

# Exhibition 2015 Feedback

## Residential Site Options Analysis

88 comments were received. These were analysed into themes presented in the tables below. Following these tables is a list of all the comments received.

**Option 1 St John's Site (25)** – 21 responses positively supported this option, there were 2 objections and 2 other comments

**Option 2 Distributed Sites (21)** – There were two comments in favour of this option. Most of the comments were objections to specific sites and in particular the loss of woodlands primarily the Hammonds Heath site. Two responses though preferring this option proposed a single site solution. Two responses suggested that the Kiln Lane site should be considered.

**Option 3 a Mix of 1 and 2 (4)** – There were two outright objections to this option and one proposed configuration.

The responses were reviewed to identify whether there was any substantial consensus on sites not put forward in the exhibition. Three strands were

- 6 responses suggested a site close to the station should be considered [NOTE no land was put forward to WBC for development in this area]
- 6 responses suggested the Kiln Lane site should be considered; 2 as a distributed site and 4 as an alternative to the St Johns site [NOTE the Kiln Lane site had been considered by the NDP and rejected See site justification]
- 6 suggested that backfill/garden in fill should be considered. [NOTE this would not be in general conformance with WBC strategy]

Ref No = cross reference to feedback cards

Threads = colour highlights common threads

If no comment was made the card was omitted from the analysis hence missing ref numbers

30<sup>th</sup> March 2015

## Comments Catalogued into Principle Themes

### Option1

| Ref No | Response   | Thread         |
|--------|--|----------------|
| 8      | Combination seems to allow site to have more green space and better school & community facilities. Use of St John's site keeps village more compact.   | +ve<br>comment |
| 23     | Option1 keeps the central residential area in the heart of the village.  |                |
| 27     | Option reduces traffic taking children to school. It also minimises the impact on the village to one site. No need for surgery there. You could use this site without moving the schools.  |                |
| 36     | Option1 is the site that makes the most sense, less disruption to the village with potential to improve the infrastructure, new schools, medical facilities.   |                |
| 50     | Option 1 makes the best sense as it is better for the village than the others are ludicrous  |                |
| 51     | No1 is the most sensible as the others affect more people  |                |
| 53     | [Choice of site] depends on what else can be offered.<br>Option1 If this could sort out the vehicular problems of the junction between West End road and Victoria Road, create a piazza style village area between pub and church. Give a centre ID to village with A Statue of Lord Mortimer – (Joke) maybe with a row of small shops? Move surgery get rid of parking issues there to. Remove the congestion along The Street. If any or all, of this is a great opportunity for us. |                |
| 56     | If option 1 allows both schools to share facilities and enlarge as necessary, and in addition there could be space for a larger surgery. This seems to outweigh the objections of residents backing onto the field. Wide footpaths alongside the development would be desirable, as well as maintaining some green spaces.   |                |
| 73     | The best way of ensuring that issues such as the school are addressed.   |                |
| 77     | Large site behind St John's School for new school and St Mary's School.<br>New doctor's surgery with parking.<br>Public toilets there or middle, of the village  |                |
| 82     | Whilst dispersed sites are an attractive option the village desperately needs to relocate St Mary's to the centre of the village. The plans could include additional school places for growing village and help eliminate parking issue that arise from the current school being one end of the village.   |                |
| 103    | Option 1 centralises schools and provides larger surgery providing parking for all schools/surgery is added at a convenient place.   |                |
| 104    | I have chosen option1 because it contains provision for new school, enlarged school and surgery extension/new. So necessary.   |                |
| 105    | A single large site would allow the infrastructure of the village to be enhanced i.e. bigger infant school, satellite health centre, possibly also meeting community space.  |                |
| 106    | Large site has + points (school and surgery etc) and keeps core of village in one place. Other options to diversify and increase footprint of overall village.   |                |
| 108    | Other options [other than 1] will put more traffic on to half a dozen different minor roads. Main site 1 will have a much more focussed and less disruptive effect on the village during build and longer term.  |                |
| 117    | Current St John's school is too small and should be combined with St Mary's  |                |

|          |  |             |
|----------|--|-------------|
|          | to make a single school in the centre of the village.  |             |
| 125      | [option 1] so long as school and GP's surgery moved.<br>Option marked/B are green woodland and against cutting down trees. Why has area marked in red [Kiln Lane site] not in the plan? The topography of the land lends itself better than option1  |             |
| 127      | Option1 More central: rounds off the village; residents more likely to walk to shops etc.; less car use; more likely to have greater housing mix; opportunity for new school(s) and surgery; conservation benefit – better than smaller sites.   |             |
| 82       | Whilst dispersed sites are an attractive option the village desperately needs to relocate St Mary's to the centre of the village. The plans could include additional school places for growing village and help eliminate parking issue that arise from the current school being one end of the village. |             |
| No Cards | Prefer option1. Would like consideration to be made for an over 50's complex with facilities included i.e. gym/indoor pool/tennis court/ and a central area for functions/clubs etc.,  |             |
| 1        | Having 110 houses accessing onto The Street near the school would not be safe from a traffic perspective. Option 1 is the worst  | -ve comment |
| 52       | Option 1 outside village envelope makes 1 big mass between Summerlug, St John's and The Avenue   |             |
| 107      | Some central development would be useful to fund infrastructure development, but the risk is that it will open the floodgates to the site being fully developed. Could it be phased beyond 2016?   | Caveat      |
| 29       | What guarantees is there will be a new doctor's surgery within option 1?<br>Who agrees it?<br>Why don't we get new school/doctor's surgery with options " 2 & 3?   | Question    |

## Option 2

| Ref No | Response  | Thread                        |
|--------|---|-------------------------------|
| 3      | Single large site between West Road and Drury Lane (West End Site). This site is on relatively high ground and allows 2 access roads not near the school.   | +ve site comments<br>West End |
| 109    | The most appropriate site when considering access, safety to pedestrians and children and practical for actually building on is the field opposite the Turners.   |                               |
| 123    | Dispersed sites are essential to prevent worsening traffic congestion at centre of village and retain its unique rural feel for the village.  | +ve comment                   |
| 16     | Definitely not dispersed no economics of scale  | Loss of woodland              |
| 17     | Some of the dispersed sites would be on woodland. Road access to the dispersed sites would increase traffic on many narrow residential streets.   |                               |
| 23     | Options 2 & 3 loses woodland also King Street industrial units which provide employment and services to the village.  |                               |
| 72     | Option2 Please do not remove more woodland at rear of estate where fruit farm was.  |                               |
| 100    | I do not think the options overleaf * are suitable especially the wooded common area x  |                               |
| 102    | The loss of woodland areas would be a greater loss than the more open spaces both from a biodiversity and recreational point of view.   |                               |
| 112    | I would strongly object to any building on the woodland behind the Strawberry Fields estate. This is an important habitat for many species and is also important for leisure walking ad to maintain biodiversity.       |                               |
| 118    | Object to any site of existing trees (woodland) being used for housing when there are open fields available inn the surrounding area.   |                               |
| 126    | The wooded options in option 2 are a complete <b>NO</b> and should never have been considered.  |                               |
| 31     | The green in Stephens Firs is <b>NOT</b> suitable or appropriate – we would object very strongly to this ridiculous idea.   | -ve other sites               |
| 36     | How can the Spring lane site still be considered. This has been rejected by WBC   |                               |
| 45     | NDP policies are not to build on the Fairground, and Windmill common. Why then has the rejected Spring Lane site been increase? –(On the NDP exhibition). This would impact on Windmill common hugely                   |                               |
| 126    | [dispersed site 6] would block access to field behind the Horse and Groom and from pub – machinery too large.   |                               |
| 52     | Option 2 but if not possible. New surgery behind Strawberry Fields to accommodate that and village schools should be together. Option3 provided new surgery and school is supported.                                    | Ideas                         |
| 84     | New schools and surgery with ample parking at South side option1 with access on to Drury Lane. St John's school could be converted to day nursery and the Horse and Groom must remain as is.                            |                               |
| 98     | No opinion on the location of dispersed sites.  |                               |
| 123    | Please consider area marked 5 [North field Kiln Lane]overleaf which is closer to the train station and exit routes to reading/Basingstoke by road – with mini roundabout onto The Street safe access could be achieved. | North Filed Kiln Lane         |
| 126    | A [Kiln Lane site] should be in the options<br>B [dispersed site 6] would block access to field behind the Horse and Groom and from pub – machinery too large.  |                               |

## Option 3

| Ref No | Response  | Thread |
|--------|---|--------|
| 10     | Option 3 is the worst of both.  |        |
| 23     | Options 2 & 3 loses woodland also King Street industrial units which provide employment and services to the village.  |        |
| 36     | How can the Spring lane site still be considered. This has been rejected by WBC   |        |
| 65     | Option 1 land for junior school and surgery only sufficient open field/play/sports area and parking. ,A lesser amount of low cost housing and not use into flood/drainage area. i.e. only use 2/3 <sup>rd</sup> of proposed area. Leave buffer area behind St John's/Garth House. No need to demolish St John's school leave buffer area behind Turks lane and Stanmore Gardens.<br>[Selected option2} with West End site as second site See map. |        |

## Station

| Ref No | Response   | Thread |
|--------|--|--------|
| 26     | What about all the open space along the Grazely Road by the pump house and beyond the sewage works?  |        |
| 93     | What about down by the station? Or the plot nearer the station marked overleaf with *. I think a majority of traffic flows Eastwards i.e. station and M4 |        |
| 110    | Small development near station for commuters.  |        |
| 111    | Small development near station.  |        |
| 1105   | Move the project nearer station to alleviate the traffic and congestion in the centre of the village.  |        |
| 1108   | Need to move development towards the station to reduce traffic through the village.  |        |

## Backland

| Ref No | Response  | Thread |
|--------|---|--------|
| 2      | The “example NDP Policy” to discourage backland development is wrong. For Mortimer this is the best form of development for Mortimer. |        |
| 4      | Residents should be asked to suggest many small plots that add up to 110 target mainly “Backfill” with no large sites.                |        |
| 18     | My preferred option is “backfill”.  |        |
| 101    | Can we reduce the bulk numbers if we can find suitable infill sites for single plots etc?   |        |
| 110    | Back garden/infill sites cause least impact.  |        |
| 111    | Windfall sites to be included in dispersed sites.   |        |

## Kiln Lane

| Ref No | Response   | Thread      |
|--------|--|-------------|
| 74     | On the W Berks website the shortlisted sites included the land between The Avenue and Kiln Lane (MOR001). Why has this not been included?  | Total site  |
| 75     | Why is the shortlisted site identified by West Berkshire Council MOR001 between The Avenue and Kiln Lane not being considered. Is this related to the chairman of the NDP living adjacent to it? |             |
| 123    | Please consider area marked 5 overleaf which is closer to the train station and exit routes to Reading/Basingstoke by road – with mini roundabout onto The Street safe access could be achieved. |             |
| 126    | A [Kiln Lane site] should be in the options  |             |
| 88     | North part of MOR001 if 006 not adequate.  | North Field |
| 93     | What about down by the station? Or the plot nearer the station marked overleaf with *. I think a majority of traffic flows Eastwards i.e. station and M4   |             |

| Ref No | Response  |    |
|--------|---|----|
| 1      | Having 110 houses accessing onto The Street near the school would not be safe from a traffic perspective. Option 1 is the worst   | 1  |
| 2      | The “example NDP Policy” to discourage backland development is wrong. For Mortimer this is the best form of development for Mortimer.   | 2  |
| 3      | Single large site between West Road and Drury Lane (West End Site). This site is on relatively high ground and allows 2 access roads not near the school.   | 3  |
| 4      | Residents should be asked to suggest many small plots that add up to 110 target mainly “Backfill” with no large sites.  | 4  |
| 5      | It is not possible to comment on these proposals without giving indication of the proposed access roads.  | 5  |
| 7      | If Mortimer keeps building larger developments i.e. Strawberry Fields the village is becoming impersonal and much too large. The WORD IS VILLAGE NOT A NEW MINI-TOWN.   | 6  |
| 8      | Combination seems to allow site to have more green space and better school & community facilities. Use of St John’s site keeps village more compact.  | 7  |
| 10     | Option 3 is the worst of both.  | 8  |
| 11     | Extend St John’s looks at more outdoor space. Parking and Drop-off for St Mary’s, extend train station parking.   | 9  |
| 16     | Definitely not dispersed no economics of scale  | 10 |
| 17     | Some of the dispersed sites would be on woodland. Road access to the dispersed sites would increase traffic on many narrow residential streets.   | 11 |
| 18     | My preferred option is “backfill”. I do not want any of sites over leaf [dispersed]. Site 6 overleaf (Spring Lane] would create a rat run through Windmill Road so it is not safe for pedestrians as no pathways and for the drivers also the proposed area is all forest. It is most important to keep the forest. | 12 |
| 19     | On any building deeds it should state that boundary fences shall allow passage for wildlife. Eg hedgehog tunnels linking gardens. Schools and the doctor’s surgery should be built before any house can be occupied.  | 13 |
| 20     | This is the only sensible solution to a host of problems  | 14 |
| 23     | Options 2 & 3 loses woodland also King Street industrial units which provide employment and services to the village. Option1 keeps the central residential area in the heart of the village.  | 15 |
| 25     | School car parks should be for schools only as will be filled up by other users   | 16 |
| 26     | What about all the open space along the Grazely Road by the pump ,house and beyond the sewage works?  | 17 |
| 27     | Option reduces traffic taking children to school. It also minimises the impact on the village to one site. No need for surgery there. You could use this site without moving the schools.   | 18 |
| 28     | Opposition to Strawberry Fields yet now that the development is mature it is an established and welcome addition. Cost and upheaval of developing one site considerably less and provides central amenities esp. schools  | 19 |
| 29     | What guarantees is there will be a new doctor’s surgery within option 1? Who agrees it?<br>Why don’t we get new school/doctor’s surgery with options “ 2 & 3?   | 20 |
| 31     | The green in Stephens Firs is <u>NOT</u> suitable or appropriate – we would object very strongly to this ridiculous idea.   | 21 |
| 34     | Provided the housing has adequate parking form two or more cars on each property and that housing is reserved for village people. Not like Strawberry Fields.   | 22 |



|    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 35 | Must guarantee new school and new doctor's surgery.   | 23 |
| 36 | Option1 is the site thanks makes the most sense, less disruption to the village with potential to improve the infrastructure, new schools, medical facilities.<br>How can the Spring lane site still be considered. This has been rejected by WBC   | 24 |
| 37 | We need more houses like Glenapp and Budgens  | 25 |
| 39 | This would release St Mary's land which could then facilitate a rural business centre with the extra school buildings or a refurbishment. Not new build.  | 26 |
| 40 | All development to meet the standards of Strawberry Field which is excellent i.e. built walls instead of nasty wooden fences pocket park and landscape space =quality for our lovely village.   | 27 |
| 41 | Do not spoil brewery common fairground frontage by destroying all holly cover. Keep the character. Use top end field behind existing St John's school for new school and surgery.   | 28 |
| 43 | Seems to have less impact traffic etc in the village  | 29 |
| 45 | NDP policies are not to build on the Fairground, and Windmill common. Why then has the rejected Spring Lane site been increased? –(On the NDP exhibition). This would impact on Windmill common hugely  | 30 |
| 46 | Some of these sites are cracks  | 31 |
| 48 | Some 2 bed bungalows would suit an enormous site and release a lot of large houses.   | 32 |
| 50 | Option 1 makes the best sense as it is better for the village the others are ludicrous  | 33 |
| 51 | No1 is the most sensible as the others affect more people   | 34 |
| 52 | Option 1 outside village envelope makes 1 big mass between Summerlug, St John's and The Avenue<br>Where is vehicle access to option 1?<br>Option 2 but if not possible. New surgery behind Strawberry Fields to accommodate that and village schools should be together. Option 3 provided new surgery and school is supported.   | 35 |
| 53 | [Choice of site] depends on what else can be offered.<br>Option 1 If this could sort out the vehicular problems of the junction between West End road and Victoria Road, create a piazza style village area between pub and church. Give a centre ID to village with A Statue of Lord Mortimer – (Joke) maybe with row of small shops? Move surgery get rid of parking issues there to. Remove the congestion along The Street. If any or all, of this is a great opportunity for us. What about the village being its own developer? | 36 |
| 56 | If option 1 allows both schools to share facilities and enlarge as necessary, and in addition there could be space for a larger surgery. This seems to outweigh the objections of residents backing onto the field. Wide footpaths alongside the development would be desirable, as well as maintaining some green spaces.  | 37 |
| 59 | Social housing should be near the school and surgery.<br>Quality housing for downsizers should be as close to the village amenities as possible.  | 38 |
| 60 | The bottom of the field between the Avenue and ends of St John's and St Mary's road is steep and wonderful for play in the snow.  | 39 |
| 63 | New facilities on St John's site desperately needed but site developed in conjunction would create visual impression of urban sprawl. Also some sites should be left for the next imposition from above.  | 40 |
| 65 | Option 1 land for junior school and surgery only sufficient open field/play/sports area and parking. A lesser amount of low cost housing and not use into flood/drainage area. i.e. only use 2/3 <sup>rd</sup> of proposed area. Leave buffer area behind St John's/Garth House. No need to demolish St John's school leave buffer area   | 41 |

|          |  |    |
|----------|--|----|
|          | behind Turks lane and Stanmore Gardens.<br>[Selected option2]with West End site as second site] See map.   |    |
| 68       | Relocation St Mary's to option1 would presumably free up building space for homes in the current Sty Mary's site giving people there new homes. Benefits of access to the village and the station – the latter without adding too heavily to current station parking problems, while at the same time alleviating school pick-up problems. | 42 |
| 71       | Agree schools should be centralised. Houses better dispersed and mix of size. Has field over leaf been [Kiln Lane top field] been considered??   | 43 |
| 72       | Option2 Please do not remove more woodland at rear of estate where fruit farm was.   | 44 |
| 73       | The best way of ensuring that issues such as the school are addressed.   | 45 |
| 74       | On the W Berks website the shortlisted sites included the land between The Avenue and Kiln Lane (MOR001).Why has this not been included?   | 46 |
| 75       | Why is the shortlisted site identified by West Berkshire Council MOR001 between The Avenue and Kiln Lane not being considered. Is this related to the chairman of the DP living adjacent to it?  | 47 |
| 77       | Large site behind St John 's School for new school and St Mary's School.<br>New doctor's surgery with parking.<br>Public toilets there or middle, of the village   | 48 |
| 78       | Affordable housing will bring the usual 'benefits'. Police cars, unkempt gardens jealousies etc. etc. etc.   | 49 |
| 79       | Disappointed that agricultural land is being considered as potential sites.  | 50 |
| 80       | All sites with the keeping of the woodland on the Hammonds heath site.   | 51 |
| 81       | Option1 with<br>With the development of the site beside Summerlug- one large estate with access only via main road, not on to Drury Lane, and<br>Site opposite football pitched see over.  | 52 |
| 82       | Whilst dispersed sites are an attractive option the village desperately needs to relocate St Mary's to the centre of the village. The plans could include additional school places for growing village and help eliminate parking issue that arise from the current school being one end of the village.                                   | 53 |
| 84       | Houses to be dispersed on small sites.<br>New schools and surgery with ample parking at South side option1 with access on to Drury Lane. St John's school could be converted to day nursery and the Horse and Groom must remain as is.   | 54 |
| 85       | It would be shameful to build on the woodland dispersing a wide range of animals and birds. It bis a local amenity too.  | 55 |
| 88       | North part of MOR001 if 006 not adequate.  | 56 |
| 93       | What about down by the station? Or the plot nearer the station marked overleaf with *. I think a majority of traffic flows Eastwards i.e. station and M4   | 57 |
| 94       | Combining the schools would also substantially reduce car use and congestion in the village.   | 58 |
| 96       | In order to gain access to the Horse and Groom site that it could be via St John's Road and then through Garth Hall  | 59 |
| No Cards | Prefer option1. Would like consideration to be made for an over 50's complex with facilities included i.e. gym/indoor pool/tennis court/ and a central area for functions/clubs etc.,  | 60 |
| 98       | No opinion on the location of dispersed sites.   | 61 |
| 100      | I do not think the options overleaf * are suitable especially the wooded common area x   | 62 |
| 101      | Can we reduce the bulk numbers if we can find suitable infill sites for single plots   | 63 |

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
|     | etc?<br>Car parking for school pick up?  |    |
| 102 | The loss of woodland areas would be a greater loss than the more open spaces both from a biodiversity and recreational point of view.  | 64 |
| 103 | Option 1 centralises schools and provides larger surgery providing parking for all schools/surgery is added at a convenient place.   | 65 |
| 104 | I have chosen option1 because it contains provision for new school, enlarged school and surgery extension/new. So necessary.   | 66 |
| 105 | A single large site would allow the infrastructure of the village to be enhanced i.e. bigger infant school, satellite health centre, possibly also meeting community space.  | 67 |
| 106 | Large site has + points (school and surgery etc) and keeps core of village in one place. Other options to diverse and increase footprint of overall village.   | 68 |
| 107 | Some central development would be useful to fund infrastructure development, but the risk is that it will open the floodgates to the site being fully developed. Could it be phased beyond 2016?   | 69 |
| 108 | Other options [other than 1] will put more traffic on to half a dozen different minor roads. Main site 1 will have a much more focussed and less disruptive effect on the village during build and longer term.  | 70 |
| 109 | The most appropriate site when considering access, safety to pedestrians and children and practical for actually building on is the field opposite the Turners.  | 71 |
| 110 | Back garden/infill sites cause least impact.<br>Small development near station for commuters.  | 72 |
| 111 | Windfall sites to be included in dispersed sites.<br>Small development near station.   | 73 |
| 112 | I would strongly object to any building on the woodland behind the Strawberry Fields estate. This is an important habitat for many species and is also important for leisure walking ad to maintain biodiversity.  | 74 |
| 117 | Current St John's school is too small and should be combined with St Mary's to make a single school in the centre of the village.  | 75 |
| 118 | Object to any site of existing trees (woodland) being used for housing when there are open fields available inn the surrounding area.  | 76 |
| 119 | Limit social housing as much as possible.  | 77 |
| 123 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dispersed sites are essential to prevent worsening traffic congestion at centre of village and retain its unique rural feel for the village.</li> <li>Please consider area marked 5 overleaf which is closer to the train station and exit routes to reading/Basingstoke by road – with mini roundabout onto The Street safe access could be achieved.</li> </ul> | 78 |
| 124 | There will be future beyond this construction - more houses which can then take up the dispersed sites.  | 79 |
| 125 | [option 1] so long as school and GP's surgery moved.<br>Option marked/B are green woodland and against cutting down trees. Why has area marked in red [Kiln Lane site] not in the plan? The topography of the land lends itself better than option1  | 80 |
| 126 | The wooded options I n option 2 are a complete <b><u>NO</u></b> and should never have been considered.<br>A [Kiln Lane site] should be in the options<br>B [dispersed site 6] would block access to field behind the Horse and Groom and from pub – machinery too large.   | 81 |
| 127 | Option1 More central: rounds off the village; residents more likely to walk to shops etc.; less car use; more likely to have greater housing mix; opportunity for new  | 82 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
|     | school(s) and surgery; conservation benefit – better than smaller sites.  |    |
| 129 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single row on option 3 to face existing houses on the other side (West End road).</li> <li>• Kings Street option.</li> <li>• Preserve Firs Lee site</li> <li>• Preserve Hammonds Heath site on grounds of wildlife and pleasant area for children to visit (woodland)</li> </ul> | 83 |
| 130 | Option 1 [behind St John's school ] plus Kings Street site.   | 84 |
| 131 | I do not believe sites that are predominately filled with trees should be used for housing. It goes against your biodiversity objectives. Would destroy the rural feel.   | 85 |
| 133 | <p>Phase 1 – new school and some housing behind St John's</p> <p>Phase 2 – develop St Mary's with housing – this removes parking on The Street and brings both school to shae facilities</p>  | 86 |
| 134 | We need definite answers on the feasibility of re=locating schools  | 87 |
| 135 | It would be a great shame to lose woodland next to the common and behind Windmill Common. Other areas that could be considered are fields further down close to then station. These have the advantage of easy transport to Reading/ Basingstoke.   | 88 |
| 137 | First option – single site behind St John's school with broom reserved for new school(s) and larger doctor's surgery.   | 89 |
| 105 | A single large site would allow the infrastructure of the village to be enhanced i.e. bigger infant school, satellite health centre, possibly also meeting community space.   | 67 |