

The text of an Email sent from the Chair of Uley Parish Council on behalf of the PC to Stroud District Council Housing Committee ahead of the Housing Committee Meeting on 7 June 2026

“Thank you for your email. The main trouble for us with all this is that, on behalf of SDC, you and your team appear to approach this development from a very different angle to that from which UPC is bound to approach it. This is partially understandable in that the site belongs to SDC, whereas UPC has to take a more holistic view on behalf of the parish, its history and its future and, in particular, the local residents. Whilst we appreciate that SDC must operate within its policy framework, this current approach to the proposal seems to us totally illogical.

You have advised us repeatedly that you are only concerned with the site and that anything outside it is not in your remit. You have said that we will have the opportunity to present our views at the planning stage. This strikes us as a bizarre way to go about drawing up a proposal for a development which will inevitably impact the whole village. Given that Stroud District Council is responsible to the entire district as well as to individual council-owned sites, we do not understand why you would not be considering the development of this site in its context. Why would the proposal not give consideration to the people who will live on the site and those living in the surrounding area? Why would the acute problems of parking and access and egress from The Street and up South Street not be taken into account? Why is the safety of pedestrians and school children on South Street not considered when drawing up this proposal? And why is no apparent weight given at this stage to the policies applying to sites adjoining a Conservation Area when they will be germane at the planning stage?

As a parish council, we are constantly mindful of the way we handle public money. To us it seems extraordinary that SDC should be spending all this time focussed on proposals for a site without any apparent consideration of how it and its occupants will fit into the village. Over the months we have been trying to persuade you to take a broader view and consider the obvious negative impacts that the current proposal will have on Uley. This is in order that time - and money - might be saved by getting the plan right from the start rather than all of us having to expend a large amount of time and energy in conflict.

You tell me that I do not understand the roles of the various committees. Believe me, by now I have a pretty good idea.

Thank you for sending us the latest Road Safety Audit. We wonder why this has been held back from us for so long. Prepared, checked and approved (by the same person who carried out the survey) all on March 11th and only forwarded to us on May 28th. This very short report focusses on the site access alone; it takes no account of safety in the area surrounding this access splay. Perhaps this is unsurprising since the report states that it was carried out specifically "to assess the potential impact of Uley Church of England Primary School on the proposals." Surely this *must* be the wrong way round for a public body to approach its own proposed development.

Furthermore, the report states: 'It was noted on site that on-street parking is occurring within the vicinity of the proposed site access, associated with parents picking up children from the local school. This will restrict visibility from the proposed access and could result in vehicles egressing the access erroneously with side-swipe type collisions with ahead traffic.'

#### RECOMMENDATION.

It is recommended that appropriate parking restrictions be provided at the site access and South Street. This is a serious imposition upon the neighbourhood. The means suggested to resolve the access -

yellow lines - simply shifts an even bigger problem onto the surrounding street and its inhabitants and access to the school. It is not the way to approach solving a problem that arises within the proposal itself, it being simply too large, too dense, too constricted and too hemmed in.

We understand that there has been time slippage on the milestones but wonder why the meeting with the Housing Committee has not been delayed as a result. The update requested is incomplete; there has been no comprehensive report on Highway Safety and we do not see how the Housing Committee can move this issue on without this. The report of Uley's public meeting, which voiced the concerns with which you are so familiar, was one of the main instigators of the Committee's decision to delay these proposals going forward to planning. Uley's concerns about this proposal have, in large part, not been addressed.

It is good of you to offer us a further meeting, thank you, but I do not think it would get us anywhere unless you are able to view this proposal in its broader context. I will report your offer to our monthly Parish Council meeting on Wednesday.

This email embodies UPC's ongoing grave concerns about the current proposal for the future of The Knoll. As such UPC agrees to this email being put forward to update the Housing Committee. The only new issue I would add is that, as you know, Uley School is applying for a new nursery with a planned capacity of 30 children plus teachers. Together with the impact that it is hoped this will have on the primary school's numbers, this will mean a further 56 children being dropped off each day making a total of 149, plus teachers.

Kind regards,

PS You may wish to know, in the event that this proposal moves forward to planning, that otters are now seen regularly around The Knoll as they make their way up from the river to feed on goldfish and Koi Carp from villagers' ponds in Woodstock Terrace.