

250735 Planning Committee Questions

1. How can the same development evaluated as unsustainable and unacceptable in application 242421 now become acceptable when the only change is:
 - a) A package of infrastructure improvements, wrongly described as significant, when in fact they offer so very little to compensate for the damage and harm that this development will cause.
 - b) A minimal decrease in housing numbers that increases the housing density from what was already previously recognised as too high.
2. Why have the reasons for the closure of School Road to through traffic not been taken into consideration when the reasons for the closure were:
 - a) To ease traffic through the conservation area of Arborfield Cross.
 - b) To stop traffic passing in front of The Coombes Primary school on Safety and Environmental grounds

This development, if approved, would fully eliminate the benefits dictated and reasons provided for the closure.

3. This proposed development has:
 - a) Very poor local amenities the nearest shop being >820 metres away
 - b) Is almost wholly dependent on the use of a car.
 - c) Is proposed in a part of the borough that is already recognised as having the worst public transport facilities.

Yet, the location is considered to be an ideal place to have so much affordable housing.

4. Further, despite the pressure, it is unacceptable to allow unsuitable and unsustainable development that:
 - a) Has never been in consideration for development in the Local Plan thoughts or discussions
 - b) Is in an area when there has already been so much housing and where the current LPU determines there will at least 5,000 more houses built.
5. Is it appropriate for a Case Officer to persuade the planning committee that refusal will result in a likely developer win at appeal ? The absence of a 5YLS does not mean every appeal is successful; it simply means the tilted balance is engaged, and inspectors form their own views on benefit vs harm. Officers and the Planning Committee should not make decisions based on anticipated appeal outcomes, but solely on the merits and disadvantages of the current proposals. Speculation about future appeals is not a material planning consideration and should not influence deliberations.

Even when you take account of the unacceptable position that the borough has created where it has approved the building of more houses than it needed and then failed to put in

place a local plan that could demonstrate a sufficient housing supply. It cannot be acceptable or sensible to allow detrimental and unsustainable housing in an area that has already, and will continue to support, a disproportionate amount of the Borough's housing requirements.