

**APPENDIX E**

**West Berkshire Council response to the consultation on the proposed officer recommendation that the Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) should progress to referendum**

*Total responses received: 23*

<b>Respondent ref</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Council response</b>
SMNDP1	John Alcock	<p>I am not against the development on MOR006, the referred to site, but am against the proposal of the 110 homes to be considered for this site.</p> <p>It seems to me that the two professional reports on the development by Richard Humphreys QC and Kirkham Landscape Planning have been completely ignored by the Parish Council and the Steering Group.</p> <p>Also there appears to be no commitment regarding both the Doctors Surgery and School. Whatever their decision this will have a significant impact on MOR066</p> <p>I would support a development split between MOR005 and MOR006 to provide lesser density.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>As part of the process for making Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs), following the issuing of the examiner's report, a local planning authority must consider the examiner's report, decide which of the recommendations should be followed and publish its decision.</p> <p>The relevant legislation which governs the process for making NDPs (Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) (as amended) enables local planning authorities to propose to make a recommendation which differs from that recommended by the examiner as a result of new evidence.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes it clear that the three elements of sustainability (social, economic and environmental) should not be</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>considered in isolation but considered as a whole as they are mutually dependent.</p> <p>Whilst the Landscape Capacity Assessment recommended that two sites are considered further as potential housing sites, and only part of the allocated site, it is considered that there are other reasons why the allocated is suitable in other sustainability terms. These are that the site would include land for a new infant school and doctor's surgery, and that it was the preference of the local community that only one site is allocated within the village (see paragraph 102 of the examiner's report), and that the one site be the allocated site (see paragraphs 104-105 of the examiner's report).</p> <p>The examiner in his report stated that had it not been for the landscape issue, he would have recommended that the NDP progress to referendum, albeit with modifications.</p> <p>One of the modifications the examiner would have made is for the re-wording of NDP policy RS5 (Residential Site Allocation) for the</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>site to provide <u>up to</u> 110 dwellings rather than 110 dwellings.</p> <p>Regarding the doctors surgery and school, the examiner's report at paragraph 131 comments that the site promoter is "...contractually obliged by the option agreement that they have with the owner of The Site (the Englefield Estate) to provide gratis 1 hectare of land for the new school and surgery." It should also be noted that paragraph 122 of the examiner's report states "In response to a direct question from me the landowner and proposed developer of The Site have now confirmed that in principle a development of about 60 units would be viable even with the provision of affordable housing and land set aside for the school and surgery. Thus the allocation of The Site for 110 dwellings is not necessarily essential."</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP2	John Bagshaw	The NDP has been developed with a great deal of consultation within the parish, and reflects the views and preferences of the great majority	The comments are noted.

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>of residents. While the preferred option (if it existed) for most would probably be for no additional housing estates to be added to the current village, it is generally recognised that the national and local housing shortages must be addressed, and that Stratfield Mortimer must play its part in accommodating desperate needs. The allocation of up to 110 additional homes can be used to enhance the community and the NDP has been written to emphasise these opportunities and ensure that additional housing also brings improved amenities.</p> <p>The choice of the land behind St John's is clearly sensible when a map of the current village is studied. It will ensure new residents can access the principal amenities (shops, schools, play areas etc.) on foot, and therefore limits the impact of more vehicles. It will boost local shops and pubs, and strengthen the heart of the community, while leaving the countryside access via the footpaths and lanes largely unspoilt.</p> <p>It is to be hoped that the other bodies responsible for school and health care provision will respond well to the allocation of space for them within the NDP proposed development sites. This is a far sighted plan with a real vision of the future of the parish.</p>	<p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP3	Brian Baldwin	I favour Option 1.	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP4	Sadie Baldin	Support for proposed recommendation	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			should proceed to referendum.
SMNDP5	Jacqueline Bowyer	<i>Response the same as SMNDP1 above</i>	See response for SMNDP1 above
SMNDP6	Canal and Rivers Trust	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The Canal &amp; River Trust have considered the content of the document and have no comments to make in this case.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP7	Andrew Clark	<p>My objections to this proposal to proceed to Public referendum on the Mortimer NDP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Independent examiner recommended that the NDP should not proceed to referendum – his main concerns were that the process for site selection was flawed because there were no Landscape assessments undertaken to inform the decision on site selection – undertaking a retrospective Landscape survey does not address these fundamental concerns. He stated ...' I find that potential landscape and visual impacts have not been considered properly when <u>promoting</u> the site for development. Having regard to National policy, which gives importance to environmental as well as to economic and social considerations, <u>I am not satisfied that the making of the NDP is appropriate nor that it would as a whole contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. My recommendation must therefore be that the proposal to make the NDP be refused.</u></li> <li>2. The subsequent landscape Survey, commissioned by West Berkshire CC, supports the recommendations from the external examiner but both have been ignored by the NDP and West Berkshire in proceeding – what is the point of</li> </ol>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>As part of the process for making NDPs, following the issuing of the examiner's report, a local planning authority must consider the examiner's report, decide which of the recommendations should be followed and publish its decision.</p> <p>The relevant legislation which governs the process for making NDPs (Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) (as amended) enables local planning authorities to propose to make a recommendation which differs from that recommended by the examiner as a result of new evidence.</p> <p>The examiner's report concluded that the NDP should not proceed to referendum <i>based purely</i> on there</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>undertaking these independent reviews if our Local Authority are not going to use them to in its decision process – it's just a waste of public money and calls into question on what basis decisions are being made.</p> <p>3. The Landscape study <u>does not</u> include a new or more detailed local landscape character assessment of the whole of Stratfield Mortimer and its Landscape setting – why not!!! How can you make an informed decision on the impacts of the site on the village without this???</p> <p>4. The Landscape Capacity Assessment <u>does not</u> assess this particular development proposal and <u>does not</u> undertake detailed assessments as would be required for a Landscape and Visual impact Assessment in accordance with the Guidelines of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Edition 3 2013 – once again why not???? And how can you make an informed decision on the impacts of the site on the village without this???</p> <p>5. The site was selected prior to a Landscape assessment and identification of a potential access –the people of Mortimer were not/have not been presented with the full facts and implications....and are still not....</p> <p>6. The landscape assessment recommendations for 'the site' disregarded and have not been included in the NDP guidelines and recommendations for the site - the Landscape assessment recommends only partial development of the site and specific boundary treatments that have not been included.</p> <p>7. If the NDP proceeds in its current form, there are only three potential outcomes :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Over development of the site</b> – 110 houses+ school/doctors on reduced area</li> <li>b. <b>Significant landscape impact</b> identified by the Landscape report/</li> </ol>	<p>being no landscape evidence.</p> <p>The NPPF makes it clear that the three elements of sustainability (social, economic and environmental) should not be considered in isolation but considered as a whole as they are mutually dependent.</p> <p>Whilst the Landscape Capacity Assessment recommended that two sites are considered further as potential housing sites, and only part of the allocated site, it is considered that there are other reasons why the allocated is suitable in other sustainability terms. These are that the site would include land for a new infant school and doctor's surgery, and that it was the preference of the local community that only one site is allocated within the village (see paragraph 102 of the examiner's report), and that the one site be the allocated site (see paragraphs 104-105 of the examiner's report).</p> <p>With regard to the other issues raised in the response, it should be noted that the examiner recommended in his report that the NDP should not proceed to</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>Independent examiner if the whole site is allocated</p> <p>c. <b>Not achieving the 110 allocation</b> – no alternative sites have been included in the NDP</p> <p>Each of these are unsatisfactory for people of the village and the Environment – the only beneficiary are the Landowner and Developer</p> <p>8. The NDP village questionnaire was biased and only provide one option site to meet the 110 requirement – now this quota may not be met....so will other sites be identified – how?....because these options are not included in the NDP</p> <p>9. Why have West Berkshire commissioned and paid for an Independent Examiner and Landscape assessment and chosen to ignore them – the community of Mortimer deserve a clear explanation of the issue prior to calling any referendum.</p> <p>10. The NDP does not address the existing infrastructure issues on Sewage disposal and Water Pressure. These need to be addressed prior to increased development in the village</p> <p>11. The residents of Mortimer have been misled by representation of a new school and Doctors. There is no evidence or guarantee that either of these proposal will proceed to development – and if they do not what will happen to the allocated Land?</p> <p>12. Provision of Affordable housing has already been challenged by the developer on the access site – this will set a precedent for the larger site – more profit for the developer/ landowner....Less affordable housing for the people of Mortimer</p> <p>13. The existing school is currently 'visually exposed in the heart of the village' – in the new location it will be 'invisible' from the</p>	<p>referendum based purely on there being no landscape evidence. Had it not been for the landscape issues he would have recommended that the NDP progress to referendum, albeit with modifications.</p> <p>The examiner considered highway access within paragraphs 170 and 172 of his report.</p> <p>West Berkshire Council's Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) states that the delivery of the NDP will be monitored by the Council to ensure that the housing requirement is met. The Council reserves the right to identify any opportunities to address any shortfall through the DPD process if the NDP is not adopted within 2 years of the adoption of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The examiner's report at paragraph 131 comments that the site promoter is "...contractually obliged by the option agreement that they have with the owner of The Site (the Englefield Estate) to provide gratis 1 hectare of land for the new school and surgery."</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>Village .</p> <p>14. Some quotes from the West Berkshire commissioned Landscape Capacity Assessment:</p> <p><b>Impact on Key landscape characteristics</b>  Loss of open arable land which contributes to the wider landscape  Further urbanisation of wooded ridge planting to west  Encroachment into landscape corridor of the stream  Urbanisation of rural aspect of footpath along eastern edge of site</p> <p><b>Impact on key visual characteristics</b>  Loss of views to the wider countryside from the footpath  <u>Impact of extensive development on the skyline in views from the south</u>  Potential visual impacts on views from Drury Lane and wider landscape  Loss of views to wooded ridgeline</p> <p><b>Impact on key settlement characteristics</b>  Scale of development over the whole site would urbanise the settlement edge Expansion beyond plateau settlement pattern  <u>Scale of development over the whole site would be out of keeping with the settlement pattern and contrary to LCA guidance</u></p> <p><b>These are the findings of the West Berkshire Councils commissioned Landscape assessment –these issues have not been addressed in the NDP as the subsequent recommendations have not been included in the NDP document and, as such, it should not proceed to referendum.</b></p>	<p>NDP policy SDB1 (General Features) identifies that either a review or partial review of the allocation would be required if no progress has been made to secure the relocation of the infant school or doctor's surgery 5 years from the formal adoption date of the NDP. The examiner considered this policy within paragraph 196 of his report.</p> <p>Regarding sewage disposal and water pressure, NDP policy SDB1 requires that an integrated water supply and drainage strategy is provided in advance of development to ensure the provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure for water supply and wastewater, both on and off site. Development will have to be occupied in line with this strategy.</p> <p>Each planning application is considered on its own individual merit. Any planning application for the site would be required to deliver affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy policy CS6 (Provision of Affordable Housing). NDP policy HD1 emphasises that affordable housing will need to be delivered in accordance with the</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>policy requirements set out in West Berkshire's District Development Plan.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP8	Gillian Clark	<p>My objections to this proposal to proceed to Public referendum on the Mortimer NDP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Independent examiner recommended that it should not - what has changed? Have his concerns and recommendation been fully considered and implemented in the revised NDP? - No</li> <li>2. An independent Landscape assessment has subsequently undertaken on the sites - this information has not been used to inform the decision and site selection process.</li> <li>3. The landscape Survey supports the recommendations from the external examiner but both have been ignored by the NDP and West Berkshire in proceeding - why? Presumably because it has already been decided that this should proceed - so why proceed with a referendum? From this it would appear that the decision has already been made.....</li> <li>4. This site was selected prior to a Landscape assessment and identification of a potential access - why? Presumably because it has already been decided that this should proceed - again why bother with a Referendum</li> <li>5. The landscape assessment recommendations for 'the site' have not been included in the NDP guidelines and recommendations for the site.</li> <li><b>6. The Landscape assessment recommends only partial</b></li> </ol>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>As part of the process for making NDPs, following the issuing of the examiner's report, a local planning authority must consider the examiner's report, decide which of the recommendations should be followed and publish its decision.</p> <p>The relevant legislation which governs the process for making NDPs (Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) enables local planning authorities to propose to make a recommendation which differs from that recommended by the examiner as a result of new evidence.</p> <p>The examiner's report concluded that the NDP should not proceed to referendum based <i>purely</i> on there being no landscape evidence.</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p><b>development of the site if the NDP proceeds in its current form there are only three potential outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Over development of the site – 110 houses + school /doctors on reduced area</b></li> <li><b>b. Development of the site with significant landscape impact identified by the Landscape report/ Independent examiner</b></li> <li><b>c. Not achieving the 110 allocation - no alternative sites have been included in the NDP</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Each of these are unsatisfactory and the only beneficiaries are the Landowner and Developer</b></p> <p>7. The NDP village questionnaire was biased and only provide one option site to meet the 110 requirement – now this quota may not be met so will other sites be identified –these options are not included in the NDP</p> <p>8. Why have West Berkshire commissioned and paid for an Independent Examiner and Landscape assessment and chosen to ignore them – the community of Mortimer deserve a clear explanation of the issue prior to calling any referendum.</p> <p>9. The NDP does not address the current issues on Sewage disposal and Water Pressure. These need to be addressed prior to development of the site</p> <p>10. The residents of Mortimer have been misled by representation of a new school and Doctors. There is no evidence or guarantee that either of these proposal will proceed to development</p> <p>11. Boundary treatment identified in the Landscape assessment have not been included in the NDP</p> <p>In light of the facts above I believe that the NDP cannot/ should not proceed to referendum.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes it clear that the three elements of sustainability (social, economic and environmental) should not be considered in isolation but considered as a whole as they are mutually dependent.</p> <p>Whilst the Landscape Capacity Assessment recommended that two sites are considered further as potential housing sites, and only part of the allocated site, it is considered that there are other reasons why the allocated is suitable in other sustainability terms. These are that the site would include land for a new infant school and doctor's surgery, and that it was the preference of the local community that only one site is allocated within the village (see paragraph 102 of the examiner's report), and that the one site be the allocated site (see paragraphs 104-105 of the examiner's report).</p> <p>The Landscape Capacity Assessment recommendations are not included within the NDP, however the examiner's modifications to NDP policy SDB1 (General Features) include inclusion</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>of text that the site must provide up to 110 dwellings subject to the outcome of technical studies.</p> <p>With regard to the other issues raised in the response, it should be noted that the examiner recommended in his report that the NDP should not proceed to referendum based purely on there being no landscape evidence. Had it not been for the landscape issues he would have recommended that the NDP progress to referendum, albeit with modifications.</p> <p>West Berkshire Council's Housing Site Allocations DPD states that the delivery of the NDP will be monitored by the Council to ensure that the housing requirement is met. The Council reserves the right to identify any opportunities to address any shortfall through the DPD process if the NDP is not adopted within 2 years of the adoption of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>Regarding sewage disposal and water pressure, NDP policy SDB1 requires that an integrated water supply and drainage strategy is provided in advance of development</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>to ensure the provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure for water supply and wastewater, both on and off site. Development will have to be occupied in line with this strategy.</p> <p>The examiner's report at paragraph 131 comments that the site promoter is "...contractually obliged by the option agreement that they have with the owner of The Site (the Englefield Estate) to provide gratis 1 hectare of land for the new school and surgery."</p> <p>NDP policy SDB1 (General Features) identifies that either a review or partial review of the allocation would be required if no progress has been made to secure the relocation of the infant school or doctor's surgery 5 years from the formal adoption date of the NDP. The examiner considered this policy within paragraph 196 of his report.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP9	CLH Pipeline	Thank you for your email to CLH Pipeline System Ltd dated 3 March	The comments are noted.

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
	Ltd	2017 regarding the above. Please find attached a plan of our clients apparatus. We would ask that you contact us if any works are in the vicinity of the CLH-PS pipeline or alternatively go to <a href="http://www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk">www.linesearchbeforeudig.co.uk</a> our free online enquiry service.	The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.
SMNDP10	CPRE Berkshire	CPRE has supported the Mortimer Neighbourhood Plan site selection for some time and see it has limited landscape impact and is the best location for new housing the District requires. We therefore support the WBC proposal.	The comments are noted.  The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.
SMNDP11	Gladman	<p>This letter provides the response of Gladman Developments (hereafter referred to as “Gladman”) to the current consultation held by West Berkshire Council (WBC) on the proposed modifications to the Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Plan (SMNP) under paragraph 13 of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).</p> <p>Whilst WBC and the Parish Council do not agree with Examiner Humphreys’ recommendations, the statutory framework for examination provides the pathway by which the assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan can take place against the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Paragraph 10 (3)(a) of Schedule 4b makes clear that the only modifications that may be recommended are ‘modifications that the examiner considered need to be made to secure that the draft order meets the basic conditions mentioned in paragraph 8(2). As such, in order to allow for the flexibility required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (basic condition (a)) and to ensure the delivery of sustainable development (basic condition (d)) the Examiner</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>As part of the process for making NDPs, following the issuing of the examiner’s report, a local planning authority must consider the examiner’s report, decide which of the recommendations should be followed and publish its decision.</p> <p>The relevant legislation which governs the process for making NDPs (Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) (as amended) enables local planning authorities to propose to make a recommendation which differs from that recommended by the examiner as a result of new evidence.</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>was clearly entitled to recommend the proposed modifications to ensure that the SMNP is consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions.</p> <p><u>Policy RS5</u></p> <p>Gladman support the Examiner’s opinion that a full and formal landscape and visual impacts assessment was required for site MOR006 and indeed that such an assessment would inform the capacity of the site and its ability to assist in delivering the 110-dwelling requirement set out in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Whilst we support and acknowledge the move to amend the policy wording, as suggested by the Examiner, to read ‘up to 110 dwellings’, we contend that the LVIA commissioned, post Examiners Report, by West Berkshire Council on behalf of Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council, does not set out the number of dwellings that the above site could accommodate as recommended by Examiner Humphreys.</p> <p>Paragraph 13(1) of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) makes it clear that the local planning authority can only propose to make a decision which differs from that recommended by the Examiner if ‘the reason for the difference is (wholly or partly) as a result of new evidence or a new fact or a different view taken by the authority as to a particular fact’. Whilst new evidence has been provided and cited by West Berkshire Council, Gladman contend that said evidence provides insufficient detail to resolve the concerns raised by the Examiner.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, should the Councils proceed with a strategy which seeks to disregard the Examiner’s recommendations then we recommend that this matter should be referred back to Independent Examination otherwise it will likely be an area of</p>	<p>The NPPF makes it clear that the three elements of sustainability (social, economic and environmental) should not be considered in isolation but considered as a whole as they are mutually dependent.</p> <p>Whilst the Landscape Capacity Assessment does not set out the number of dwellings that could be provided, the examiner’s modifications to NDP policy SDB1 (General Features) include that the site must provide <u>up to 110 dwellings, subject to the outcome of technical studies</u>.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		contention for those promoting land interests within the neighbourhood area. In this regard, it is not permissible to appoint a different Examiner. Paragraphs 7 to 11 of schedule 4b identify a single examiner. In this instance, Examiner Humphreys was appointed the sole Examiner of the SMNP, and if the Council progress on the proposed modifications then this matter should be referred back to Examiner Humphreys for further consideration.	
SMNDP12	Highways England (Beata Ginn)	<p>Thank you for your e-mail dated 2 March inviting Highways England to comment on Neighbourhood Planning - Stratfield Mortimer and Burghfield</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, in this case the M4 motorway.</p> <p>We have reviewed consultation and have no comments.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP13	Highways England (Glen Strongitharm)	<i>Response the same as SMNDP12.</i>	See response to SMNDP12 above
SMNDP14	Historic England	Historic England considers that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the basic conditions and should, therefore, proceed to referendum.	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.
SMNDP15	Andy Hulley	<p>I am not in agreement with the proposed recommendation that the SM NDP should progress to referendum for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SM NDP have ignored the independent examiners findings and continue to push for a one site development.</li> <li>• Over embellishment of the proposal suggests to the community that they <u>will</u> be getting a new school &amp; surgery.</li> <li>• The environmental impact study does not support the NDP proposal.</li> </ul>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>As part of the process for making NDPs, following the issuing of the examiner's report, a local planning authority must consider the examiner's report, decide which of the recommendations should be followed and publish its decision.</p> <p>The relevant legislation which governs the process for making NDPs (Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) (as amended) enables local planning authorities to propose to make a recommendation which differs from that recommended by the examiner as a result of new evidence.</p> <p>The NPPF makes it clear that the three elements of sustainability (social, economic and environmental) should not be considered in isolation but considered as a whole as they are mutually dependent.</p> <p>Whilst the Landscape Capacity Assessment recommended that two sites are considered further as</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>potential housing sites, and only part of the allocated site, it is considered that there are other reasons why the allocated is suitable in other sustainability terms. These are that the site would include land for a new infant school and doctor's surgery, and that it was the preference of the local community that only one site is allocated within the village (see paragraph 102 of the examiner's report), and that the one site be the allocated site (see paragraphs 104-105 of the examiner's report).</p> <p>The examiner's report at paragraph 131 comments that the site promoter is <i>"...contractually obliged by the option agreement that they have with the owner of The Site (the Englefield Estate) to provide gratis 1 hectare of land for the new school and surgery."</i></p> <p>NDP policy SDB1 (General Features) identifies that either a review or partial review of the allocation would be required if no progress has been made to secure the relocation of the infant school or doctor's surgery 5 years from the formal adoption date of the NDP. The examiner considered this policy</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>within paragraph 196 of his report.</p> <p>The Landscape Capacity Assessment recommends that part of the allocated site is suitable for development. The examiner identified modifications that he would have made to policy SBD1 (General Features) .</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP16	Name withheld	<p>Thank you for allowing me to give my views on this proposal.</p> <p>I live on the West side of this site and will be impacted by any development.</p> <p>I am not against the development on MOR006, the referred to site, but am against the proposal of the 110 homes to be considered for this site.</p> <p>During the NDP consultation period I believe no one came to visit the total site to see what the landscape assessment might be. If one is to read the Inspector's (Richard Humphreys QC) report of 25th October 2016, he states the following:</p> <p><b>" clarification concerning residential site selection in the NDP</b></p> <p><i>68. This issue has caused me considerable concern, in particular in respect of the regard had to the landscape and visual impacts of the</i></p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>Detail on the site visits that was undertaken by the examiner is set out in his report in paragraphs 109-113.</p> <p>As part of the process for making NDPs, following the issuing of the examiner's report, a local planning authority must consider the examiner's report, decide which of the recommendations should be followed and publish its decision.</p> <p>The relevant legislation which governs the process for making NDPs (Schedule 4b of the Town and</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p><i>proposed development of the Site. By way of overview , it is clear to me in the light of all the evidence that no regard has been had by SMPC to 2 relevant landscape assessments when resolving that The Site be allocated 110 dwellings. Regard was only had to the Historic Landscape Characterisation Sensitivity Map. Moreover, although the Steering Group was advised by one of its members to take the advice of a landscape architect, it did not do so.”</i></p> <p>He also states later in his report:</p> <p><i>“108. Nevertheless, it is clear in my view that there has been a failure by the Parish Council / Steering Group when formulating, and consulting on, its proposals properly addressing the landscapes and visual impacts of the amount of development proposed for the Site and other potential sites.”</i></p> <p>Mr Humphreys has on many occasions in his report used the phrase “up to 110” rather than specifying a particular number. This seems to imply his disregard for the proposed amount.</p> <p>For some reason the 110 target for new homes on this site seems to be intractable as far as the SMPC/NDP is concerned. Again in the Report from Richard Humphreys QC it states:</p> <p><i>“98. On 16th January 2015 Bell Corwell planning consultants provided suggested densities for possible sites. I understand that this document was used at, or at any rate informed the proposals presented to, the public exhibition in February 2015. I note that this suggested that 55-60 dwellings on the Site on 3.7 ha would be appropriate, although the SMPC/the Steering Group still put forward The Site for 110 dwellings.”</i></p> <p>The further landscape assessment by Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd whose report dated 26 January 2017 stated under the following</p>	<p>Country Planning Act 1990) enables local planning authorities to propose to make a recommendation which differs from that recommended by the examiner as a result of new evidence.</p> <p>The NPPF makes it clear that the three elements of sustainability (social, economic and environmental) should not be considered in isolation but considered as a whole as they are mutually dependent.</p> <p>Whilst the Landscape Capacity Assessment recommended that two sites are considered further as potential housing sites, and only part of the allocated site, it is considered that there are other reasons why the allocated is suitable in other sustainability terms. These are that the site would include land for a new infant school and doctor’s surgery, and that it was the preference of the local community that only one site is allocated within the village (see paragraph 102 of the examiner’s report), and that the one site be the allocated site (see paragraphs 104-105 of the examiner’s report).</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>paragraphs:</p> <p><b>“Impact on key visual characteristics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Loss of views to the wider countryside from the footpath</i></li> <li>• <i>Impact of extensive development on the skyline in views from the South</i></li> <li>• <i>Potential Visual impact on views from Drury Lane and wider landscape</i></li> <li>• <i>Loss of views to wooded ridgeline</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Impact on key settlement characteristics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Scale of development over the whole site would urbanise the settlement edge</i></li> <li>• <i>Expansion beyond plateau settlement pattern</i></li> <li>• <i>Scale of development over the whole site would be out of keeping with the settlement pattern contrary to LCA guidance”</i></li> </ul> <p>I am sure by now you will have read both reports and are wondering why both the Parish Council and Steering Group are still adamant for proposing the Referendum for 110 dwellings on this site. WBC have paid for two professional reports yet they still the wish to go against the recommendations, obviously the professional viewpoint is not good enough, they know better.</p> <p>On 26th January 2017 there was a Public Exhibition hosted by T A Fisher, the preferred developer and The Englefield Estate, the land owner of both sites, with plans shown for the 110 dwellings to be built on and divided between both MOR005 and MOR006. This provided a lesser density of housing on MOR006 more in line with the professionals’ figures referred to earlier. This was turned down by both the SMPC and Steering Group. If this could be accepted I would be happy to support this unreservedly.</p>	<p>With regard to the other issues raised in the response, it should be noted that the examiner recommended in his report that the NDP should not proceed to referendum based purely on there being no landscape evidence. Had it not been for the landscape issues he would have recommended that the NDP progress to referendum, albeit with modifications.</p> <p>The examiner’s report at paragraph 131 comments that the site promoter is “...<i>contractually obliged by the option agreement that they have with the owner of The Site (the Englefield Estate) to provide gratis 1 hectare of land for the new school and surgery.</i>”</p> <p>NDP policy SDB1 (General Features) identifies that either a review or partial review of the allocation would be required if no progress has been made to secure the relocation of the infant school or doctor’s surgery 5 years from the formal adoption date of the NDP. The examiner considered this policy within paragraph 196 of his report.</p> <p>The Public Exhibition was in relation</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>Please also consider the proposed school on MOR006. No development should be agreed until there is a firm commitment that the school be built. There is little enough room for current pupils so it is incumbent on you to ensure that at least that part of the infrastructure is in place first.</p> <p>All the above points need very careful consideration from the Planning Committee, please do not “just nod it through”. Hopefully common sense will prevail and you will not support the building of 110 dwellings on MOR006 a totally unacceptable development on that particular site. If you were to see it I feel you would agree.</p>	<p>to a proposed planning application and not part of the NDP consultation.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP17	Natural England	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Rights of Way, Access land, Coastal access and National Trails – Berkshire Circular Routes</b></p> <p>Paragraph 75 of the NPPF highlights the important of public rights of way and access. Development should consider potential impacts on access land, common land, rights of way and coastal access routes in the vicinity of the development. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on the any nearby National Trails. The National Trails website <a href="http://www.nationaltrail.co.uk">www.nationaltrail.co.uk</a> provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer. Appropriate mitigation measures should be incorporated for any adverse impacts.</p> <p><b>Natural England does not consider that this Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Development Plan poses any likely risk or opportunity in relation to our statutory purpose, and so does not</b></p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p><b>wish to comment further on this consultation.</b></p> <p>The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document.</p> <p>If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p>	
SMNDP18	South Oxfordshire District Council	Unfortunately South Oxfordshire will not be making comments on the NDP. As Stratfield Mortimer is neither adjacent or close to SODC boundary.	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP19	Sport England	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Government planning policy, within the <b>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</b>, identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>The examiner recommended in his report that the NDP should not proceed to referendum and this was based purely on there being no landscape evidence. Had it not been for the landscape issues he would have recommended that the NDP progress to referendum, albeit with modifications.</p> <p>The representation does not raise</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>with community facilities is important.</p> <p>It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England’s statutory consultee role in <b>protecting playing fields</b> and the presumption against the loss of playing field land.</p> <p>Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Planning Policy Statement: ‘A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England’.  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy">http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy</a></p> <p>Sport England provides guidance on <b>developing planning policy</b> for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</a></p> <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of <b>assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities</b>. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their</p>	<p>any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>delivery.</p> <p>Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance">http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</a></p> <p>If <b>new or improved sports facilities</b> are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.  <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-costguidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-costguidance/</a></p> <p>Any <b>new housing</b> developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p> <p>In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links</p>	

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>below, consideration should also be given to how <b>any new development</b>, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <p>NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a></p> <p>PPG Health and wellbeing section: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</a></p> <p>Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a></p> <p><i>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)</i></p>	
SMNDP20	K. Tudgay	<p>As I have no computer like many people we don't get a chance, and by writing by hand as now to object to the referendum to go ahead.</p> <p>The so called new evidence in January 2017 produced by so called examiner his or hers viewing of the landscape must have been viewed</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>West Berkshire Council's adopted Core Strategy identifies Mortimer as a Rural Service Centre within the</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>through dark glasses and did not see the beauty of Stratfield proposed area. Why housing? This area of Berkshire is to crowded already. Just many people working London so second housing. The housing will not be for local persons such as "Shinfield." So please leave us some countryside.</p>	<p>settlement hierarchy. It is therefore expected to see some growth over the Core Strategy period of 2006-2016.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP21	Paul Whiting	<p>I am writing to raise my concerns on the process that is being followed on the proposed development of 110 houses in Mortimer. First I understand that the Independent Landscaping Report proposal is being ignored in that the recommendation is that the land is not suitable for 110 houses, but a reduced number. Second there seems to be vested interest between members of the NDP, developer, council and land owners, this must be wrong and I think there needs to be transparency on this. Third, the proposed plan shows the affordable housing all grouped together, as we know this has been proved to cause problems on other developments. Finally I have objected before on the grounds that the village infrastructure will not take a development of this size, but have not had any response.</p> <p>I would appreciate some form of response from yourselves on these points.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>As part of the process for making NDPs, following the issuing of the examiner's report, a local planning authority must consider the examiner's report, decide which of the recommendations should be followed and publish its decision.</p> <p>The relevant legislation which governs the process for making NDPs (Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) (as amended) enables local planning authorities to propose to make a recommendation which differs from that recommended by the examiner as a result of new evidence.</p> <p>The NPPF makes it clear that the three elements of sustainability (social, economic and</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>environmental) should not be considered in isolation but considered as a whole as they are mutually dependent.</p> <p>Whilst the Landscape Capacity Assessment recommended that two sites are considered further as potential housing sites, and only part of the allocated site, it is considered that there are other reasons why the allocated is suitable in other sustainability terms. These are that the site would include land for a new infant school and doctor's surgery, and that it was the preference of the local community that only one site is allocated within the village (see paragraph 102 of the examiner's report), and that the one site be the allocated site (see paragraphs 104-105 of the examiner's report).</p> <p>With regards to the other issues raised in the response, it should be noted that the examiner recommended in his report that the NDP should not proceed to referendum based purely on there being no landscape evidence. Had it not been for the landscape issues he would have recommended that the NDP progress to referendum,</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
			<p>albeit with modifications.</p> <p>Chapter 12 of the NDP has regard to infrastructure, and an objective of the NDP is to provide the infrastructure services and amenities required in a modern rural parish. Policies IS1-IS6 have regard to the provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, NDP policy SDB1 (General Features) requires the allocated sites to include an area for community facilities to be used for the relocation of the infant school and a new doctor's surgery.</p> <p>The representation does not raise any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>
SMNDP22	Judy Winter	<p>This is an ill thought out proposal which does not have the requisite existing infrastructure to support the new occupants of another 110 houses in our village.</p> <p>On top of which, The District Council have recently given planning permission for an extra 17 houses on the Fairwinds and Tower House sites (The Street), at an entrance to the proposed MOR 006 land. This will result in a total of 127 houses extra in the Mortimer Common village.</p> <p>I have set out in detail, my reasons on 3 separate sheets attached to</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>It should be noted that the examiner recommended in his report that the NDP should not proceed to referendum based purely on there being no landscape evidence. Had it not been for the landscape issues he would have recommended that the NDP progress to referendum, albeit with modifications.</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>this email, marked 1 to 3.</p> <p>It is all very well for Government Dept's to produce that x-no of new properties must be built in certain areas, but if those areas cannot physically cope with the extra housing, it is surely more sensible to go back to the Government Dept for an amendment, than to "plough-on" to referendum regardless.</p> <p><u>GUIDELINES FOR OPPOSING THE PLANNED NEW DEVELOPMENT TO W.BERKS COUNCIL</u></p> <p>This village does not have the infrastructure to support the occupants of another 110 houses.</p> <p><u>Schooling:</u> The infant's school is already at capacity. The proposed builders have allocated an area for a new, larger school to be built on the site. However West Berks council have stated quite clearly that they do not have the funds available to build this project.</p> <p><u>Doctor's Surgery:</u> The proposed Builders have also allocated an area for a new larger Surgery to be built on the site. However, the Doctors have made it clear that they have no intention of moving from their currently owned and purpose built site, and that the additional Number of patients would not be enough to warrant NHS payment of another Doctor. Therefore the extra patients would have to be absorbed into the already often overstretched system currently in place on Victoria Road. The Development Plans show SIGN'S of "children crossing" and "a white cross", suggesting that the need for larger Schooling and Medical facilities for the proposed increased population has been addressed, whereas in reality, only SPACE has been allocated. The buildings are NOT going to materialise, and, further, in 5 years' time, these VACANT areas will revert to more "housing plots".</p>	<p>The examiner's report at paragraphs 132, 133 and 135 consider the new school, and it is not stated that the Council do not have the funds available.</p> <p>The examiner's report makes no reference to the doctors of the existing GP surgery not wanting to relocate.</p> <p>NDP policy SDB1 requires that an integrated water supply and drainage strategy is provided in advance of development to ensure the provision of adequate and appropriate infrastructure for water supply and wastewater, both on and off site. Development will have to be occupied in line with this strategy.</p> <p>The examiner considered highway access within his report at paragraphs 170-172.</p> <p>West Berkshire Council's Housing Site Allocations DPD sets out parking standards which any future planning application would have to comply with.</p> <p>The representation does not raise</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p><u>Water:</u> Following the severe problems that the Fire Dept. had in dealing with a recent incident at Wokefield Park, Thames Valley Water Board has made it dear that they cannot currently provide the extra pressure required for the additional new houses</p> <p><u>Sewage:</u> We have also been made aware that the Sewage plant on the Grazeley Road, which currently serves our village, does not have the capacity to deal with the extra houses. Whilst these latter two services can presumably be increased, the money has to come from somewhere. W. Berks. Council is in dire straits financially (cutting back on Libraries etc). The proposed builders have not offered to foot the bills, and that leaves us – The Tax Payers!! Our latest tax-bill already shows a significant annual rise.</p> <p><u>Traffic:</u> The access point for the proposed development is onto the main road in the centre of the village, very close to the access point of the Infant's School. This area is already a frequent bottleneck at certain times of day, especially at the start and end of school, an activity in the Community Centre, or a service in the Church. This is a very busy road, being the main access to Reading and the M4 from Tadley and AWE at Aldermaston. The addition of another 200 + cars trying to gain access to the road, especially in the a.m. for work and school does not bode well for safety, and further congestion in a small rural village.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> The parking in the village is already inadequate. Traffic regularly overflows onto the side-roads, and the congestion down at the Station is appalling. The addition of the residents of another 110 houses, all getting involved in village activities will be an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p><u>NDP:</u> This self-appointed, un-elected committee are determined to get this development passed, and have been quite verbally threatening to</p>	<p>any issues which would prevent the Council from making a final recommendation that the NDP should proceed to referendum.</p>

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>the villagers in meetings to discuss the development topic, repeatedly saying that if we don't agree to their proposals, the alternative will be much worse for us all. The initial questionnaire sent out to all the residents was felt to be very biased and leading in its wording. They have been extremely low-key in advertising meetings. and deadlines, and many villagers were unaware of a lot of the process, and feel it has been a "done deal" from the beginning. Certain members of the Committee are known to have close allegiance with the Landowner's estate, and the Developers, and 1 or 2 have recently had to stand down due to vested interests. Sadly too late. Ironically none of the NDP members live near their chosen site!</p> <p><u>Independent Report:</u> W. Berks council called for this and a Q.C. spent several days in the village, looking at sites, speaking to NDP and villagers alike as he wished. The outcome was felt a very fair analysis which sensibly was NOT in favour of such a large development in the centre of a small village. He recommended instead, several smaller developments around the perimeters of the village, adding also that the current site would have a significantly negative impact on the many properties that currently abut it.</p> <p>Unsurprisingly, this wasn't what the NDP wanted to hear, and so, they have virtually ignored it. This report by a professional, experienced, and totally independent assessor has cost us, the taxpayers a sum in the region of £25,000.00!!</p> <p><u>The Site:</u> This is a large area of very natural beauty, with footpaths to allow villagers and visitors alike to enjoy the peace and far reaching views on their doorstep. The field "Malthouse Lane" has a long history of being farmed with Barley to supply the original Malthouse and Brewery within the village. Although no longer used for this purpose, the Farmer continues to grow Barley here, and the crop, through from sowing to harvesting, is a joy to behold. This farming and surrounding</p>	

Respondent ref	Respondent	Comments	Council response
		<p>habitat also attracts many species of wildlife, including Deer, Kites and Barn owls. If this is developed, all that will remain is a footpath past a very large housing estate!!</p> <p>Summary: This village, unlike surrounding sprawling areas such as Burghfield, Aldermaston, and Tadley, is a very small and compact community.</p> <p>The infrastructure really cannot support an additional 110 houses anywhere, but if Government states that that is what we have to have, then surely the Assessors advice of 4 or 5 smaller developments of approx., 20 houses apiece around the perimeter of the village is a much more sensible idea.</p>	
SMNDP23	Martin Winter	<p><i>Comments submitted on 17 March 2017:</i></p> <p>Comments the same as SMNDP23 above.</p> <p><i>Comments submitted on 7 March 2017:</i></p> <p>We refer to Bettina Kirkham's Report and note that that address of site MOR006 is shown incorrectly twice at the start of the report on pages one and two.</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>See response to SMNDP22.</p> <p>In relation to the comments submitted on 7 March, the address of the site that has been used is the address given to West Berkshire Council by the site promoter when the site was submitted as part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>