

Comment

Consultee	Daryl Jordan (1334722)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	Daryl Jordan (1334722)
Comment ID	PS252
Response Date	25/02/23 12:29
Consultation Point	Policy RSA 13 Land north of A4 Bath Road, Woolhampton (Site Ref MID4) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.8
Bookmark	Jordan, Daryl

1. Do you consider the Local Plan Review is legally compliant?

Please see the guidance note for an explanation of what 'legally compliant' means

No

Please give reasons for your answer

No guidance is provided in the document.

2. Do you consider the Local Plan Review is sound?

Please see the guidance notes for an explanation of what 'soundness' means.

The soundness of the LPR should be assessed against the following criteria from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Please tick all that apply:

Positively Prepared: The plan provides a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed need and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development. . No

Justified: the plan is an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence. . No

Effective: the plan is deliverable over the plan period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground. . No

Consistent with national policy: the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies of the NPPF. . No

Please give reasons for your answer

Consideration has not been given to previous objections and been included regardless.

I wish to strongly object to the inclusion of the development of 16 dwellings on land at the junction between Bath Road and New Road Hill, Midgham, Berkshire in the West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039

I am staggered that once again I am writing to object to this application for development, having been rejected in May 2022 after a thorough discussion within the planning council. Having read the design statement, it is clear that nothing has changed and so therefore why is it even being attempted for another application within the local plan? I assume the council who rejected it and those members of the public who objected to the development last time would eventually give up. Well this is absolutely not the case and the reasons for rejection last time are just as relevant this time around as well as three additional points namely a serious road traffic accident at the proposed entrance in December 2022, significant ice across the road on the hill running alongside the development site in recent cold weather and the significantly sized development (1500 plus) along the A4 on the edge of Thatcham. This also doesn't reflect the biodiversity loss on the site...

The appeal document (statement of case), describes the proposed site as having a low probability of flooding. This may be so, but I do not believe consideration has been taken into how this development would affect the likelihood of flooding on other residents of the village. Currently, following a downpour, rain water runs down New Road Hill and across the A4 into already filled drains. This in turn causes flooding around the hall/children's park area to the south of the proposed development. During the past 12 months, the volume of water caused significant flooding as seen in the photos I have attached. *[document attached]* This is an annual occurrence. As I live *[personal information removed]* just north of the village hall, the thought of a large development and the subsequent increase of water that will inevitably run off to the existing properties is of great concern. I have included photographs to emphasise this concern.

One of the other points that appears not to have been given enough thought is the issue of increased traffic. The appeal document states the new development would help reduce vehicle speeds into the village; there is no evidence to suggest this would happen. However, there would certainly be an increase in the number of cars using the A4 in an already busy stretch of the road; a busy stretch that would have to cope with an increase of traffic having to access the development via the only entrance to it, on the A4. *[personal information removed]*, I see on a daily basis the volume of traffic and can foresee the dangers involved in adding the complication of an access point, with cars waiting to turn right and causing a build up of traffic turning left into the development. This is made all the more difficult with the entrance to the village hall opposite the junction. Currently, at peak times, it can take a wait of up to five minutes to turn right from the village hall, which will only be made more treacherous with an increase in vehicles using the junction. At the end of the design statement, the first reason given for choosing the location/site was that it provided the safest single point of access. This is simply ludicrous. Anyone who lives along this stretch of the A4 are well aware of how busy the road has become and to increase the number of cars entering and exiting this access point will only add to the perils of this stretch of road.

The appeal document lists the current infrastructure in the village of Woolhampton as satisfactory for the development of 16 new dwellings. I would strongly disagree. The infrastructure might be acceptable

for the village as it is currently, but considering there are many new dwellings built at the east end of the village, the facilities simply cannot support further development on top of that which is already taking place. For example, the primary school is at maximum capacity and would need significant investment and new buildings in order to offer places to a greater number of children. I wonder if West Berks council have considered an expensive extension to the local primary school into their decision on this application? With the inevitable extra children the development at the east end of the village will create, there simply are not the places locally for primary aged children. Also access to the primary school is an issue. The design statement states that the school is within walking distance; unfortunately, villagers cannot walk to the school because of the lack of a footpath up the hill. The appeal document continually states inaccuracies such as this one, which casts doubts on the credibility of the statement of case.

One of the key reasons why I object to this development is the inevitable change that it will make on the landscape character of the village, especially considering the substantial new development currently taking place at the east end of the village. The appeal document says that West Berkshire Council overstated this argument when refusing the original planning application. In my opinion, the landscape character of a village is at its very heart and essential to preserve the rural nature of Woolhampton for all the residents. In my view, little regard has been taken into considering conservation issues, including protected species, and in reading the statement of case it appears the appellant/developers have completed very little since the original application to address this fundamental issue. If planning was refused first time round due to, amongst other reasons, landscape character and conservation issues, if the points have not been addressed or anything changed, then surely the original decision must stand. The transition between countryside and built-up area has not been successfully secured and I believe the proposed dwellings will significantly alter the setting of Woolhampton in a negative way. Has the appeal document provided evidence that the development won't have a detrimental effect on wildlife? Have surveys for bats and dormice been completed? I see an application that has very little regard for any of these things that local villagers feel strongly about.

In conclusion, West Berkshire Council viewed that the proposed development is not on land identified as suitable for new residential development and the reasons above are just a few of the issues which mean that in my opinion, they were correct in their decision to originally refuse this planning application. I hope they stay strong and resolute when dealing with this unwanted application with the West Berkshire Local Plan 2022-2039.

3. Do you consider the Local Plan Review complies with the Duty to Co-operate?

Please see the guidance note for an explanation of what 'Duty to Cooperate' means.

No

Please give reasons for your answer

No guidance provided.

4. Proposed Changes

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Review legally compliant or sound, having regard to the tests you have identified above (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).

You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan Review legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

An accurate guidance document being provided with clear explanations would help considerably.

5. Independent Examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearing session(s)? No

6. Notification of Progress of the Local Plan Review

Do you wish to be notified of any of the following?

Please tick all that apply

The submission of the Local Plan Review for Independent Examination . Yes

The publication of the report of the Inspector appointed to carry out the examination . Yes

The adoption of the Local Plan Review . Yes

Attached file 1 [PS252 Daryl Jordon redacted.pdf](#)

PS252 Daryl Jordon attachment

