

Appendix 2 – Response Report Matson

| Matson Comments | Key theme | Response | Proposed Change to SPD |
|---|------------------|---|---|
| Need for resident led regeneration | Community | Whilst the council can encourage a resident led process it can not insist on it through the SPD. Any planning applicant will need to demonstrate how they have consulted with the community. We would encourage residents to join the Community Action Group and contact tpas who are independent advisors for residents. | No change required. |
| Need to capture the culture of the neighbourhoods - ethnographic study | Community | Noted. | Expand 6.2 to include community strategy and details of what this should contain. |
| There is much that is positive about Matson and this needs to be captured | Community | Noted. | Expand 6.2 to include community strategy and details of what this should contain. Be more positive in the SPD where appropriate. |
| Asset based mapping should take place to capture much that is positive about Matson and the skills that already exist in the community. | Community | Noted. | Expand 6.2 to include community strategy and details of what this should contain. |
| There are no four bed homes - families must move off the estate | Homes | Noted. | At the time of writing no developers have submitted any detailed layout which shows any development proposals. A rehousing strategy would be required to be submitted with any planning application. This strategy will provide the council and residents with details of who is effected and what is proposed to ensure that residents have their housing needs met. This is a requirement of SD11, SD12, of the JCS and CP policy A3 and reiterated in the SPD text. Expand 6.2 to refer to Local Needs Assessment for each |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------|---|--|
| | | | phase to ensure the housing needs of residents are met. |
| Critical issue is the connection between Matson and Winnycroft to integrate the new and existing communities and help to support the retail and community offer in Matson. The link should be made during the early stages of the Winnycroft development | Phasing | Noted. | Expand 2.1.6 to provide more detail about the Winnycroft permission, services and infrastructure. Add more detail in the phasing section of the SPD of the importance of the integration and connection to Winnycroft developments. |
| Current shopping parade is scruffy and needs updating | Shops and services | Noted. | No change required. |
| Lack of fresh food and healthy choices | Shops and services | Noted. | Include in 2.1.4 Local Facilities |
| No supermarket, useless for people with no car | Shops and services | Noted. | Include in 2.1.4 Local facilities. |
| Sound insulation in flats is extremely poor – can hear people using the bathroom on floors above | Homes | It is acknowledged that a number of residents have complained about the sound insulation in their existing homes, especially in the flats. This comment will be passed on to Gloucester City Homes. Please note that any new development must accord with the latest Building Regulations with regard to sound insulations. These have been considerably improved since the estate was originally constructed in the 1950s. | No change required |
| Community want to be consulted on the details of the rehousing strategy | Community | Noted. | A rehousing strategy should involve detailed conversations with effected residents to discover what their housing needs are. The rehousing strategy would form part of the planning application which is subject to public consultation. |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|--|
| Do not build on the Library open space | Open Space | The library space is owned by Gloucester City Homes. No planning applications have been submitted to develop on the site. The council has no control over what planning applications are submitted to it. Any applications proposing a loss of open space will be determined in accordance with the SPD and the adopted JCS and CP policies. | Open space framework plan amended. |
| Retain our green spaces | Open Space | Noted. | No change required. |
| Plan ahead for electric cars | Infrastructure | This is dealt with in the SPD and in the JCS and CP. | No change required. |
| Get parked cars off the road - provide off-street parking | Parking | Parking is dealt with in section 5.2 of the SPD. Car parking on plot is encouraged. | No change required. |
| No 4 bed homes in Matson | Homes | Any planning application would need to accord with Policy SD12 Affordable Homes and SD11 Housing Mix from the JCS and Policy A3 Estate Regeneration of the City Plan Presub. These policies seek to ensure a suitable mix of homes are provided that meet local need. Reference to meeting need is made in 1.2 Vision and guiding principles and in 3.2 Housing and Regeneration. | Update Policy A3 - Estate Regeneration in section 3. Planning policy context |
| All buildings should have no steps and level access | Access | All development across the city needs to be built in accordance with the building regulations. CP policy C1 - Active design and accessibility will also be consider during any future planning application stage. | Ensure reference to CP policy C1 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--|--|
| What will happen to owner occupier's homes? | Homes | At the time of writing no developers have submitted any detailed layout which shows any development proposals. A rehousing strategy would be required to be submitted with any planning application. This strategy will provide the council and residents with details of who is effected and what is proposed to ensure that residents have their housing needs met. This is a requirement of SD11, SD12, of the JCS and CP policy A3 and reiterated in the SPD text. | Add reference to owner occupiers in any descriptions of rehousing strategy |
| Is there a refurbishment package for home occupiers? | Homes | It makes sense to consider the refurbishment of the properties surrounding new development. This will help create a cohesive place. The council would be supportive of such an approach. At the time of writing no refurbishment package has been submitted to the council | Add reference to refurbishment of homes adjacent to new development and the importance of a cohesive scheme. |
| Flats should have lifts to make it possible to live in them as life changes and so disabled people can live in them | Homes | Accessibility is a key consideration. The NPPF, JCS, and CP all seek to provide access. Applicants will need to demonstrate how that ensure accessibility and do not discriminate against people. They will also need to ensure that the housing needs of people are met. | Add reference to accessibility to chapter 5.3 Building Design. |
| Deal with anti-social behaviour and 'push the bar higher' – be ambitious and set high standards. | Community | Noted. | Include reference to 'Designing Safer Places' SPD. |
| Bin storage is a real problem | Infrastructure | Bin storage is dealt with 5.3.14 of the SPD | No change required. |
| There has been nothing said about house owners on the Matson estate. While all tenants have received news letters after changing your delivery company home owners seem to have been neglected | Homes | Leaflets were produced and delivered by GCH. This was not part of the council's consultation | No change required. |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--|--|
| | | process. Residents for the council's consultation were consulted in accordance with the council's Statement of Community Involvement. GCH will be notified of this comment. | |
| Get it done quick | Phasing | Noted. The speed of delivery is dictated by the developer. | No change required. |
| Will all new buildings be of the same height and construction so there is little distinction between social and private for security | Homes | Yes. Policy SD12 of the JCS requires that "The design of affordable housing should meet required standards and be equal to that of market housing in terms of appearance, build quality and materials" | Add reference to SD12 part 5 - tenure blind to section 3 Planning Policy Context |
| Cameras everywhere - linked right into the Force Control Centre in Quedgeley. | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| A running track installed for 'The Daily Mile' - tarmacked in spongy surface - covered with cameras and well lit. | Infrastructure | Noted. The SPD requires community facilities to be provided to meet local need. | No change required. |
| Screens showing Daily What's On on Google Calendar to help combat loneliness and depression. | Community | Noted. It is a good idea to utilise technology to combat loneliness. This would not be a matter for the SPD but is an idea that the council would encourage you to pursue within the community. | No change required. |
| Refer to Norwegian Cruise Lines, Royal Caribbean eg Symphony of the Seas - top deck to get ideas for recreational facilities. That is what we want - we want a 'resort'. | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| Lots of Juliet balconies and little balconies for breakfast. | Homes | Page 38, 5.3.10 states "For upper floors balconies or terraces should be provided." | No change required |
| Lots of space for window boxes. | Homes | Page 38, 5.3.10 states "For upper floors balconies or terraces should be provided." | No change required |
| Measures to help with heat gain | Homes | Any new development would have to comply with the latest Building | No change required |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|---|--|
| | | Regulation. These set the standards for insulation and the heating and cooling of buildings. | |
| Make sure there is enough cabinetry | Homes | Storage is an important part of well functioning home. Policy F6 of the CP requires developers to build to the Nationally Described Space Standards. The standards includes providing storage space. | Refer to CP policy F6 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context |
| Make enough room for 3 tall 186cm tall fridges and freezers so people can budget their food well. | Homes | Storage is an important part of well functioning home. Policy F6 of the CP requires developers to build to the Nationally Described Space Standards. The standards includes providing storage space. Whilst a good idea, unfortunately this is too specific for the SPD. This comment will be passed to GCH to consider when they design their schemes. | Refer to CP policy F6 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context |
| There is to much traffic on Matson avenue to have a road into the top of the said avenue. It would make more sense to put traffic lights on Winnycroft lane and the junction of Painswick road, this is because the amount of traffic and children on Matson ave | Infrastructure | Noted. Future planning applications will need to be assessed by the Highways Authority to ensure highway safety. | No change required. |
| The footpaths should be wide - not narrow. | Infrastructure | Noted. All footpaths would need to be designed and constructed to meet the requirements of the Highway Authority. | No change required. |
| The streets should be surfaced with good quality sound absorbing tarmac. | Infrastructure | Noted. The footpaths and road surfaces will need to be built in accordance with the Highways Authority's requirements. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|---------------------|
| <p>I would like to see a Wrestling Club set up there please.</p> <p>We should have an international world class Wrestling Gym and Performance Facility there so we can invite the Americans from the WWE and they can do workshops for the local children.</p> <p>It would fit in well with the Roman roots of the town - the Rugby club at Kingsholm used to be the training centre for the Roman centurions I believe.</p> <p>The local children need to have a world class sporting facility that is unique in the country right on their doorsteps.</p> <p>It's about time they were looked after and cared for there.</p> | Community | Noted. The council would encourage you to pursue this idea within the community. | No change required. |
| I would like to see window boxes so people can grow flowers if they want to. | Homes | Page 38, 5.3.10 states "For upper floors balconies or terraces should be provided." | No change required |
| I would like to see really nice planting. | Environmental quality | Noted. High quality landscaping is a planning policy requirement and identified throughout the SPD. | No change required. |
| I would like to see areas dedicated to meadow. | Environmental quality | Noted. High quality landscaping is a planning policy requirement and identified throughout the SPD. | No change required. |
| I would like to see hundreds of trees planted. | Environmental quality | Noted. High quality landscaping is a planning policy requirement and identified throughout the SPD. | No change required. |
| I would like to see nice expensive trees like groves/avenues of Magnolia. | Environmental quality | Noted. High quality landscaping is a planning policy requirement and identified throughout the SPD. | No change required. |
| I would like to see Cherry Tree blossom extensively. | Environmental quality | Noted. High quality landscaping is a planning policy requirement and identified throughout the SPD. | No change required. |
| The scent of the neighbourhood should be attended to - lots of jasmine, honeysuckle etc. | Environmental quality | Noted. High quality landscaping is a planning policy requirement and identified throughout the SPD. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|--|------------|--|---|
| <p>We note there are areas being identified for open space and biodiversity enhancement including new tree planting on Figure 4.2. This is encouraging especially as the government is proposing to make biodiversity enhancement mandatory for most new developments shortly. The guidance on green/open spaces for Matson (5.2.9 to 5.2.12) is welcomed but it would be helpful if the 'Building with Nature' accreditation scheme could be referenced somewhere as a good approach. Making reference to the Gloucestershire Local Nature Partnership website would also be helpful to developers and planning officers - www.gloucestershirenature.org.uk .</p> <p>Provision of open green space is part of the solution of being able to allow housing development because it would not generate sufficient recreational pressure on the nearby Cotswold Commons and Beechwoods SAC. This issue is that most housing developments over more than a few houses will need to be subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process which should be mentioned in Sections 2.4 and 3.6. The interim guidance on this was sent in a letter from Natural England to all relevant Local Planning Authorities in August 2018 which I am sure the City Council is aware of. Along with other planning authorities the City Council should be funding visitor surveys this year which will be used to formulate a recreational strategy for protecting the Cotswold Beechwoods SAC from new residential developments.</p> <p>In paragraph 5.2.6 (and Fig 5.6) we recommend that providing 'good' lighting on routes should not compromise any identified use of these and adjacent area of open space by bats and other sensitive nocturnal wildlife. This can be done by avoiding illumination of hedges, trees, ponds and meadows etc. The use of highly directed lighting on to only the route surface, low level bollards or path inserted lights using LEDs should be considered. These could perhaps be wholly or partially powered by solar energy and be time controlled or triggered to only operate when low light conditions occur.</p> | Open Space | Noted. Building with Nature and Policy E8: Development affecting Cotswold Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation are policies in the Presubmission City Plan. | Add reference to Building with Nature accreditation in 'Green Spaces' section 5.2.9 to 12 and reference to Policy E8: Development affecting Cotswold Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation in chapter 3 Planning Policy Context |
| Play areas and parks need an update. At the moment they look tired and dated. | Open Space | Noted. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|---|
| It would be great to have better and more obvious links between Matson Library and Abbeydale. | Infrastructure | Noted. | No change required. |
| Greggs, village pubs and McDonalds! Get businesses on board = more employment. Swimming pool / affordable leisure centre. | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| Parking along the street, people don't use the off road parking. Don't think the funding will come through leading to unfinished regeneration | Infrastructure | Noted. On street parking and a move to off street parking is dealt with in the SPD | No change required. |
| Privately owned homes being rented out for more than affordable rent. Not helping the housing problem. | Homes | Noted. The council has adopted policies in the JCS with regard to housing mix and need. However it can not control people renting out their homes or the price they charge for that. The solution needs to be to ensure that the housing need is met for residents on each phase of development. | Include details of a Local Housing Needs Assessment for each phase. |
| Quality of residential buildings need to improve. Recent new builds have has issues with sewage. I have been told. Green space needs to be retained. Crime has reduced. | Homes | During any planning application process Severn Trent will be consulted. Planning permission will only be granted for a scheme that Severn Trent are satisfied with. | No change required. |
| Regeneration important to improve quality of house | Homes | Noted | No change required. |
| More affordable shops! | Shops and services | Noted. | No change required. |
| Traffic by Winnycroft development will be a problem. Good quality buildings should be retained. | Infrastructure | Noted. | No change required. |
| Don't want rehab. Problems with people taking drugs and leaving needles in parks. Surveillance in parks is needed and a rehab will de-value peoples homes. | Security and crime | Noted. The SPD sets out a number of good urban design principles to reduce crime and the fear of crime in any new development. Any planning applications will have to accord with the SPD Designing Safer Places. | Make reference to Designing Safer Places guidance in SPD. |
| Better facilities (wardens) for older people with disabilities. Larger communities need more facilities. | Community | Noted. A community facilities strategy is required to assess that the right facilities that are needed | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|--|---------------------------------|
| | | by the community are provided in suitable locations. Planning applications will need to accord with the JCS and CP, both of which have policies to protect community facilities. This is outlined in 3.5 Community Facilities of the SPD. | |
| Innovation around bins and recycling | Infrastructure | Noted. Covered by policy A1 of CP | No change required. |
| Design of houses and open spaces designed for future needs | Homes | Page 39, Design for Change, 5.3.16 outlines that new development needs to be flexible enough to respond to future changes in use, lifestyle, and demography. This means designing for energy and resource efficiency, creating flexibility in the use of property, public spaces and service infrastructure (including car parking and refuse bin storage), and introducing new approaches to the use of transportation, traffic management and parking. | No change required |
| Cycle lanes and open up parks to cycles. Currently a sign saying "no cycles" useless for kids. Not used by kids. Bike Park! | Infrastructure | Noted. | No change required. |
| Parking - on street- not enough parking. Pot holes, curbs dropping in. Causing problems between residents. 10 Beacon Rd | Parking | Noted. Parking dealt with in SPD. | No change required. |
| Structural issues on to housing and pavement in Beacon. Gloucester City Homes Property. | Homes | This comment will be passed on to GCH and the Highways authority who are responsible for the road and footpath. | No change required |
| Would like Beacon Rd regenerated, needs parking solution and road repairs. | Infrastructure | Noted. County council are responsible for the Highway. | Removal of Matson Avenue focus. |
| Parking on curb blocking access for disabled people. | Access | Parking enforcement is the | No change required |

| | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|--|
| | | responsibility of the county council. | |
| Regeneration should be for whole estates not just selected sites. | Community | Noted. | Removal of Matson Avenue focus. |
| Not sure whether or not we should do anything to our house. Winsley Rd is poorly maintained, not included. What about everything else? Refurbs? Plan? Redundant space - 12 - 12a Winsley access blocked up. Bollards and new buildings blocks access to bus stop. Just a fly tipping street now. Driving over green space on Painswick Rd to Garnalls Rd to park on tenancies. People drive over green space to Painswick Rd from Prinknash Rd to take out wooden posts with power tools. | Open Space | Noted. | Removal of Matson Avenue focus. |
| Garnalls Rd --> Painswick road hedge overgrown from 2 Garnalls Road. Security issue- poor lighting. Needs more lighting. GCH "can't afford it". Whose hedge is it? GCC or GCH? Can it be removed? Fly tipping. | Security and crime | Noted. Not an issue for the SPD. | No change required. |
| Make green spaces nicer and not build on them all. "I love the sheep". | Open Space | Noted. | SPD amended to provide greater clarity over the approach to open space. Removal of one move approach to allow consideration of other options that do not rely on the building of green spaces first. |
| Shops need to be totally refurbished, horrible aggressive begging | Security and crime | Noted. This is partly an issue that should be reported to the police. | No change required. |
| Parking is horrendous and buses are expensive. | Parking | Noted. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| I don't have a problem with flats. I would like to see more of a mix of homes including family homes. Allocation and mix of homes is a central issue (who is housed sensitive lettings). | Homes | Noted. | A rehousing strategy would be required to be submitted with any planning application. This strategy will provide the council and residents with details of who is effected and what is proposed to ensure that residents have their housing needs met. This is a requirement of SD11, SD12, of the JCS and CP policy A3 and reiterated in the SPD text. Expand 6.2 to refer to Local Needs Assessment for each phase to ensure the housing needs of residents are met. |
| We should be involved in design, important that young people are involved in design of the estate for the future. | Community | Whilst the council can encourage a resident led process it can not insist on it through the SPD. Any planning applicant will need to demonstrate how they have consulted with the community. | No change required. |
| Premier so good. Would like more offer. E.g. Garages, Tesco Express, Indian takeaways. Green spaces are good. Places to chill with your kids. Well designed, got to look nice. We should be involved in design, important that young people are involved in design of the estate for the future. Get rid of druggies outside the shops. | Shops and services | Noted. | No change required. |
| Matson has a significant number of mature and veteran Oak trees. This is a key landscape characteristic of Matson. They pre date the estate and are remnants from the old Matson / Selwyn House estate. No other area of Gloucester has so many mature/veteran oak trees. | Environmental quality | Noted. | Expand 2.2.2 to include "No other area of Gloucester has as many mature and veteran Oak trees." |
| Opportunities section for both SPDs should include tree planting | Environmental quality | Noted. | Expand 2.5 to include tree planting |
| I think they are contradictory messages around transport, I am not sure I understand there is a coherent approach. Talks about improving vehicular links into Matson from Winnycroft but the same time the | Parking | Noted. During the planning application stage parking will be looked at by the Highway Authority. | Amend 5.2.22 to remove numbers of parking spaces and make reference to the on street parking |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------|---|---|
| dangers of congestion. It states that it wants to “promote(s) pedestrianized movement” but at the same time 2 car parking spaces per units. How do you balance up increased quantum with this amount of car-parking! | | The SPD will not specify numbers of spaces per dwelling but will encourage new development to deal with the on street parking issues. | issues and pedestrian priority. |
| Matson, plenty of opportunities to get density up at Matson and link to improved offer that might draw Winnycroft residents in to Matson. Need to consider shared facilities to make sustainable, e.g. library GP/coffee shop, | Community | Noted. | Expand 2.1.6 to provide more detail about the Winnycroft permission, services and infrastructure. Add more detail in the phasing section of the SPD of the importance of the integration and connection to Winnycroft developments. |
| Winsley Road, where there are a number of walk up flats. Why these have not been considered | Homes | The SPD covers the whole area of Matson as outlined on Figure 2.4 on page 5 of the document. Any application in the area will need to accord with its principles and the policies of the JCS and CP. The council have not yet received any planning applications. This comment will be passed to GCH. Consideration will be given to removing the Framework Plans from the SPD. | Consider removing Framework Plans as it is accepted that applications could come in across the area and the SPD is applicable to the whole area. |
| 2.4.8 I think this overstates the case – there is plenty of potential for archaeological survival in this area, especially in the area around the moated site. Suggest this is rewritten – can provide text if need be. 2.4.9 Again – this is broadly correct – I would add that, around the scheduled monument, consultation with Historic England will also be required (impact on the setting of the SM). | Historic environment | Noted. | ANDREW PROVIDING AMENDED TEXT |
| Query how Painswick Road is a “positive urban design influence” | Miscellaneous | Noted. The Painswick Road provides connectivity and legibility. | No change required. |
| Negativity re: cul-de-sacs. They are popular with residents because they’re quiet, and it’s safer for children to play outside | Security and crime | Noted. Whilst there are benefits associated with living in a Cul-de-sac they do reduce connectivity and legibility. | No change required. |
| Lack of links between Painswick road and Matson avenue isn’t | Infrastructure | Noted. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|--|
| necessarily a bad thing- there are plenty of pedestrian links which are more sustainable | | | |
| There's a bias against passive use of POS | Open Space | Noted. | Add reference to passive open space to 2.2.2 |
| The entire document is very centred on Matson Avenue, and doesn't engage as much with other areas where there are properties in poor condition, and which have opportunities to increase density- i.e. Winsley Rd, Caledonian rd. | Homes | Noted. | Consider removing Framework Plans as it is accepted that applications could come in across the area and the SPD is applicable to the whole area. |
| No consideration of the needs of the existing community re: tenure | Homes | Noted. | Add more detail to chapter 6. Delivery on the need to protect social tenure |
| There's no aspiration to make the process resident led | Community | Whilst the council can encourage a resident led process it can not insist on it through the SPD. Any planning applicant will need to demonstrate how they have consulted with the community. | No change required. |
| Pg 19- need to consider the needs of older/disabled people in higher-density blocks, including accessibility i.e. installing lifts | Access | CP policy C1 - Active design and accessibility will also be consider during any future planning application stage. | Ensure reference to CP policy C1 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context and section 5.3 Building Design |
| There is no explicit commitment to tenure blind development | Homes | Noted. | Add reference to SD12 part 5 - tenure blind to section 3 Planning Policy Context |
| Pg 24-re: A4 planning use- there is a desire in the community for a family-friendly pub since the Robinswood caught fire- could this feature the regeneration? | Community | The SPD is not proposing any specific uses. An assessment of community facilities and need will have to be undertaken to inform any planning applications. This is mentioned in chapter 6 Delivery. | No change required |
| Pg 27- east-west connectivity isn't a priority for residents as they have concerns about the highways impact this would have | Infrastructure | Noted. Improve connectivity improves opportunities for improve permeability, legibility and access. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| Pg 30- off street parking should be prioritised over on-street, which causes traffic problems | Parking | Noted. Any planning application will be assessed by the Highways Authority to ensure sufficient parking and highway safety. On street parking is identified as issue in the SPD. On street can be effective if designed as part of a scheme from the outset. The on-street parking in Matson was not planned for or designed into the layout. | No change required. |
| Pg 31- curving streets compromises lines of sites to front doors, and therefore security | Security and crime | Noted. This refers to gentle curves for car users rather than strong curves or bends that compromise pedestrian safety. | No change required. |
| Pg 32- what does "improve lighting" mean? | Security and crime | Noted. | Expand 5.2.8 to provide details improved lighting. |
| Cycle routes would be safer on road rather than on the pavement- they should be separate from pedestrians | Infrastructure | Noted. | No change required. |
| Pg 34- Instead of walls to minimise visual impact, consider planting which is more sustainable and more attractive | Environmental quality | Noted. 5.2.15 covers this point. | No change required. |
| Consider secure basement parking for flats | Parking | Noted. | No change required. |
| Pg 36- bin stores need to be flexible to accommodate changing waste regimes | Infrastructure | Noted. | No change required. |
| Pg 38- there is considerable demand for houses which don't have gardens | Homes | Noted. Gardens provide opportunities for green infrastructure, biodiversity, and can positively contribute to health and wellbeing. Will expand to refer to variety of garden sizes to meet a variety of needs. | Expand 5.3.7 to refer to a variety of garden sizes for a variety of needs. |
| 1.1.2 "Whilst all of GCH properties meet decent homes standards" - not sure this is accurate. Blocks of flats in Quenneys Close | Homes | Noted. This will be checked with GCH. | Check with GCH before republishing. |

| | | | |
|---|-----------|---|---|
| 1.1.2 "The estate is primarily social rented tenure." - Is this accurate | Homes | Noted. This is not accurate. GCH will be asked for a breakdown of tenure for their properties. | Amend once details available from GCH. |
| 1.2.1 suggests that there is not already a sense of pride amongst people who live in Matson, which is untrue. There are high levels of pride in the community, the concern with physical regeneration is that communities will be broken up and this will be lost. Thought should be given about how the community infrastructure can be maintained during and after physical regeneration. Also, these reputational issues were dealt with in the community's economic development plan, The Power of Three, which is about to be refreshed. The SPD should have regard to this. | Community | Noted. | Includes reference to the Power of Three Community Economic Development Strategy. |
| 1.2.2 - "Ideally" - Suggests that these aims are merely an ideal and not hard and fast principles | Community | Noted | Remove 'ideally' para 1.2.2 |
| 1.2.2 - "An overall increase in housing density..." Which should include a more efficient use of space by building above 2 or 3 storeys | Homes | Noted. 5.3.2 states that "New development should make efficient use of land to maximise the number of new homes..." This does not restrict the use of flats or higher density. | No change required. |
| 1.2.2 - "aim to deliver" - Again, a vague commitment with no certainty around additionality | Community | Noted. | Remove 'aim to deliver' |
| 1.2.2 - "Where the loss of an existing home is involved, no one will be expected to move twice..." There needs to be some thought around this. Whilst for some residents, the idea of only 1 move as opposed to 2 will be attractive, for others, 2 moves may not be inappropriate. We would also be concerned that an emphasis on 1 move makes it easier to break up communities as residents are moved out of the area where | Homes | Noted. This will be removed to allow more flexibility. It is acknowledge that some people may not want to stay in the area or may be happy to move twice if it enables them to stay in the area in a better home. | Remove reference to the move once policy. |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--|---|
| they've always lived. | | This approach is restrictive to phasing and development options. | |
| 1.2.3 - "broadening the mix of housing to include a range of tenures" - There is already a mix of tenures- this seems to suggest that there isn't. Whilst private housing will need to be a part of regeneration, this to us suggests a move away from building additional social and affordable properties. | Homes | Noted. This will be rephrased or removed as it is not the council's intention to reduce the amount of social rent. | Rephrase or remove 1.2.3 |
| 2.1.1 - "However it is important that the SPD looks beyond the estate itself as connections between with the wider are in terms of walking route, green links..." - This is good- need to consider links especially with the new Winnycroft development | Infrastructure | Noted. | No change required. |
| 2.1.6 - "There is significant new housing development coming forward adjacent to the estate at Winnycroft...This could provide around 700 new homes including affordable housing." - Untrue, at least in relation to "Big Winny" which has no affordable housing. Needs clarifying | Homes | Noted. | Remove sentence and expand 2.1.6 to provide more detail about the Winnycroft permission, services and infrastructure. |
| 2.2.2 - "The new development at Winnycroft Lane will add further community facilities to the area..." Only if there are appropriate connections to the existing facilities on the estate. | Community | Noted. | Expand paragraph 2.1.6 to include greater detail about the planning permission at Winnycroft and the proposed services, facilities and integration. |
| 2.2.3 - "Several open spaces lack definition and purpose." - Open spaces don't need to have a defined purpose- sometimes residents like a space just because it provides a nice view. Passive open spaces are just as important as active open spaces, and the latter shouldn't take priority. | Open Space | Noted. | Add reference to passive open space to 2.2.2 |
| 2.3.2 - "...open space that lacks a clear use..." - bias against the passive use of open space | Open Space | Noted. | Add reference to passive open space to 2.2.2 |
| Figure 2.22: Existing semi-detached housing image is in face maisonettes in Winsley Road and not semi-detached houses. | Homes | Noted. | Substitute photograph in Figure 2.2 to show semi detached property. |

| | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|---|
| <p>2.4.2 "Whilst the sheep are viewed as part of the distinctive character of Matson, they can cause problems to the quality and usability of open space as droppings are problematic." - The sheep are almost universally popular with residents</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Re word 2.4.2 bullet 3 regarding sheep.</p> |
| <p>2.5.1 - "Focus new development on Matson Avenue..." - We appreciate the financial constraints which mean that this regeneration has to be focuses, but an overriding emphasis on Matson avenue is to the detriments of other areas, which would provide good opportunity for redevelopment but have been overlooked. For example, maisonettes in areas like Winsley Road are completely owned by GCH and are an inefficient use of space, as well as not being fit for purpose. Going from 2 to 3 storeys in this area would help towards increasing density and be a more efficient use of the space.</p> | <p>Homes</p> | <p>Noted. This will be removed as a principal and it specifies a single idea that goes beyond the scope of the SPD. It is only appropriate to suggest opportunities that have been formed from the analysis rather than from a developers preferred approach. It is acknowledged that there are areas beyond Matson Avenue that would benefit from regeneration.</p> | <p>Remove 2.5.1</p> |
| <p>5.3.2 - "Building Heights..." - Height should be a factor in increasing density and providing additionality</p> | <p>Homes</p> | <p>Noted. 5.3.2 states that "New development should make efficient use of land to maximise the number of new homes..." This does not restrict the use of flats or higher density.</p> | <p>No change required.</p> |
| <p>Figure 5.26 shows a red brick building. Red Brick is not a characteristic of Matson</p> | <p>Homes</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Remove image</p> |
| <p>5.3.13 - "Brick is the preferred principal material for elevations" - Not consistent with the character of Matson</p> | <p>Homes</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Remove reference to brick. Render is more locally distinctive.</p> |
| <p>Following our phone conversation regarding our concerns from a County Council level regarding the highway evidence which has not been provided, following Jamie's meeting with the consultants last years we have significant issue with the mention of an unjustified</p> | <p>Highways</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>All comments to be included</p> |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------|------------------------------------|
| <p>number of additional dwellings and other community uses in the Podsmead and Matson draft SPD's.</p> | | | |
| <p>Therefore regarding both the Podsmead and Matson final draft SPD's we recommend the removal of the quantum of additional dwellings stated in 1.2.3 of both the Podsmead and Matson SPDs.</p> | <p>Highways</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>All comments to be included</p> |
| <p>In the meeting last year it was mentioned the transport evidence that would be required to determine the impact of the proposed additional vehicle trips on the surrounding highway network, junction capacity analysis and mitigation required. In the absence of such evidence the highway impact of the proposed increase in housing can not be determined and whether any significant impact on existing surrounding junctions can be mitigated. This would also be the case for additional proposed use classes (shops, community facilities etc.) if significant enough in scale to result in trip attraction from areas beyond Podsmead and Matson.</p> | | | |
| <p>It is sought that the transport evidence previously sought with the consultant is provided before mention of any quantum of land uses is stated and would suggest the documents are otherwise headed as Design Guides only.</p> | | | |
| <p>Para 2.1.3 – replace 'good' with 'multiple' and insert 'regular' in front of bus services.</p> | | | |
| <p>Para 2.4 – remove 'technical' from title as this would require evidence basis.</p> | | | |
| <p>Para 2.4.1 – remove 'technical' and replace with 'brief'.</p> | | | |
| <p>Para 2.4.3 – remove 'the key' – evidence required to support statements.</p> | | | |
| <p>Bullet point 1 – replace 'good connections' with 'several connections'.</p> | | | |
| <p>Bullet point 2 – remove as no supporting evidence and conflicts.</p> | | | |
| <p>Bullet point 3 – insert 'generally' in front of good and remove 'within</p> | <p>Highways</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>All comments to be included</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| and’. | | | |
| Bullet point 5 – remove as no supporting evidence and conflicts. | | | |
| Bullet point 6 – remove without evidence of congestion – limit to facts such as some narrow streets with on-street parking. | | | |
| Bullet point 7 – remove ‘the design of this junction has not yet been finalised’ accesses associated with planning ref. 14/01063/OUT Land South of Winnycroft Farm has been granted planning and is currently undergoing technical approval checks. | | | |
| New bullet point – surrounding main highway network junctions have identified capacity issues. | | | |
| Para 2.5.1 – remove ‘key’. | | | |
| New bullet point – improve pedestrian and cycle linkages to [identity desired locations]. | | | |
| 3.2 New bullet point – Suitable highway mitigation that can be achieved. | | | |
| Para 3.2.5 | | | |
| Bullet point 2 – remove, as this risks promoting incremental development. | | | |
| Bullet point 3 – amend, as this makes reference to the quantum of housing previous mentioned in para 1.2.3 with no supporting highway evidence. | | | |
| Para 3.6.2 | | | |
| Bullet point 5 – include Travel Plans – move to bullet point 1 and change ‘proposed’ to ‘necessary’ mitigation. | | | |
| Para 3.6.3 The Transport Assessment would need to demonstrate that highway impact can be accommodated or adequately mitigated. | | | |
| Para 4.1.1 – remove ‘should’ include A1 shops and replace with ‘could’. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Figure 4.3 – no evidence submitted to support illustrated proposed routes for vehicle improvements, potential linkages and proposed gateway improvements based on survey numbers of vehicle demand and usage, and if appropriate to, on technical design compliance checks. | Highways | Noted. | All comments to be included |
| Para 4.3 – No evidence to demonstrate suggestions are possible or appropriate based on transport surveys or design compliance. Therefore should be removed without evidence. | | | |
| Para 4.3.2 | | | |
| Bullet point 2 – should not state, without evidence, that making a new vehicle link between Matson Avenue and Winnycroft Lane is suitable in terms of existing and proposed traffic movements. | | | |
| Bullet point 3 – should not state, without evidence, that making a new vehicle link between Painswick Road and Garnalls Road is suitable in terms of existing and proposed traffic movements. | | | |
| Bullet point 4 – no mention of improving pedestrian links across to facilities located on the far western side of Matson. | | | |
| 5.2.22 – Remove and replace with parking according to evidence of demand and availability of suitable provision. | | | |
| Council might like to see more density but we don't | Homes | The NPPF requires planning authorities to make the most efficient and effective use of land without causing harm. | No change required. |
| Shops are appreciated and valued, especially pharmacy, hairdressers and post office. All are well used. Owners are not investing in their shops though because they're waiting to hear timeframes. | Shops and services | Noted. | No change required. |
| Shops not accessible, delivery access is a challenge | Shops and services | Noted. | No change required. |
| No-one has heard of Beechwood National Nature reserve – where is it? There's a small area of outstanding natural beauty by Motocross, behind services. What is this called? | Environmental Quality | Noted. The Beechwoods is mainly located in the Cotswold but is a European Designated Site. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|--|---|
| Need to encourage residents there to use Matson/facilities, else will just have them/us. Rugby club is cliquey | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| Agree that; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads are narrow and poorly designed • Entrances to Robinswood Country Park and Matson Park are hidden | Highways | Noted | No change required. |
| Sheep are part and parcel of Matson. They're not an inconvenience. They're 'traffic calming' too | Community | Noted. | Re word 2.4.2 bullet 3 regarding sheep. |
| Moat School a barrier? Don't agree. Road next to it is fine. | Highways | Although no applications have been submitted for the development of the site, if in the future a site were to come forward, it is considered important to secure an east west connection across the site to improve permeability and stop people needing to travel around Juniper Av and Norbury Av to move across Matson. | No change required. |
| No 1 bus is good, No 13 bus is not so good. Saver cards don't work before 9am. | Access | Noted. Stagecoach are responsible for the bus services. | No change required. |
| entry points into Matson are initially unclear, but easy once you're used to it | Access | Noted. This is also identified by the urban design analysis. | No change required. |
| There's flooding in Matson Park, draining down slope into Underhill Rd and Matson Ave from Robinswood. Not draining. | Flooding | Noted. Severn Trent and where appropriate the Environment Agency would be consulted as part of any planning application process. | No change required. |
| Language not good either. Neighbourhood Centre = Shopping Centre, so why not say that? | Miscellaneous | Noted. The SPD is technical planning document. The correct description would be local centre. | Amend 'neighbourhood centre' to 'local centre'. |
| Bungalows are overshadowed by 3 floor flats. Siting is important. Maybe go for 3 storey town houses and 4 floor flats? | Homes | The amenity of neighbouring occupiers is protected from overshadowing, over bearing and lack of privacy by policies in the JCS and CP. Planning permission would | No change required. |

| | | | |
|--|------------|---|--|
| | | not normally be granted for developments that had poor relationship with adjacent properties. | |
| Like the lifetime homes approach eg homes planned with availability to fit a lift in the corner | Homes | Noted. | Add reference to accessibility to chapter 5.3 Building Design. |
| Bungalows in Redwell Rd are riddled with mould/damp. All bungalows are suffering from this. Damp proof course not working? Not got proper foundations? Springwater course? | Homes | Noted. This comment will be passed to GCH. | No change required. |
| Don't think should site pub under flats – who would want to live over drinking facilities? | Homes | Noted. The SPD does not suggests siting a pub under flats. | No change required. |
| It says 'no bikes' at Robinswood Hill and Matson Park. Kids would be upset by this – wouldn't be able to bring their bikes into green playing area | Open Space | Noted. | No changes required. |
| There's already vehicle access connecting Painswick RD, Garners Rd and Underhill Rd. | Access | Noted. | No change required. |
| The orange arrow opposite school to Painswick Rd is not appropriate | Access | Noted. This is an indicative plan showing the principle of improving permeability into Matson. All planning applications would be assessed by the Highway Authority for safety. | No change required. |
| The CAGs would like to stay together as we feel there is lots we can learn from each others' experiences. | Community | Noted. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|--------|---------------------|
| <p>Buildings are quite old in Matson and Podsmead and definitely need works doing. We have a big interest in our estates – we volunteer/work there, so have an interest in how any redevelopment or refurbishment impacts on our communities. We also want them to grow. We don't want to lose the sense of community either – which is why we got involved</p> | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| <p>There is an anti-social element and we are interested to see how a housing project might address this. Could be a game changer, so we want to be involved to ensure we raise the standards and reduce opportunities for antisocial behaviour</p> | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| <p>Estates are split – Oaks/Winnycroft, owners/renters. But we are all affected by issues such as loud music. We need to encourage pride in the area</p> | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| <p>Redevelopment is definitely a 'long game' but we want to see better and happier communities – with great housing, low cost bills, good insulation, addressing the 'bins' issue etc (currently have a problem with cardboard piled up – fire hazard – this is an issue for shop owners as well; people putting rubbish in commercial bins too)</p> | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| <p>We were impressed by the Horfield re-development, with service roads, bins at the back. This seemed to address most of our concerns</p> | Infrastructure | Noted. | No change required. |
| <p>The biggest issue is the negative perception people have of Podsmead and Matson. Even though statistics show that problems are not so high. We</p> | Community | Noted. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|------------|--------|---|
| hope regeneration will design this out, creating a more connected, vibrant and positive community. Changes to the structure and open spaces are needed to achieve this | | | |
| Should there be a greater emphasis on the social value of Matson and Podsmead in SPD? There is so much good stuff going on – many ‘little gems’ within both communities that people may not know about | Community | Noted. | Expand 6.2 to include community strategy and details of what this should contain. Be more positive in the SPD where appropriate. |
| There needs to be more housing – and this can be done well or very badly. The SPD talks about ‘greater density’, but we don’t want a ‘shoe horned’ look. We also need a variety of garden sizes to suit what people want. | Homes | Noted. | Expand 5.3.7 to refer to a variety of garden sizes for a variety of needs. |
| Open space is important - to grow food, exercise etc – good for people’s mental health. | Open Space | Noted. | SPD amended to provide greater clarity over the approach to open space. |
| We need communal space and own garden area around flats, giving functional outdoor space for above flats. Important because balconies are too small (and some not even balconies). How about verandas like in Australia? | Open Space | Noted. | Expand page 28, 5.3.1 to refer to functional and useable balconies. |
| Bike storage is also important in flats. Likewise for big prams. These are currently left in hallways | Homes | Noted. | Add information around flat storage for bikes and prams to chapter 5. |
| If you’re going to build 4 storey flats, given an aging population, then lifts are essential | Homes | Noted. | Add reference to accessibility to chapter 5.3 Building Design. |
| We worry about the segregation between Matson and Winnie. They don’t like the sheep for example. We need to encourage more integration. Local schools/bus stops/road joining (but not creating a rat run). | Community | Noted. | Expand 2.1.6 to provide more detail about the Winnycroft permission, services and infrastructure. Add more detail in the phasing section of the SPD of the importance of the integration and connection to Winnycroft developments. |

| | | | |
|--|-----------|---|---|
| Traffic calming through shared space can be quite good, especially from the viewpoint of people with disabilities | Highways | Noted. | No change required. |
| People prefer houses, not flats. If flats these should be limited to 3-4 storeys. They also need to design out noise, keep warmth in and be cheap to run | Homes | Noted. Some people prefer flats and some people do not. Flats will have to be part of any development proposals that come forward if the LPA is going to meet its requirements to making efficient use of land but also housing need. | No change required |
| Design should look to reduce ASB in flats, otherwise everyone gets involved. | Homes | Noted. All planning applications must be designed in accordance with the community safety policy in the CP, JCS, NPPF and the council's Designing Safer Places guidance. | Make reference to Designing Safer Places guidance in SPD. |
| Communal areas should look attractive rather than just functional – but will also need a better level of cleaning than at present, especially on ground floors | Homes | Noted. | Add that communal areas should be attractive and well maintained. |
| Flats should have plenty of internal storage too | Homes | Storage is an important part of well functioning home. Policy F6 of the CP requires developers to build to the Nationally Described Space Standards. The standards includes providing storage space. | Refer to CP policy F6 in Chapter 3 Planning Policy Context |
| Arts and culture also improve mental health. Its not all about sport. No place to do this at the moment. We do activities like pop up recording studio, which helps reduce ASB | Community | Noted. This will be dealt with as part of the community facilities need through the planning application process. | No change required. |
| We'd like our communities to be community-run, not done 'to' us | Community | Whilst the council can encourage a resident led process it can not insist on it through the SPD. Any planning applicant will need to demonstrate how they have consulted with the community. We would encourage residents to join the Community | No change required. |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | Action Group and make contact with tpas who are independent advisors for residents. | |
| Some of us would love a Costa (other feel this is too pricey), so there needs to be a range of activity/shopping options to meet community need | Shops and services | Noted. | No change required. |
| Working from homes covenants could be included on new homes by developers to reduce parking. Or 'no white vans/business vans' parking. Or designated parking | Parking | Noted. | No change required. |
| Biodiversity enhancement This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraphs 8, 72, 102, 118, 170, 171, 174 and 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit. | Environmental Quality | Noted. | Add biodiversity on residential units as part of section 5. |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <p>Landscape enhancement The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might make a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p> | Environmental Quality | Noted. | No change required. |
| <p>Para 2.5.1 could refer to "the quality and accessibility of open spaces" to ensure everyone can enjoy the health and wellbeing benefits</p> | Open Space | Noted. | Add "the quality and accessibility of open spaces to ensure everyone can enjoy the health and wellbeing benefits.." to 2.5.1 |
| <p>Para 3.4.3 - would benefit from a stronger statement that streets are safe for pedestrians and cyclists of all ages and abilities</p> | Highways | Noted. | Add to 3.4.3 |
| <p>Para 4.1.1 - to support healthy food choices, the mixed use centre</p> | Shops and | Noted. This is covered by the | No change required. |

| | | | |
|--|------------|---|---------------------|
| should be truly mixed-use and avoid over-proliferation of A5: hot food takeaways | services | Presubmission City Plan Hot Food takeaway policy. | |
| We support the protection and retention of key areas of good quality green space as it promotes active lifestyles and supports good health and wellbeing, as per Section 4.2. | Open Space | Noted. | No change required. |
| The SPD refers to the high levels of green open space in the area. However, further consideration should be given to ensuring all residents are able to access them and that what is there is of good quality | Open Space | Noted. | No change required. |
| We strongly support Section 4.3 as it refers to safe and accessible pedestrian and cycle routes both within Matson and beyond. These routes should be accessible to people of all ages and abilities. In particular, they should enable resident to use active travel options to schools, health facilities and the proposed mixed use centre. They should also be integrated with high quality green infrastructure to maximise mental and physical health benefits | Highways | Noted. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|--|
| <p>Para 5.2.2 - we support the aim that streets should be designed for people, not cars as this will realise a range of safety, physical activity and air quality benefits. However, this sections could be more strongly linked with integrated green infrastructure to maximise benefits</p> | <p>Access</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Expand 5.2.2 to include reference to GI and health and wellbeing benefits of designing routes for people first.</p> |
|--|---------------|---------------|--|

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------|---|
| <p>Para 5.2.14 - this touches on electric charging but there could be reference to the benefits of ensuring electric charging infrastructure to 'future proof' the SPD. This could be included in Para 5.3.16</p> | <p>Parking</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Add reference to electric charging to 5.3.16</p> |
| <p>Section 5.3 - this section could be strengthened with reference to internal space sizes, which have an indirect impact on health and wellbeing, e.g. kitchens that are large enough to store and prepare fresh food</p> | <p>Community</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Add to 5.3</p> |
| <p>A lot of the 'open space proposals' indicated in the document are just based on lazy assumptions and plonking things into convenient places to maximise space for building works.</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Amend Open Space Framework plan and provide clarity over the approach to open space.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| <p>There is very little suggestion made in the SPD of opportunities to create high-quality new open spaces within the redevelopment, to help mitigate against any losses. Why not?</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Amend Open Space Framework plan and provide clarity over the approach to open space.</p> |
| <p>Providing suitable mix of new housing in terms of both tenure and type is important element of the regeneration in light of both the need for housing and in particular Affordable Housing in the City. The under delivery of Affordable Housing in other areas of the City has an impact on both Matson and Podsmead, the provision of new high-quality Affordable Housing will mitigate this to some degree.</p> <p>The one move only approach must be supported by building appropriate new homes to ensure residents who wish to remain in their community can do so.</p> <p>The principle of integration into the wider area needs to reflect the development of the new housing off Winnycroft Lane in particular. The timing and nature of regeneration activities is critical to how these new communities relate to Matson and in particular the schools and neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>One principle that has been omitted is effective community engagement in the design of the regenerated areas and homes, although this is referred to within the section on delivery.</p> | <p>Homes</p> | <p>Noted. The council has adopted policies in the JCS with regard to housing mix and need.</p> | <p>Expand paragraph 2.1.6 to include greater detail about the planning permission at Winnycroft and the proposed services, facilities and integration.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| <p>The active and passive roles of open space is an important consideration. Open Space that creates exactly that i.e. “space” has an important role and its worth should not be underestimated, albeit the design of such passive space needs consideration</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Add reference to passive open space to 2.2.2</p> |
| <p>Land use and densities need to be used to support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The provision of more homes generally ii. An appropriate mix of homes, in particular Matson has suffered a loss of rented family housing as a result of Right to Buy Sales. This impacts on residents’ abilities to live in appropriate housing or remain on the estate as their family grows. <p>Amenity Space for flats- it is vital that balconies provide function outdoor space, Juliette balconies not achieving this objective</p> | <p>Homes</p> | <p>Noted. The council has adopted policies in the JCS with regard to housing mix and need.</p> | <p>Expand page 28, 5.3.1 to refer to functional and useable balconies.</p> |
| <p>Streets and routes should be future proofed with a focus on maximizing the use of sustainable transport, walking, cycling and public transport.</p> <p>The issue of future proofing is addressed and this is to be welcomed.</p> <p>Planning streets and routes has a vital role in maintaining and or improving air quality and whilst part of the City’s planning policy should be a consideration for the SPD. Creating attractive corridors should assist is ensuring shops, services, schools and public open space is all best utilised.</p> | <p>Access</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change required</p> |
| <p>The link between physical regeneration and the provision of opportunities for the current residents of Matson to benefit for social and economic regeneration is a fundamental. Without the latter increased levels of market housing will effectively gentrify the Estate, changing its demographics rather than assisting existing residents to benefit from the regeneration. Gentrification may have negative impacts on existing residents as local offers exclude them for a variety of reasons.</p> | <p>Phasing</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Expand 2.1.6 to provide more detail about the Winnycroft permission, services and infrastructure. Add more detail in the phasing section of the SPD of the importance of the integration and connection to Winnycroft developments.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|------------|--------|---|
| <p>Phasing</p> <p>Achieving more homes and ensuring a balanced community will provide benefits to Matson through increased use of services and amenities building on an already strong community with many assets and can help assist social and economic improvement. The integration of the new housing developments at Winnycroft need to be considered as a fundamental part of the regeneration project and therefore phasing of development to ensure this is achieved is critical</p> | | | |
| <p>My main concern/query is that the document states (p.25) that 2.17ha of POS would be lost (as indicated on the suggested framework plan). I cannot for the life of me see where the 2.17ha is being lost on the plan – that’s well over two football pitches worth of land – the only open space that looks like its disappearing entirely is Matson Library (0.4ha), which I presume would be the first place they would start to rebuild – but of course they could also re-provide some new POS as part of the new layout. So where is the 2.17ha being lost? The only other significant open space that doesn’t seem to still be shown on the framework plan is the Evan’s Walk open space and play area (also 0.4ha) – but I’m not sure why this has to disappear really? Its very close to (or inside) the scheduled monument boundary – would development actually be allowed there?</p> | Open Space | Noted. | Open space framework plan to be amended and clarity provided over approach to open space. |

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---------------|---|
| <p>I would also say that it should be a requirement that any trees lost will be replaced on a ratio of 2:1. Two new, small trees for each large tree is a small price to pay.</p> | <p>Environmental Quality</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Add tree planting to 2.5 Opportunities</p> |
| <p>The Redwell Rd play area is not indicated on any of the plans (red circle on plan below). There is also one further formal sports pitch (used for rugby) inside Matson Park (red rectangle), which is not indicated on the plan at Fig 2.23 (p14), as well as space for another in the park (not currently used).</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Add missing play area to Fig 2.23 Diagram of Public Open Spaces within study area and missing pitch.</p> |
| <p>Also p.14, I definitely wouldn't describe the MUGA as 'large' – it is about 24 x 12m, which is fairly small for a MUGA ('standard' size is usually around 36m long). p.24 Sud Brook mis-spelt on the plan.</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Remove 'large' from MUGA description page 14. Correct spelling of Sudbrook on page 24 figure 4.2</p> |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p>It is really not helpful that the Opportunities Diagram on p.16-17 is turned sideways to the other maps/plans in the document. This makes it very difficult to navigate and even more so when there are no labels on the plan at all – not even a street name.</p> | <p>Miscellaneous</p> | <p>Noted. This is to fit it in the document</p> | <p>Add some street names to plan.</p> |
| <p>I don't think that it is made clear enough in the document that new open spaces could be created as part of the redevelopment. Of course I understand that it is also vital that the new homes have private gardens, but there will definitely be scope to create functional new open space, the assumption just seems to be that open space will be lost and that's that. The tie-in with drainage SUDS etc could create opportunities for new areas of high quality green infrastructure. There also needs to be clear emphasis on the improvement of the overall quality of the spaces and not just improving the play facilities or biodiversity – for example, Matson Park has surfaced paths running through the park, which are generally well used for walking, running cycling etc. However, the condition of these paths is generally very poor due to age and the action of the permanent freshwater springs running off the hill (as is the visibility in and out of the park itself, which is mentioned in the document ref: poor entrance points). For me, a valuable result of losing some open space to the regeneration would be for the park infrastructure to be brought up to date – new path surfacing, opened up and safer entrances etc. The investment in Matson Park over recent years has been so minimal and yet it could be a stunning open space, safe and well-used. Some of the trees in the park are the best in Gloucester.</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change required.</p> |
| <p>Any amenity spaces retained or re-provided should be planted/enhanced with new trees and a diverse meadow mix as a minimum (i.e. reduce the large areas of gang-mown grass, other than for informal paths and kickabout spaces).</p> | <p>Environmental Quality</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No change required</p> |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|
| <p>The proposed play areas do give cause for concern – the one shown at Norbury Ave is very close (less than 100m) from the Evan’s Walk site – again, not sure what is happening at Evan’s Walk, but care would have to be taken if the [lay area were moved to Norbury – firstly there are mature oak trees and secondly, it would be closer to properties. I would have no problem in seeing ‘play features’ laid out in the other green spaces, perhaps some more natural play elements, but the formal play areas need to be carefully sited, as they can potentially create a lot of noise (happy, playing noise and also ASB noise at night unfortunately).</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Open space framework to be amended and clarity provided over approach to open spaces.</p> |
| <p>The other proposed LEAP is in the new (reduced size) open space next to the block that GCH had consent for building on the old caravan store area at St Peter’s Rd/Garnalls Rd (and taking a bit of the POS for development). Again, this is really quite close to the Redwell Play Area (there is more space at Redwell for noisy and expansive play). A smaller play feature might be possible at St Peter’s Rd but this was very close to the new flats and was going to be laid out with a BBQ and seating area, so hopefully would also have a community purpose. Again, I’m just concerned that the proposed LEAP locations are in places where we would normally rule out such a facility. A LEAP ideally needs to be 400m2 in size and with buffers of 20m to all nearest properties.</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted. This would be carefully considered during the planning application process.</p> | <p>Open space framework to be amended and clarity provided over approach to open spaces.</p> |
| <p>It would be great to see a ‘community space’ mentioned and not just a play space – where people of all ages can enjoy spending time together – play facilities always seem to be separated somehow from everything else – why not propose a community space that incorporates features for young, middle and elderly people in a high quality setting? For me the best place for this would be in the Rectory Rd rose garden open space i.e. proper outdoor gym equipment (not the cheap stuff that no-one uses), seating (some covered?), children’s play (activity trail?), BBQs etc, all designed into a high quality space to allow the community to gather, relax and exercise outdoors. The Rectory Rd space is probably the one that could be most improved and given a practical and useful function.</p> | <p>Open Space</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Add to opportunities the need for all ages and abilities to be able to enjoy open space.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|--|---|
| <p>There seems to be very little mention in the document of how the school fits into the community and the influence of the Redwell Centre surely these are both critical players in creating a cohesive and well-functioning community?</p> | Community | Noted. | Add reference to schools and existing facilities to 3.5 Community Facilities. |
| <p>please could mention be made in the document of that awful caravan store on Sneedham's Green? – I would think as a mitigation for the loss of some other small open spaces that this could be removed and returned to the green.</p> | Open Space | Noted. | Include in opportunities section 2.5 |
| <p>We feel that whilst the case for regeneration is strong , the SPD as it stands is insufficiently ambitious. The proposals are patchy, and focused too much on the Matson Avenue corridor, when there are significant other parts of the estate that are in urgent need of regeneration. There is a history of regeneration starting and one end of Matson Ave and stalling about halfway up and it would be difficult to justify such an approach this time .</p> | Miscellaneous | Noted. The SPD can only provide guidance on the existing policy framework. | Remove focus on Matson Avenue |
| <p>The SPD is an opportunity for the City Council to set out its ambition for Matson – these may be tempered in time by what is achievable within Government policy. When it was built the estate was a prestigious place to live and our community is rightly proud of its spirit and achievements. We are not, however, blind to the challenges or the need to bring the estate to being a healthy and happy place to live. This SPD must deliver on the hopes raised – it is more than just housing, the lives of the people of Matson are at stake.</p> | Community | Noted. | No change required. |

| | | | |
|--|-----------|--------|--|
| <p>Matson forms part of the Matson, Robinswood and White City ward of Gloucester City Council, and falls within the Gloucestershire County Council electoral division of Coney Hill and Matson.</p> <p>Matson is a post war development dating largely from the 1950s, and contains dwellings of a non-traditional build. Matson is an area of high deprivation- in terms of the multiple indices of deprivation, it ranks in the bottom quintile both nationally and locally, and sits in the top 2% most deprives wards in the UK.</p> | Community | Noted. | No change required. |
| <p>It is important the applications for parcels of regeneration are accompanied by local housing needs assessment, these should reflect the current circumstances and/or need of existing residents and how the application will ensure these are meet in line with the applicants rehousing strategy as agreed with the City Council and as a minimum their statutory responsibilities.</p> | Homes | Noted. | Expand page 40, chapter 6 to include reference to Local Housing Needs assessment as part of phasing rather than just rehousing strategy. |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------|---|
| <p>Include the Power of Three community economic development plan. The Power of Three was developed in consultation with ward citizens over nine months from 2015 into 2016 and has been a powerful tool for community organisations to work together, focus their narratives and report on parts of their work.</p> | <p>Economic development</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Include reference to the Power of Three in the SPD</p> |
| <p>I have struggled with the SPD documents as they are difficult to pin down. For example, I could not help but notice Fig, 2.14. Over a £1million spent on this process to state 'seem underused', against an image of a one car in a parking area. Under the Power of Three ideals, a local person could have been paid to lead a monitoring program of car parking areas, which would have funnelled more of the £1 million back into the community economic and produced more robust empirical data, than 'seems'.</p> | <p>Community</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>No changes required.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|
| <p>What must be said is that the SPD does seem to aim through key sites to have an influence on the areas reputation which aligns with the Power of Three plan. As GCH took part in the Power of Three process it is disappointing though that further concepts from community economic development are not embedded in the SPD such as the need to keep money rotating through the community rather than just leaking away. If no local people gain employment or skills through the regeneration the long term effects are minimal. Likewise, the health assessment undertaken by GCH identified lack of local employment opportunities within the ward but the SPD does not have anything to say about ensuring the regeneration process has a direct impact on secondary economic opportunities in terms of supporting contractors and servicing workers.</p> | <p>Economic development</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Include reference to the Power of Three in the SPD</p> |
| <p>The SPD seems to lack any grand ambition and plan for a long term outlook across the board. For instance the national if not international discussion is that the car industry and transport sectors will under go massive change with reduced private ownership of personal vehicles in the next two decades, meanwhile the SPD place heavy emphasis on parking of cars. Likewise, the employment sector gives every evidence of the importance of gig work and self-contracting, which in Abbeydale presents with many family homes having a work van parked outside, but there is no discussion in the SPD as to the likely shape of personal economic growth in Matson and its implications for needs such as workspaces, storage or van parking.</p> | <p>parking</p> | <p>Noted.</p> | <p>Add consideration to economic growth in the 'Future proofing' section 5.3.16</p> |
| <p>It is difficult to perceive from the SPD the wider argument for regeneration, the agenda seemingly is about key locations rather than tackling core issues such as the poor state of housing, its unsuitability for the lifestyles and climate of recent decades and certainly for those going forward. I cannot help but wonder if this stance has been driven by the positioning of GCH through its economic dominance as the power voice behind regeneration. When thinking about the SPD and the process that has lead to it my mind kept returning to a quote from Roads to nowhere: how infrastructure built on American inequality,</p> | <p>Community</p> | <p>Noted. The council would encourage you to pursue this idea within the community and GCH.</p> | <p>No change required.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Johnny Miller, Wed 21 Feb 2018 , The Guardian “I call it the falseness of community engagement,” says Denise Johnson, her voice rising with emotion at the frustration of decades of failed promises. “Back then, when they were building that highway, there was no mandated policy that you had to engage the community. Now, there is a mandated policy to engage the community, which is a good thing. But at the same time, it’s still just ... their agenda.” A more cohesive partner based sharing of power and leadership has been used successfully in other communities https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q9Ae_H9MjgM#action=share and may have more luck at building a grander ambitious agenda for regen that takes account of peoples priorities and stimulates discussion about the future as well as being better informed.</p> | | | |
|--|--|--|--|