

PLANNING REF : 242067
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Paddock View
: 1 Nursery Close, Hurst, Berks
: RG100EQ
SUBMITTED BY : Mr Jim Fife
DATE SUBMITTED : 09/09/2024

COMMENTS:

My wife and I first moved to Hurst in 1997 and we object to this application 242067 for the following reasons:

1. This land is not a sustainable area for further development. Transport from the site to sites of employment, shops, doctors etc. necessitate the use of cars, as walking distances are unrealistic, cycling would be dangerous on these roads and there are no regular or viable buses or other public transport between the site and these destinations. The suggestion on the plans that even the village shop can be accessed on foot without crossing the main road A321 is untrue. The A321 has to be crossed twice to reach the shop.

2. It is a greenfield site and, given that Wokingham Borough has plenty of brownfield sites, it should not be built on until other brownfield sites have first been considered. Many species use this land as a nature corridor or call home. This is land of high, not low, ecologic interest.

3. Flooding in this part of Hurst is a major concern and was raised by the Inspector in the recent unsuccessful appeal to the previous application ref: APP/X0360/W/22/3309202 on the basis that "...flooding or drainage...were matters raised by many interested persons in written representations and also by many of those who spoke at the Inquiry". (Para 114).

4. Whilst flooding onsite can in principle be ameliorated, rainwater must go somewhere, and the FRA measures suggested take no account of the high-water level arriving from upstream which already threatens to flood the property at 11 Barber Close after prolonged rain.

5. The Draft Maintenance Strategy in FRA Section 7.0 gives maintenance requirements for the site but fails to mention the existing downstream ditch (Hatchgate Ditch) on the western plot boundary, from which water floods regularly in winter. Many properties surrounding the site will be threatened with flooding as a direct result of the proposed development and the consequent lack of drainage and soakaway which are currently present onsite. The proposal takes no account of elioration measures for existing householders who will suffer flooding as a direct and provable result of their proposed development.

In summary, this proposal should be rejected for the same reasons as other recent proposals on this land. An intensive Appeal procedure was launched for development of this land and the conclusion was reached that the land was unsuitable within the past two years. Allowing this development now would effectively void the process and outcome of that recent Appeal.