-existent pavements. k)Site is part of the proposed Green Ring	no	Changes made to NDP housing site allocations in order to be in general conformity to the Local Plan. See site assessment for possible mitigation
58a	GL16 BAY	d=61+		5.3 Housing	Poolway Farm: a)140 houses is greater density than Greenfield Rd area (adjoining estate). Plot size will be 60% in comparison.	no	See 30d.
58b	GL16 BAY	d=61+		5.3 Housing	Development in conflict with Hospice ;.	no	See 30d.
58c	GL16 BAY	d=61+		5.3 Housing	c) housing this far from Town Centre will not suit ageing population with mobility problems (other areas in TC would be better)	no	NDP does not allocate extension as in Green Ring and outside settlement boundary. For type and mix of housing to suit needs see affordable and Lifetime Homes in pre-application discussions
58d	GL16 BAY	d=61+		5.3 Housing	d) should development be granted, then nearby residents would prefer bungalows along boundary	no	For type and mix of housing to suit needs see affordable and Lifetime Homes in pre-application discussions Section 6
59	GL16 8DE	c=45-60		5.3 Housing	Poolway Farm: object.a) Access onto Gloucester Rd will be potentially dangerous b) wildlife affected c) old mines d) potential for flooding e) hospice g) lack of infrastructure and services	no	See 30d.
59f	GL16 8DE	c=45-60		5.3 Housing	f) devaluation of neighbouring properties	no	not a planning reason
60a	GL16 8BY	d=61+		INTRO	a)Keep the separate identities of the villages	no	noted
60 b	GL16 8BY	d=61+		5.3 Housing	b)Need for local employment for the people in those houses and c) increased services and infrastructure eg schools	no	noted
60d	GL16 8BY	d=61+		5.4 communities	increased health provision especially GP access	no	noted
60e	GL16 8BY	d=61+		5.7 Infrastructure	improve roads for traffic	no	noted
61 1	GL20 8JG		Tessa Jones Environment Agency	5.7	Flooding NDP proforma sent (61 2)). Substantive further comments would be made if the Plan was seeking to allocate sites for development in flood zones 3 and/or 2	no	Reviewed 61. EA and GCC advise no more detailed modelling since SFRA. Planning requirements eg for Old Guardian Office, will need to be met. Advise any developer to contact EA and conduct risk assessments as necessary for rear, higher, area of site (Newland St frontage is Grade II listed). See CITPA5

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
61 3	GL20 8JG		Tessa Jones Environment Agency	5.7	flood risk information	no	Reviewed - see above
61 4	GL20 8JG		Tessa Jones Environment Agency	5.6, 5.7	The NDP is considered unlikely to have any significant effect on the European designated sites. Based on the FODDC screening and NPPG practice guidance, the Ndp is unlikely to have any significant environment impact. See HRA/ SEA comments for more detail	no	noted
62			nazandjac	5.3Housing, 5.7 Infrastructure	Poolway extension: need for the green buffer as evidenced by FODDC's case against Lower Lane; Secretary of State mentioned emerging policy of buffer zone; drainage and sewerage issues, and that drainage infrastructure; mine workings; surface water; transport and emerging access onto feeder road Gloucester to Monmouth via dangerous junction at Mile End. Reducing potential for leisure area for Hospice. If extended, almost the size of refused Lower Lane development (140 compared to 180). Question about FODDC consultation on AP.	no	See 30d.
63a	GL16 8BY	B=18-44		5.1 Town Centre	more retail shops for the local community	no	covered in existing policies
63b	GL16 8BY	B=18-44		5.3 Housing	Big housing developments will have a negative impact on Coleford eg Poolway Farm. Strain on health and education infrastructure; Coleford will benefit from small unique developments.	no	See 30d.
63c	GL16 8BY	B=18-44		5.6 natural environment	Attractiveness and character of Coleford will be damaged by large housing developments at gateways into town	no	see CITPA1, CITPA2, CH2
63d	GL16 8BY	B=18-44		5.7 infrastructure	Impact on traffic numbers and speed on Mile end junction and down Bakers Hill into town will be increasing risk	no	covered in policies CITPA1, CITPA2
64	GL16 8D3	B=18-44		5.3 Housing	Poolway: as at March 2016 FODDC advised on purchase that original Poolway Site was identified. As residents flooded in 2007, worried about potential flooding affecting their health. Tranquillity important for residents who are emergency shift workers. also affect, care home and hospice; breaches Green Ring and narrows gap between Berry Hill and Coleford; concerns about high proportion of social housing; noise, crime and disruption; smaller developments wanted by local people.	no	See 30d.
65	GL16 8DF	d=61+		5.3 Housing	Against Poolway: drainage and sewerage issues, traffic and access point issues onto Gloucester Rd	no	See 30d.
66	GL16 8DN				Photo complaint 17 Boxbush Rd	no	Sent letter explaining why number 17 has been referred to and photographed Page 1 Appendix G and Appendix A Character Assessment Coleford Town as part of streetscape
67a	GL16 8DE	d=61+	Hard copy	5.1 Town Centre	Not sufficient supermarkets and people use cars to other towns	no	covered by retail policy
67b	GL16 8DE	d=61+		5.3 Housing	This amount of housing (at Poolway) is too close to care home and hospice	no	covered by actions in 39, 40
67c	GL16 8DE	d=61+		5.4 Communities	Coleford doctors full already and no NHS dentist	no	covered by actions 6e
67d	GL16 8DE	d=61+		5.6 natural environment	Footpaths near to Coombs need to be maintained better. Don't spoil environment.	no	Comment passed on for action by the Town Council
67e	GL16 8DE	d=61+		5.7 Infrastructure	Access for vehicles onto Gloucester Rd will create a crossroads at bottom of hill. Gloucester Rd in poor state of repair	no	Comment passed on for action by the Town Council
68a	GL16 8DE	d=61+	Hard copy	5.1 Town Centre	needs greater variety of shops including another supermarket, including for people with no transport	no	covered by retail policy

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
68b	GL16 8DE	d=61+	Hard copy	5.3 Housing, 5.7	Poolway Farm: traffic at Gloucester Rd horrendous now, including HGVs. Road cannot cope with much more traffic. Elderly person with no transport finds walking into town frightening and fume filled.	no	See 30d.
69	GL16 8DF	d=61+	Hard copy	5.3 Housing	Poolway Farm objection: keep green areas for future generations; flooding and surface water issues; development out of character, traffic impact especially at gateways into Coleford;	no	See 30d.
70	GL16 8DE	d=61+	Hard copy	5.3 Housing	Against Poolway: because of traffic, sewerage infrastructure; foot and mouth; mineshafts; green spaces near to Coleford need to be kept; care home and hospice need the tranquillity; now very difficult to get appointment with doctors locally, and this would aggravate the situation.	no	See 30d.
71	GL16 8DE		Hard copy	5.3 Housing	Against Poolway: volume of traffic on busy road; sewerage infrastructure; foot and mouth; mineshafts; care home and hospice need the tranquillity; another green space concreted so close to town	no	See 30d.
72	GL16 8AY	d=61+	Hard copy	5.3 Housing	Against proposed addition to allocations Sept 16: extends housing too far from Glos Rd for convenient access to network; too many houses in one plot; needs more parking spaces to avoid parking on pavements; needs access for buses into Coleford and internal to estate; avoid connecting the road through to the Gorse to prevent rat run; public footpath from Greenfield Rd would not support excessive use into town, with loss of privacy	no	See 30d.
73	GL16 8DF	C=45-60		5.3 Housing	Valued view of landscape at edge of Coleford spoiled. Traffic onto Gloucester Rd will increase. Need for greater shopping facilities; sewer infrastructure inadequate; hospice should have tranquillity. Spoils Coleford	no	See 30d.
74	40 Coombs Rd		Mr & Mrs Williams	5.3 Housing	Poolway Farm: feel disadvantaged by late delivery of newsreel. Land in bowl has mineshafts; houses will back onto hospice (built there as tranquil); questions issues from foot and mouth 2001 burning; queries lack of infrastructure for large scale development, especially health services; lack of employment for residents of new houses; drainage is already an issue in Coombs estate and this will add to problem; increase of traffic from Thurstan's Rise shows bottleneck at the edge of town centre- likely to apply similarly. Want feedback from SG after analysis	no	See 30d.
75	22 Coombs Rd		Mr & Mrs Williams	5.3 Housing	Poolway; Land in bowl has mineshafts; houses will back onto hospice (built there as tranquil); questions issues from foot and mouth 2001 burning and criteria for disturbance of area; queries lack of infrastructure for large scale development. Want feedback from SG after analysis	no	See 30d.

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
76	GL16 8AY 39 Coombs		Mary Coupland	5.3 Housing	Poolway:sewerage infrastructure cannot cope with possible effects on town centre and Whitecliff as stated in NDP; drainage issues evident already in Coleford, and cul-de-sac in Coombs Rd floods now; extension of Coleford envelope into Green Ring will have flood and traffic implications;health services overstretched now and service county wide under pressure, how cope; lack of employment(insufficient industry locally); hospice and residential home will face noise, disruption and pleasant aspect; ; why has the original site housing not been built?; narrowing of green space is contrary to plan where separation of Coleford and Berry Hill needed; flora and fauna pass along this as wildlife corridor toward pond on (Forest Hills) golf course; exploration of mineshafts needed to see if development possible; increase of traffic bottlenecks where other development has occurred; air pollution issues. Gren is key to character of Coleford. Refs are made to specifics in the NDP.	no	See 30d.
77	GL16 8AY 37 Coombs		Wakefield; Andrew White; Oliver Miles;J	5.3 Housing	Commented on late delivery of newsletter.Poolway: housing will back onto hospice (latter being built due to tranquillity of its position); mineshafts in area;;questions issues from foot and mouth 2001 burning and criteria for disturbance of area	no	See 30d.
78	GL16 8AY 17 Coombs		J Evans	5.3 Housing, 5.7	Poolway, Ellwood Rd, Tufthorn Traffic Lights, Sonoco site if developed with housing would have severe effects for school infrastructure which is already difficult.Need for extra shopping including supermarket. Housing must have infrastucture planned with it.	no	Noted and covered by existing NDP Policies on Infrastructure and also Developer Contributions.
79	GL16 8DE 37 Pike Road		D Bidmead	5.3 Housing	Poolway: this will encroach on green space between Coleford and Berry Hil, contrary to NDP. 2015 consultation showed local people wanted small developments but this is 140 houses; questions issues from foot and mouth 2001 burning and criteria for disturbance of area; has outlook from care home and hospice been taken into consideration;existing hazard for traffic at B4208 on Bakers Hill junction,what are plans to minimise increased risk from at least 195 vehicles plus delivery (calculated from 1.39 cars per household (Dept foTransport); Lack of employment locally will exacerbate commuting and bottlenecks at Monmouth and A48/A40 approaching Gloucester	no	See 30d.
80	GL16 8AY 38 Coombs		E Bidmead	5.3 Housing	identical to 79 above	no	See 30d.
81	GL16 8DE 37 Pike Road		S Bidmead	5.3 Housing	identical to 79 above	no	See 30d.
82	GL16 8AY 38 Coombs		I Bidmead	5.3 Housing	identical to 79 above	no	See 30d.
83	GL16 8AY	d=61+		5.3Housing	Poolway: site density is out of keeping with adjacent Coombs estate (0.03 ha per dwelling compared to .05ha per dwelling). 40% social housing including a proportion of retirement homes where older people need easy access to services which are in town centre so (Marshes)site adjacent to Co-op is more appropriate.	no	Noted: policy CH2 addresses the concerns.
84		d=61+		5.4 Communities	Bale Field: comments from Trustees regarding changes to parish boundary and outline of the field on the map.	yes	Clarified area and boundaries and considered position re local green spaces. Keep status but with ref to possible boundary change of parish as in Boundary Commission proposal https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk/node/9253

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
85a	GL3 4FE		Andrew Hughes Glos Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)	5.4 Communities	Health:referred to detailed 5year prioritised primary care infrastructure plan (PCIP) approved by CCG March 2016, on CCG website. Looking Forward to Glos 2031 in PCIP sets out where investment is expected to be made in new/extended buildings over the next 5 years.	yes	Following meetings with CCG representatives and staff from local medical centres, amendments have been made.
86b	CF30 0EH		Ryan Norman Forward.Plans@dwrcymru.com		"Given that the NDP has been prepared in accordance with FOD Core Strategy, we are supportive of the vision, objectives,policies and proposals as set out." Responsible for sewage (Severn Trent Water for potable water)	no	noted they have attended and represented at examination of AP
86c	CF30 0EH		Ryan Norman Forward.Plans@dwrcymru.com	5.3 Housing; 5.7 Infrastructure	"Confirm there are no issues with the public sewerage system or the Newland waste water treatment works (WWTW) in accommodating the foul-only flows from the proposed allocations."	no	Forward Plans officer (FoDDC) states that there is sufficient capacity at present and that surface water should be accommodated with SUDS. Etc.
86d	CF30 0EH		Ryan Norman Forward.Plans@dwrcymru.com	CNE3 Green Infrastructure	welcomes the inclusion of a specific policy on green infrastructure especially encouragement of SUDs in new developments	no	noted
86e	CF30 0EH		Ryan Norman Forward.Plans@dwrcymru.com	CITPA4 flooding	note concerns and welcome the provisions of that policy. Pleased that SUDS is first method of water disposal and also the requirement for evidence to be provided to show there will be no flood risk to the site, land and infrastructure."	no	noted
86f	CF30 0EH		Ryan Norman Forward.Plans@dwrcymru.com	5.3 Housing; 5.7 Infrastructure	Where a development site would cause capacity issues on the sewage system we (Dwr Cymru) would require the Developer to fund a hydraulic modelling assessment to be carried out to identify a point of connection and/or any improvements required to the system to accommodate their site."	no	noted

Number	Postcode	Age range	Name if given	Policy	Summarised comment	Amend y/n	Reasoning/amendment
86g	CF30 0EH		Ryan Norman Forward.Plans@dwrcymru.com	5.3 Housing; 5.7 Infrastructure	If a development site would bring our WwTW to capacity and there were no improvements planned under our Capital Investment Programme, then we would require the Developer to fund a feasibility study to be undertaken in order to understand the level of improvements required, and subsequently fund the improvements under the provision of a planning obligation.	no	noted
87	GL3 4AW		Glos Care S	5.7 Infrastructure Health	NDP paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 quoted. Reference to the engagement by CCG and Glos Care 2015-16, and the 2017 document A Case for Change. "As part of any consultation Coleford NDP will be considered alongside other Forest NDPs	no	noted