

Report to Standish Parish Council 10th June 2026

Item 7. NDP

The Regulation 14 consultation was completed on 12th August. We had 19 responses from local residents and have compiled these into a chart, with our comments, and these will form part of the Regulation 15 pack that goes forward to SDC for the next stage. We still have to go through the statutory and other organisation responses and do the same exercise. Since 12th August, the NDP has been effectively put on hold by the housing developers' planning appeal on PS19a (part), as the outcome of this will have an impact on The NDP content relating to PS19a and Stagholt Farm. Although at the end of the appeal inquiry, the inspector said we should have his decision in 6 weeks, the decision was subsequently called in by the Secretary of State, so we now do not know the timescale.

UPDATE: Having just this morning received the appeal decision on PS19a, I note paras 57 and 58 as follows:

57. Having regard to the eNDP draft land allocation PS19a interface reference. Stagholt Farm land is not proposed for housing and there are no assurances it <https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate> 6 Appeal Decision 6009483 would be developed during the plan period. Additionally, the eNDP site could be accessed from the south or by using Gloucestershire County Council (GCC) owned land otherwise forming part of the allocation.

58. Bringing those points together, I therefore accept the creation of an access to unallocated land at Stagholt Farm would not meet the test of necessity to make the appeal proposals acceptable.

Obviously, this is disappointing for us and we will need to seek advice from Stroud planners as to how to redraft the relevant sections of the NDP.

Item 8. M-U Path

Work is currently proceeding on the second phase.

Item 10. Horsemarling Lane

On 30th September, Richard and I attended a Teams meeting, organised by County Cllr John Patient, with John and Joe Woodward, who is leading on the scheme for Highways. It was a nearly-two-hour meeting and there is a transcript of most of the meeting which councillors can have access to if they would like it. My main takeaway from the meeting were as follows:

- There have obviously been a lot of delays on progressing this. As an example, once Joe took over in 2025, PJ Livesey sent him the 2017 plans which had been superseded. He did a lot of work on these before realising that there were 2023 plans.

- The plans now include a raised footpath with a 125mm kerb. This wasn't what the PC wanted as it limits the multi-user options, but the road safety audit has insisted on it.
- At national speed limit, and without street lighting, the proposed rumble strips are potentially dangerous at night. Hence, discussion of 20mph (see below).
- The bridle path probably won't be delivered. Joe commented that, in the current plans, there are stretches where riders are pushed back onto the road.
- There was some discussion about whether the lane could be widened using GCC farmland. I pointed out that this was a non-starter in any sort of reasonable timescale, given how long it had taken for us to negotiate similar for the multi-user path on the B4008. This was accepted.
- Highways will not accept a S106 offer from PJJ.
- Highways, and in particular the road safety audit, can insist on a 20mph speed limit as an essential part of the scheme (I think this is the good news!)
- Joe is now writing to PJJ to give them until the end of 2026 to submit their detailed plans. He will provide them with a checklist to ensure they know everything they have to comply with.
- If PJJ fail to respond within the timescale, the matter will be referred back to SDC planners to take enforcement action.

Richard may have other comments to make as he didn't talk as much as me and took notes.

SH

13/10/2026

Appendix

Not for the website

From District Councillor Mark Ryder: Informal Report on Community Governance Review

Mark asks that this informal note is not shared publicly. It is anticipated that the official report will be published imminently.

“There was around one hour of debate on the options for Great Oldbury and Standish. I focussed on a couple of arguments, firstly that it is the (future) residents that should have a say (so, this CGR is many years too early), and secondly that Standish has invested a great deal of time, money and effort in developing its neighbourhood development plan and consideration of all the factors relating to PS19a - something that was widely acknowledged around the table.

It was emphasised by SDC officers that the main consideration for a CGR is recognising the views of the residents impacted by any changes, effective governance, and identity.

This is why I don't think the recommendations will change - everyone agreed that the fact that there are no residents to ask on the land in question is fundamental.

There was also a query regarding the farm located next to the railway off the Gloucester Road. As the request from Great Oldbury was specifically the land within PS19a, it leaves some anomalies and the boundary could be better defined. That boundary definition won't change in this CGR, but there was a feeling that if those residents were asked their views on changes, they would likely strongly identify with Standish rather than Great Oldbury.

It is not absolutely necessary, but it would be helpful to encourage some Standish residents to submit views on the draft proposals when they come out.”