

PLANNING REF : 242067
PROPERTY ADDRESS : West Hope
: Wards Cross, Hurst, Berks
: RG10 0DS
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Geoffrey Manning
DATE SUBMITTED : 05/09/2024

COMMENTS:

Dear Sirs

This application is contrary in the extreme to the decision made by the inspector, David Wildsmith on 9th March 2023 to dismiss the appeal Ref. APP/X0360/W/22/3309202, the reasons running to 26 pages of sound reason as to the appeal failure.

I would recommend that this notice of failure be read by everyone concerned with this latest unwanted application.

The main reasons for failure were briefly the following, nothing has changed to warrant a reapplication for less houses on two disparate areas of the same field with a large void in the middle, which no doubt the appellants will at some stage try to infill via a retrospective application.

The proposed development is contrary to Policies CP9, CP11, MDDLPC02. To violate such policies would render the whole planning organisation and set policies redundant, thus the rule of law would fail and a free for all in any development ensue.

WBC have in the recent past delivered more houses than policy dictates, thus their land bank has been reduced, however Inspector Wildsmith concludes this excess delivery can off set the lower landbank to no disadvantage to future developments in the proper areas.

He further concludes the area is not sustainable due to the total lack of infrastructure in Hurst. There are still no doctors surgeries, dentists, vets, shops, but one small village store that would not

allow major weekly shopping, lack of an adequate bus service to anywhere useful, secondary schools that are too far for children to walk to and in the majority of cases no adequate footpaths or street lighting and so the list goes on.

There is no proposal for any of these deficient services to be provided by the developers.

Reference the lack of public transport it is blatantly apparent that all new households will require at least one motor vehicle and logic says it will be two / three per house. thus a couple of hundred or so more cars on the inadequate roads of this area.

Hurst is outside the Governments distance to walk guide lines to either larger centres of population and shops , railway stations and very important secondary schools.

The majority of roads do not benefit from continuous footpaths or street lighting, again a deterrent to walking anywhere. I put it to you, would you expect or think it reasonable for your child to walk each way on a daily basis to Wargrave Piggot school or The Holt . I think not and I imagine the child would have something to say about the situation as well. Thus filling this wet field up with house full of children is foolhardy in the extreme.

The practicalities of houses on this field which is well known to flood and be under water for several months of the year were well understood by Inspector Wildsmith and the discharging of surface water into inadequate ditches and onto other peoples property was not lost on him. That practice is unacceptable and my own garden suffers to a greater or lessor extent by the runoff now. There is no

proposal in the application to ameliorate this situation, it will only get worse once the field is covered in concrete and tarmac.

It should be noted that the four houses at the controversial Sawpit development were constructed without proper regard to surface water run off and have recently applied to allow access to the Hatch Gate drains. That was a master piece of planning wasn't it.

Just with reference to the lack of doctors surgeries, we are obliged to use the Twyford surgery which already have 22,000 patients on their register , do you think it reasonable to lumber them with another 400 - 500 more from this unwanted development. Are the developers going to provide any assistance for the surgery to be enlarged with a

suitable increase in staff- no, I thought not.

The field is a mix Grade 3a and 3b , currently used as grazing for horses, There are acknowledged problems with flooding which precludes production of some crops that will not tolerate such wet conditions and similar problems with some animals, notably sheep.

Thus there

could be limited cash crops which can be produced but in this era of food insecurity then to take a productive field out of use and build on it is foolhardy.

Thus end my main objections, but I still commend Inspector Wildsmith's reasoning for dismissing the previous appeal.

This appeal must also fail the test and and be dismissed.

G A Manning

Wesr Hope, Wards Cross, Hurst.