

PLANNING REF : 242067
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Woodsome
: Tape Lane, Hurst, Berkshire
: RG10 0DN
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Duncan Howe
DATE SUBMITTED : 15/09/2024

COMMENTS:

I must object to this development in the strongest possible terms and urge you to refuse this application. As a member of this village I absolutely do not believe that this application is in the best interest of the village.

I believe this will be a very detrimental development to the village, as we have insufficient facilities to support this number of new dwellings. The land on which this application is based is not suitable for development and floods every year. There are not enough school places, not enough public transport, not enough pavements, not enough streetlights and the increase in traffic will cause risk to all those walking their children to the local primary school each day. Not to mention the increase in delivery vans that will inevitably follow the cars.

Given the previous application was so resoundly refused, I don't see that any of the following reasons have been addressed in the new application:

The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area, in landscape and visual terms;

The effect on trees and hedgerows;

The effect on BMV agricultural land;

Whether the appeal site represents a sustainable location;

The effect of the proposed development in terms of highway safety; and

Whether the submitted planning obligations would satisfactorily address the impact of the proposed development.

Furthermore, the application previously submitted no dispute about the fact that this proposal is not in accordance with the development plan, taken as a whole. They acknowledged that by seeking to develop this countryside location, outside the Hurst settlement boundary, for a large-scale housing scheme, the proposal would be at odds with the spatial vision for the Borough, set out at Section 3 of the CS, and would clearly conflict with a number of adopted policies such as CS Policies CP9 and CP11, as well as MDDL Policy CC02. This application will have the same detrimental affect and must therefore be dismissed once again.

I have no choice but to trust in your good judgement and reject this endless stream of applications on a site that sits outside the village boundary and represents an unsustainable development site. Once again, I object to this application.

