

PLANNING REF : 251486
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Barkham
:
: RG41
SUBMITTED BY : Mr . King
DATE SUBMITTED : 24/07/2025

COMMENTS:

I object to this application for the following reasons:

1) Significant harm resulting to the countryside as a consequence of proposed residential development on this site has been identified already by planning officers and inspectors alike on three separate occasions, as cited in the planning statement. The current proposals, at a density ratio of 22.86 dwellings per hectare, would cause greater harm than those applications would have (at 11.43 dph and 7.14 dph) and so, even in circumstance where paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is engaged, the weight attributed to this factor in the overall planning balance would be increased as a consequence.

2) The reasoning in and conclusion of the landscape and visual appraisal are not persuasive, particularly when set in context of the findings of three previous planning appeals in relation to the potential impact of development on landscape character in this location.

3)The argument put forward that this would be a valuable 'windfall' site is similarly unpersuasive, and has been made and dismissed twice before. 16 dwellings would have negligible impact on the borough's identified shortfall in housing delivery.

4) The B3349 Barkham Road is not, as suggested, an 'attractive' cycle route. Its poor condition, vehicle loading and frequent incidents of speeding dissuades opportunity for safe, active travel by this method, as is proven conclusively by the very low numbers of individuals who risk doing so.

5) The estimated vehicle movements to and from the site appear to have been underestimated for 16 dwellings and creating access to the highway network via the narrow road that is Edney's Hill, which is used by large agricultural vehicles, is misguided in the extreme.

6) The social, economic and environmental benefits attributed to the proposals have been overplayed. In reality, and in light of previous appeal findings, these proposals fail completely the environmental limb of the test of sustainable development. The social and economic benefits of 16 new households would not be significant. In conclusion, therefore, the proposals do not constitute sustainable development as defined in the NPPF and to which the tilted balance of its paragraph 11(d) refers.

Consequently, I urge that this application be refused.