

Detailed Pre-Submission Representations and NDP Responses

All the representations to the pre-submission consultation are listed in the table below. Where the representation was lengthy and not easily broken down in this table format, a summary of the points made has been entered and the full text can be seen in Appendix A.

The lengthy West Berkshire Council representation has been broken down into individual points and listed first. As some of these were issues of non-compliance, a meeting was held on 5th January between members of the Steering Group and WBC officers where these issues were resolved; the minutes of that meeting are in Appendix B.

Seventeen representations were received from private individuals; these are indicated by IR and a sequential number in the first column. Public bodies and companies are shown by name.

X-Ref	Representation or Summary of Representation	Response and Any Proposed Amendment
West Berkshire Council:		
WBC/1	Access to the site needs to be defined within the NDP. The council need to be satisfied that suitable access can be provided to the site. Currently the site assessment forms raise concern over suitable access being available for the site which raises issues about the deliverability of the site.	Following discussion with WBC and TA Fisher a detailed drawing of the access is now included in The Site SDB. SDB section now rewritten.
WBC/2	Site allocation evidence – there is very little evidence to suggest that other sites have been considered. This is a very important part of the process, especially as there are other sites available in the village that could deliver a similar number of dwellings and which may well come forward through the planning application process. We are happy to offer a meeting to give some guidance about the site selection process and what is required, if you would find that useful	A more comprehensive Site Allocation Evidence has been written and is in the Evidence Base; a summary is included in C&J of Residential Site Selection
WBC/3	Affordable housing mix – the proposed mix within the NDP is contrary to the Council’s affordable housing policy, which seeks a tenure split of 70% social rented and 30% intermediate affordable units	HD Housing Mix and density NDP sections redrafted to be compliant with WBC policy
WBC/4	Parking Policy - anything over and above the West Berkshire standard sent out in the Housing Site Allocations DPD needs to be evidence based. Garages are not included as parking spaces in the West Berkshire policy, and should therefore, be excluded from parking spaces in the NDP. This does not mean that they cannot be provided, but that they are provided over and above the minimum level of parking required.	Extra parking for visitor parking removed from policy; now compliant with WBC policy Parking now part of General Design section
WBC/5	Biodiversity and Environmental Gain policy (B1) is contrary to the Core Strategy policy CS17. Suggest wording be changed to: “Any development within the part of BOA13 identified by the Berkshire LNP will need to show positive changes for biodiversity which restore, expand, link and buffer existing priority habitats within the BOA”.	Biodiversity section rewritten to comply with WBC policy

WBC/6	Local Green Space – sites that are already designated (Common Land/Scheduled Monuments) should not be designated as local green space as they are already protected.	The NDP has kept the designated sites; Assessment against criteria now in Evidence Base
WBC/7	Flood Management – you do not need to repeat the Core Strategy policy as the NDP will form part of the development plan which is read as a whole. Duplication is therefore unnecessary and potentially confusing for applicants and members of the public. All development would be required to meet the adopted Core Strategy policy in any case. This only needs to be included as a policy if additional information is required (e.g. SuDS/maintenance of Greenfield run-off rates etc).	Section redrafted now part of General Design section
WBC/8	Heritage policy – you do not need to repeat the Core Strategy policies. It may be better to have a Heritage section which simply lists projects/schemes you wish to follow up, as any application would have to meet the Core Strategy requirements in any case.	Policy removed; no policies beyond those in WBC Core Strategy identified
WBC/9	Many of the policies included within the Commercial policy section are within permitted development rights, and therefore, you do not need a policy as this type of development can take place without the need for planning permission. CS8 does not conform with the NPPF, as policies need to be positively worded, and cannot to restrict development, therefore, needs to be deleted.	Commercial section rewritten to be compliant with NPPF and WBC policy
WBC/10	At the end of paragraph 2 (page 9) it is suggested that the following wording is added in relation to the presence of Bronze Age barrows at Holden's Firs. "The presence of Bronze Age barrows at Holden's Firs shows that the area around Mortimer has been utilised by people since the prehistoric period, and evidence found at Mortimer Hill suggest that a Roman settlement existed here."	Add to beginning of para2, p 9 - The presence of Bronze Age barrows at Holden's Firs shows that the area around Mortimer has been utilised by people since the prehistoric period, and evidence found at Mortimer Hill suggest that a Roman settlement existed here
WBC/11	Consultation Process Table will need updating with details of the pre-submission consultation	Updated
WBC/12	Final point of the vision – this should not be part of the vision, but should be mentioned somewhere in the NDP. If the NDP includes a chapter on delivery and monitoring at the end, this could be included there. Otherwise leaving in the aims/objectives vision section is fine, but within the context/justification section.	Text moved to end of Strategy section
WBC/13	Bullet 4 of the themes section – needs to be some consideration of who this will be delivered (in the Heritage section).	See WBC/8
WBC/14	Strategy section – there needs to be a definition of Starter Homes. See Comment on Housing Mix and density.	Housing Mix and Density section rewritten.
WBC/15	Do not refer to 'gaps' (final bullet point) due to the change in Government policy on this issue. This policy approach was replaced a few years ago in favour of a landscape character approach. Re-word to say "retain the distinct identity of Mortimer and adjacent settlements "	Text changed to Retain the distinct identity of Mortimer and adjacent settlements
WBC/16	<u>NDP1</u> - This is not a policy that will manage development, and cannot be a policy of the NDP. This would be better referred to in a delivery and monitoring section as to how the NDP will be reviewed	Policy retained; this is about managing future developments and community involvement and consultation.
WBC/17	remove timescale from policy	Text amended RS1 The Plan defines the new Mortimer Settlement Boundary (MSB) to replace the existing Settlement Boundary, as shown on Map 1 – Mortimer Settlement Boundary below
WBC/18	The Mortimer settlement boundary should be reviewed in accordance with the criteria set out in the Housing Site Allocations DPD. Areas can be removed from the Settlement Boundary,	Not changed; this boundary has been through extensive consultation and agreement by parish council

	<p>as well as added if this is considered appropriate You could, for example, remove Windmill Common from the settlement boundary, if you felt that this area did not meet the criteria.</p> <p>WBC would recommend including the tree line to the west of “The Site” within the settlement boundary, as this is the logical boundary of the site. The site plan could show this area as part of the green infrastructure/landscaping of the site – the site policy could require the retention of the tree belt to the west of the site (see site policy section below)</p>	<p>Not changed;</p> <p>these cannot be part of The site as they are in several private ownerships</p>
WBC/19	RS2 – not required. Development outside the settlement boundary will be controlled by the Housing in the Countryside policies as set out in the Housing Site Allocations DPD	Not changed; required to help public understanding so that an informed decision can be taken at referendum
WBC/20	RS3 – not required. There is a presumption in favour of development within all settlement boundaries; therefore, development on these sites would be managed by policies in the Development Plan.	Text amended RS3 New residential developments within the new MSB, for which there is a presumption in favour, must comply with the policies of this Plan
WBC/21	RS5 – suitable access to the site must be set out in the NDP. Without confirmation that adequate access can be provided the council would be unable to accept the NDP, as there be some uncertainty about the delivery of the site. See WBC Representations for full text	<p>Same as WBC/1 plus add to RS5:</p> <p>Access to, and the layout of, the proposed site allocation will need to take account of Manual for Streets, or any West Berkshire Council highway design guidance if more up-to-date at the time;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Provide safe and suitable access for all people •Accord with Policies CS13 and CS14 of the Core Strategy and Quality Design SPD
WBC/22	RS6 – not required – all development proposed within the settlement boundary will have a presumption in favour of development and all development would, in any case be required to meet the policies of the Development Plan (including the NDP once adopted). Context and justification The supporting text needs to set out why the site is being allocated for 110 dwellings. The NDP needs to make reference to the Housing Site Allocations DPD policy for Mortimer. This should be discussed first within this section	<p>Not changed; required to help public understanding so that an informed decision can be taken at referendum</p> <p>Summary of site selection process added to this section; also see full Site Allocation Evidence in Evidence Base</p>
WBC/23	The supporting text does not need to make reference to support for the policies from local residents; this should all be set out in the background paper which covers the consultation.	Not changed; required to help public understanding so that an informed decision can be taken at referendum
WBC/24	Evidence Base – What site assessment work has the Parish carried out? Background information is required as to why “the site” has been chosen. The Council has not updated the site assessment forms used at Preferred Options, and therefore, the forms still include concerns over access to the “The Site” whilst it is understood that this has now been resolved, there is no evidence of this within the site assessment papers. There needs to be some evidence of other sites considered for development, and why these are not considered appropriate for development. Currently the Site assessment forms include all the details for the East Kennet Valley. You only need to include the details for Mortimer (which needs to be updated, as WBC has not reconsidered the Mortimer sites since preferred options and some changes may have taken place). In addition, as the NDP is not required to produce a Sustainability Appraisal, the SA/SEA site assessment forms should be removed to avoid confusion.	See Site Allocation Evidence and updated SA/SAE forms in Evidence Base

WBC/25	Housing Mix and Density HD1 - reference to Local Plan – this should refer to “Development Plan” HD2 – this is not in accordance with the Council’s Core Strategy policy CS6. See WBC Representations for full text	Housing Mix and Density section rewritten
WBC/26	It could be that a certain number/percentage of dwellings on the site could be allocated for ‘local need’ using the evidence as set out in the Housing Needs Survey. Details would then need to be included in the Context and Justification section. The Housing Needs Survey recommends provision of 12 units to meet the high level of local need. See WBC Representations for full text	Housing Mix and Density section rewritten
WBC/27	The cascade mechanism for allocations of affordable housing to local people is not in conformity with the Council’s adopted Housing Allocations Policy, and there is no way to control allocation to people with a local connection unless a ‘rural exception’ site is allocated. It is suggested that this is removed from the NDP to avoid raising hopes for local connection allocation of housing (unless a rural exception site is allocated). Delivery and Monitoring: This section should set out how the NDP team are going to deliver and monitor the policy.	Housing Mix and Density section rewritten
WBC/28	Design/Site Design/Building Design Suggest that all design policies are brought together into a single section with the design brief for “the site” kept separate. There is no need to repeat information that is already available in, for example, the VDS. There are potential deliverability/ enforcement issues with the design policies as currently set out as they are more guidance than policy. The Core Strategy includes a design policy. It may be that a separate design policy is not required. A design policy is also included within the Housing Site Allocations DPD. If the NDP does wish to include a design policy, these can be used as examples of what to include within the policy.	The various Design sections rewritten into one General Design section
WBC/29	DS1 – this is not enforceable. Windfall sites, by definition, come forward on an ad hoc basis without any prior knowledge and therefore, it would be difficult for the Parish Council to develop a design brief. The Government is promoting the release of brownfield land, with limited planning controls. It would be better to have design policies to manage development coming forward.	Policy removed
WBC/30	There is no need to repeat sections of the NPPF	Not changed; required to help public understanding so that an informed decision can be taken at referendum
WBC/31	Reference is made to the provision of rural footpath/cycle ways – this should relate to a specific policy within the NDP (potentially GS2).	Cross-ref to GS2 included
WBC/32	There is no need to talk about consultation responses in the NDP.	Not changed; required to help public understanding so that an informed decision can be taken at referendum
WBC/33	The Site Design brief for “The Site” The previous version of the Design Brief for the site was more in line with what would be expected by a design brief	The Site Design Brief section rewritten
WBC/34	The relocation of the doctors surgery is supported in terms of Highways impact .	Noted

WBC/35	SDB2 – concern over shared parking – shared parking for the school/doctors (unless solely for the use of staff), is unlikely to be acceptable in highways terms	Same as WBC/4
WBC/36	SDB3 – need to be specific about what the 5 year prior relates to (School/doctors or whole site?)	SDB3 redrafted to cover this
WBC/37	SDB4 – how is a satisfactory means of access defined? Suggest “safe and suitable access for all people ” Details of access to the site must be included in the policy. There may need to be more consideration of how the NDP wishes to deal with the TA Fisher site given that this is where the access will be located.	Same as WBC/1 covered in rewriting of Site Design Brief section
WBC/38	SDB5 – need to specific where the open space is to be provided	Not possible to be more specific at this stage’ as shown diagrammatically in SDB section
WBC/39	SDB6 – this is not enforceable We suggest that you have a look at the site policies for the Housing Site Allocations sites, and use a similar approach for this site. Each policy should be a single policy with several bullet points and some supporting text.	The Design and Site Design Brief sections have been rewritten
WBC/40	Suggestion for policy SDB1 (new policy text provided) Design guidance – This would be better as an appendix to the NDP. Access & Parking The following paragraphs in this section need re-wording to ensure that the intention is clear.	The Site Design Brief section rewritten
WBC/41	“The main access to the site should not be via a traffic-controlled junction...” The words ‘traffic-controlled junction’ does not have clear meaning in Planning and Highways Development Control, making it difficult to interpret the NDP’s intentions. Should this read a ‘traffic signal controlled junction’?	The main access to the site should not be via a traffic-light controlled junction as this would be counter to the rural ethos of the village In rewritten Site Design Brief section
WBC/42	Speed inhibitors – not humps – are to be integrated into the road design such that the whole road layout could be designated a 20mph zone The words “speed inhibitors – not humps” needs clarification so that the NDP’s intentions are clear. There are a number of vertical traffic calming features which are not “humps” such as raised tables and “thumps”. Should this paragraph refer to “horizontal” rather than “vertical” traffic calming features?	The General Design section rewritten to include this
WBC/43	An acceptable system of controlling access to the school at drop-off and collection times will have to be devised to avoid road safety issues on the site and The Street while allowing unrestricted access to the doctors’ surgery for patients. It is unclear who has responsibility for devising an “acceptable system” or who will confirm whether the system is indeed “acceptable”	The Site Design Brief section rewritten to include this
WBC/44	The definition of “kerbs” needs further clarification. Kerbs do not have to have an upstand but are still kerbs. Edge restraint will be required to support the carriageway construction and for the purposes of highway drainage. The use of the word “tarmac” should be clarified with the West Berkshire Council Highways team and the correct engineering term used.	The General Design section rewritten to include this
WBC/45	Dwellings should face, rather than back onto, the public open space areas In accordance with Manual for Streets, Secure by Design, Core Strategy Policy CS14 and the Quality Design SPD.	The General Design section rewritten to include this

WBC/46	No street lighting will be installed, unless required for safety reasons This statement should cross refer to policies DL1 and DL2.	The General Design section rewritten to include this
WBC/47	A separate non-vehicular pedestrian and cycle access must be provided to the village centre, as show The Site-Initial Development Concept on page 3 There is no specific policy which reflects this aspiration. See comment above on site design.	The Site Design Brief section rewritten to include this
WBC/48	During construction all construction vehicles will be parked on site and not in the village Noted. The NDP could require submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan to help ensure that this is enforced .	The Site Design Brief section rewritten to include this
WBC/49	The site plan needs to show the proposed access point to the site, and any secondary accesses or pedestrian /cycle only access points.	The Site Design Brief section rewritten to include this
WBC/50	Building Design and Style Much of this should be covered by the general design policy/guidance.	The General Design section rewritten to include this
WBC/51	Housing Mix – see comment about regarding housing mix. If a different mix is required this needs to be evidence based. Wording could say: “a mix of dwellings types and sizes should be provided, including a proportion of flats, houses and bungalows”	Housing Mix section rewritten to include this
WBC/52	Do not need point 4 (overall density), this is restricted by the number of dwellings on the site, therefore, this can be removed.	Not changed; required to help public understanding so that an informed decision can be taken at referendum
WBC/53	Car parking needs to be overlooked to ensure that people are happy to use it. Remove words “well screened”. Suggest additional wording “Parking design and layout should be provided in line with Manual for Streets”.	“Parking design and layout should be provided in line with Manual for Streets. In particular car parking should be located close to the main access to the dwellings, and should be overlooked by habitable rooms” included in General Design section
WBC/54	Residents’ car parking should not be well screened, as this can lead to security issues. See paragraph 5.3 of the Housing Site Allocations DPD – Car parking should be located close to the main access to the dwellings ,and should be overlooked by habitable rooms	Included in the General Design section
WBC/55	Inclusion of garages as parking spaces is contrary to the Council’s new parking policy. It is fine to request garages built to a certain size, but should be made clear this is in addition to the parking space requirements.	Included in the General Design section
WBC/56	Landscape & Environment Point 3&4 – these should be advised by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (see policy above). Suggest that the wording is changed to: “provision of a landscape buffer to the Eastern boundary of the site to shield the existing dwellings from the development but still allow open vistas to the further views.”	Included in rewritten Site Design Brief section
WBC/57	Projects – consideration of a new site for the Junior school should be included within the infrastructure section, rather than here	Moved to Infrastructure section; xref included in Site Design Brief
WBC/58	The majority of the tree belt to the west of the site is already covered by a TPO. Any projects to extend the TPO designate new ones would be better located within the Biodiversity and Environmental Gain section of the NDP. This is not something that would be dealt with at planning application stage.	Moved to Biodiversity section; xref included in Site Design Brief section
WBC/59	Paragraph 3 refers to SDB4, should this be SDB3?	Included in the rewritten Site Design Brief section
WBC/60	Suggest alternative policy wording regarding the provision of FRAs and SuDs. Any site coming forward would need to consider flooding/drainage	Rewritten as part of the new General Design section

	<p>DF1</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment will be required for all sites in line with the Core Strategy policy. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) will include a mix of measures including ground level storage and underground storage.</p> <p>Greenfield run-off rates will be retained, or improved</p>	
WBC/61	<p>If the NDP is to include maps of the local flood risk, these need to be clearer. The NDP should refer to the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (updated 2015) which includes detailed maps and a summary of the flood risk in each Settlement, including Mortimer (www.westberks.gov.uk/sfra).</p>	Rewritten as part of the new General Design section
WBC/62	<p>The requirement for an additional visitor space per 5 dwellings is over and above the HSA DPD requirement, and therefore, evidence must be provided as to why this deviation is required locally. If it is not evidence based it would be difficult to defend a planning application that does not meet the 'Mortimer' standard.</p> <p>Garages are not counted as parking spaces within the HSA DPD. Therefore, the NDP is not in conformity with the parking policy set out in the HSA DPD. Garages can be provided, but should be in addition to the minimum standard of DP1.</p>	<p>Policy removed</p> <p>This has been made specific</p>
WBC/63	<p>"the standard should be the same overall as the new Zone 3 WBC standards. Where it can be identified that these standards are, in exceptional circumstances, not sufficient then further provision should be made" The text is unnecessary as the standards in Policy P1 of the Housing Site Allocation DPD are minimum standards in any case.</p>	Text retained; required to help public understanding so that an informed decision can be taken at referendum
WBC/64	<p>"In addition all dwellings should have a further one visitor space per 5 dwellings, which may be provided communally or as an addition to the normal parking standard for individual dwellings" As further visitor spaces form a policy over and above Policy P1 of the Housing site Allocations DPD then the need for this additional visitor space will need to be evidence based specifically for Mortimer.</p> <p>Some concerns over deliverability of this, especially if the additional space is provided for an individual dwelling. It may be better for road layouts to be designed in such a way as to allow for limited on street parking.</p>	Policy removed
WBC/65	<p>Commercial</p> <p>Many of these policies, are not policies, and in many cases are covered by existing permitted development rights or the prior approval processes, and therefore, do not need a separate policy. Many of the suggested policies are covered by the Housing Site Allocations DPD Countryside policies, or the existing employment policy in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>See WBC Representation for full text</p>	Commercial section rewritten to be compliant
WBC/66	<p>Infrastructure It is suggested that rather than infrastructure policies, you use this section to set out how the CIL receipts the Parish Council receive will be prioritised</p>	Not reasonable; priorities will change by time CIL available
WBC/67	<p>The NDP should include something to say that an adopted NDP means that the Parish Council will receive 25% of the CIL receipts .</p>	<p>Test added (to last para of Objectives)</p> <p>An adopted NDP means that the Parish Council will receive 25% of the CIL receipts from new housing development</p>

WBC/68	An infrastructure delivery plan (IDP), which is prepared in partnership with service providers, and updated on a regular basis should be produced to priorities the CIL spend within the parish. This should set out what the Parish's priorities are for infrastructure improvements/delivery. Then the IDP should be included as an appendix. See Appendix 1 for WBC Representation for full text	Not reasonable; priorities will change by time CIL available
WBC/69	Water supply/drainage strategy is required under the generic site policy of the HSA DPD, therefore, does not need to be included in the NDP. There is no reference to bus services through the village. Context and Justification This does not need to refer to projects/schemes that are not supported by the residents. Delivery and monitoring Needs to set out how infrastructure provision will be delivered/monitored.	Text retained; required to help public understanding so that an informed decision can be taken at referendum Not added; details not available at this time
WBC/70	Biodiversity and Environmental Gain B1 – the policy is not in conformity with policy CS17 and paragraph 5.121 of the Core Strategy. See WBC Representation for full text B4 – this is not policy wording. Context and Justification There are other protected species present within the parish (Stag Beetle, Otter, Grass Snake, Bluebell, Palmate Newt, Badger)	Biodiversity section rewritten to conform to WBC policies
WBC/71	No organised wildlife surveys have been carried out in the area, so there could be potentially more protected species than are currently known about. This could be a project identified by the NDP.	Biodiversity section rewritten to conform to WBC policies
WBC/72	Include a larger map of the BOA – should show the whole of the parish. The NDP does not need to repeat sections of the NPPF	Biodiversity section rewritten to conform to WBC policies
WBC/73	The Fairground – fine, meets the criteria. Although a small part of the site in the south east corner is designated common land and so should be removed from the Local Green Space designation. The Pound – not sure where this is – need to check it meets the criteria Heath Elm Pont – this is designated common land so should not be designated as Local Green Space War Memorial Island – does not meet the criteria. Could consider the Local Listing process instead	Evidence of criteria assessed added to Evidence Base
WBC/74	Foundry Brook Does not meet the criteria. Too far from the settlement. The land is privately owned, although a right of way passes through.	Evidence of criteria assessed added to Evidence Base
WBC/75	Windmill Common Woodland, Private land – is the landowner happy for the site to be designated as Local Green Space? May not meet the criteria. Is it important to the form and character of the settlement?	Evidence of criteria assessed added to Evidence Base
WBC/76	Brewery Common This is common land, should not be designated as Local Green Space	Evidence of criteria assessed added to Evidence Base
WBC/77	Bronze age barrows (Holden's Firs) Designed as a Scheduled monument. Should not be designated Local Green Space. Does not meet the criteria.	Evidence of criteria assessed added to Evidence Base

WBC/78	Green space along the southern boundary of "The Site" Does not meet the criteria. Suggest that the open space is protected in perpetuity by the Site Policy (see wording above).	Evidence of criteria assessed added to Evidence Base
WBC/79	The evidence base needs to clearly show how the sites to be allocated as Local Green Space meet the criteria as set out in the NPPF. It does not need to refer to other sites that have been considered by do not meet the criteria.	Designating Green Space in Mortimer document added to Evidence Base
WBC/80	GS2 – make more of linking sites/facilities to the village centre for walking/cycling.	See WBC/31
WBC/81	GS3 –what is meant by all new cycle/pedestrian routes being green? Will need sufficient evidence to insist on this.	The example makes the sense clear
WBC/82	The Council's archaeology team have suggested how the wording of this section could be updated to better reflect the information available See WBC Representation for full text In addition, a project called Historic Landscape Characterisation recorded the historic evolution of the landscape of West Berkshire; this indicates the dynamic nature of land-use change, but also highlighted which areas seems most sensitive (historically significant and vulnerable). This data would help in the Vision's wish to retain the best landscape features of the parish. (This information has been provided to the Parish clerk (copy attached). Would recommend the historic environment maps and summary lists are part of the evidence base).	Included in rewrite of Heritage section
WBC/83	Improve Projects text - see WBC Representation for full text Improve D&M text: Throughout the document you need to make it clear how each policy will be monitored to see how it is working. This should be a summary of anything that is included in the topic delivery and monitoring sections and set out how the parish council will monitor the delivery and implementation of each policy. For an example see chapter 6 of the Housing Site Allocation DPD.	Largely included in rewrite of Heritage section -
WBC/84	It would be useful if the evidence base was numbered as to where it is referred to in the NDP.	Evidence Base numbered , and cross references included in NDP
WBC/85	Evidence Base: Site selection – you need to take forward and finalise the Council's site selection work for Mortimer. Remove the SA/SEA stuff as you do not have to do SA/SEA and remove any reference to other settlements outside Stratfield Mortimer parish. The site assessment work needs to be updated to reflect the process the NDP team have been through to choose the sites. It is likely, if the NDP is to be subject to a legal challenge, it will be over site selection, therefore, it needs to be done robustly.	Site selection document added to Evidence Base
WBC/86	Evidence Base: Local Green Space – this should set out how the sites being allocated as Local Green Space meet the criteria set out in the NPPF	Designating Green Space in Mortimer document added to Evidence Base
WBC/87	Submission requirements When the NDP is submitted to the Council the following documents need to be submitted: •A map identifying the area covered by the NDP (this should be included within the NDP in any case). •Consultation statement – stating how consultation comments have been taken on board •A copy of the NDP •Statement on how the NDP meets the legal requirements set out in the regulations	Prepared

Representations from private individuals are identified by IR and a sequential number;the		
IR1 1442	I would just like to thank the team who put together the NDP consultation paper. It's a superb document and accurately reflects my views on how the village should be developed. Well done	Noted - No action required
IR2	Congratulations on producing an excellent publication.	Noted - No action required
IR2/1	One area of lack I notice is as to adequacy or otherwise of community facilities. Is there sufficient capacity at doctor's surgeries, dental practices, opticians, &c to cope with present – and projected – demand?	Land has been allocated for new doctors' surgery and infant school; need for expansion of other services not identified during consultation
IR2/2	Is there demand for meeting places for groups? One area where there is unfulfilled demand is for additional places of worship. Reading Gospel Hall Trust has been long seeking for at least one meeting hall in the area, and still is. Many recent tries including the Royal British Legion hall in St Johns Road have not been productive. I attach a submission to West Berks in 2004 pointing out the need has been long-standing. Could some mention be made in the Plan of community facilities? I realise this may require further surveys of opinion.	Questionnaire consultation established additional public halls are a low priority
0307		
IR3	The NDP needs to take into consideration that the Infrastructure in Mortimer cannot take any more housing until WBC and Thames Water commit to providing the Funding/Land for School building at St John's and upgrading of the Sewer network from Mortimer Common to the Treatment Works. This comment applies equally to the Development at Tower House / Fairwinds and the Access Application at Monkey Puzzle Field between The Avenue and Kiln Lane. I cannot support or condone any development which increases the Sewer Flooding Risk in the Lower Street i.e. below St Mary's School until major redesign has been completed. This work must precede any housing development approvals by The NDP, SMPC, or WBC as it will involve enlarging sewers under the existing roadways and probably separation of combined surface / foul water in parts of Mortimer Common. The NDP and WBC have had copies of my full responses to the DPD last September 2014.	This issue is addressed in the NDP. Thames Water have placed on record concerns and indicated they may require increased capacity for waste water (see below). Policy IS6 is intended to ensure that there is sufficient capacity. These technical issues will be resolved by the application process when WBC's Development Management officers will need to be satisfied that all of the issues are cleared and resolved before they can recommend planning permission. It is the developer's job to do the technical assessments that demonstrate these matters
0444		
Thames Water	Thames Water support Policy IS6 and the need to take account of water supply and wastewater infrastructure in development proposals. A key sustainability objective for the preparation of Development Plans should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. <i>“Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater....”</i> Paragraph 162 of the NPPF: <i>“Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally</i>	Noted

1220	<p>significant infrastructure within their areas.”</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that “Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development” (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).</p> <p>Thames Water therefore support Policy IS6 which is necessary because it will not be possible to identify the entire water/wastewater infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). Such a policy is required to ensure the infrastructure is provided in time to service development to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, pollution of land and watercourses plus water shortages with associated low pressure water supply problems.</p> <p>Thames Water have concerns about both the waste water network and treatment capacity in the area so new developments will need to be assessed. In order to ensure that the water supply and drainage requirements of development proposals are understood and that any upgrade requirements are identified, all developers should be encouraged to contact Thames Water Developer Services in advance of the submission of planning applications.</p> <p>Thames Water recommend that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity to establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The development’s demand for water supply infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; •The development’s demand for wastewater infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; •The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met. <p>It may be necessary for developers to carry out studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and wastewater infrastructure. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, then the developer needs to contact Thames Water to agree what improvements are required and how they will be delivered prior to any occupation of the development.</p>	<p>Covered in rewritten Infrastructure section</p> <p>Explicit in rewritten Infrastructure section</p> <p>Words to the effect the developer of The Site should engage with Thames Water as soon as possible after the NDP has been passed by referendum included in the rewritten Site Design Brief section including the issue of capacity constraints</p>
Basingstoke & Dean BC	<p>The council welcomes this opportunity to work with SMPC in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate on cross boundary issues of common concern and interest.</p>	
BD/1	<p>The evidence base provided by the neighbourhood planning group provides justification on the selection of the site to meet the allocation of 110 dwellings in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, no evidence has been provided that outlines the potential impacts of the proposed allocation and how these would be mitigated.</p>	<p>An impact and mitigation analysis has been added to the Evidence Case and a reference made to it in the NDP in the Site Design Brief section.</p>

BD/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •There is no information in the evidence base to demonstrate that neighbouring parishes have been consulted on the proposed site allocation. 	The pre-submission consultation fulfils this requirement and evidence is included in the consultation statement.
BD/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDP1 - in respect of the reference to 'significant development' it would be worth defining whether the Policy applies to any development permitted which is cross boundary (i.e. falls within the borough of Basingstoke). 	By definition NDP development can only be within NDP boundary
BD/4	In addition, it would also be helpful to provide further information on the type and scale of development that would trigger this policy in the NDP.	This has been considered and it is not possible to be precise at this time.
BD/5 0743	The council would like to be kept up to date on the progress of the Stratfield Mortimer Neighbourhood Plan..	Noted
Berks Bucks Oxon Wildlife Trust	We are pleased to see the inclusion of a suite of policies focused to securing a net gain for biodiversity. Overall, the plan appears comprehensive and in line with the Basic Conditions and other relevant legal requirements set out in the Localism Act. However, the plan could be strengthened to ensure compliance as follows; 1.Commercial Policy C7 The conversion of redundant farm and rural buildings have a high likelihood of impacts on protected species including bats and barn owls. recommend that the first bullet point is clarified to state that proposals will be accompanied by appropriate protected species and habitat surveys; and proposals will avoid adverse impacts on biodiversity and seek to achieve a net gain through enhancements.	First bullet point replaced with: - respect the surrounding rural landscape and be sensitive to the amenities of neighbouring residents and other users and its setting in regard to size, light pollution, noise, dirt, loss of wildlife habitat. Proposals will be accompanied by appropriate protected species and habitat surveys, will avoid adverse impacts on biodiversity and seek to achieve a net gain through enhancements
BBOWT/1		
BBOWT/2	2 In order to ensure that the Plan has appropriate regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paras 6, 9, 17 and 165).	Reference to the NPPF is included
BBOWT/3	3. Biodiversity and Environmental Gain Stratfield Mortimer contains a number of protected habitats including; - Ancient Woodland, - Lowland Heathland and Deciduous woodland Habitats of Principal Importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity (as listed by Section 41(1) the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006) - Local Wildlife Sites – sites of County Importance for nature conservation. Nationally protected species including bats and Great Crested Newts are also recorded as present within the Stratfield Mortimer.	Biodiversity section rewritten
BBOWT/4	I recommend that the scope for Policy B1 is widened to incorporate consideration for other protected habitats and species in addition to the Biodiversity Opportunity Area. I suggest inclusion the following additional wording;	
1308	- No development will be allowed which would lead to a net loss or deterioration of protected habitats including Ancient Woodland, Habitats of Principal Importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity and Local Wildlife Sites The Biodiversity and Environmental Gain policies should also reiterate adherence to the mitigation hierarchy outlined in paragraph 118 of the NPPF. I therefore recommend	Added to Biodiversity Context & Justification: If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission

	<p>inclusion of wording which states the following wording from NPPF; "If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused". In order to ensure that the Plan has appropriate regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paras 6, 9, 17, 109, 114, 118, 125, 165) and is in compliance with the statutory obligations of the Section 40(1) of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.</p>	should be refused.
IR4 1445	<p>Submission for change to proposed settlement boundary See Appendix 1 for details</p>	Considered and refused by SMPC
IR5 IR5/1	<p>Firstly, I feel very strongly that the Kiln Lane site should have been included in the list of possible development sites in the NDP. Without including this site, I feel the entire exercise is biased before it starts, and it invalidates the outcome. If there are valid objections to developing this site, then that should have come out as a result of the NDP survey, and not be decided before the survey was issued.</p> <p>Secondly, I have pulled out a few sentences from the NDP document to illustrate my second concern.</p> <p>"change should be managed sensitively in order to improve matters where possible and to mitigate any downsides to development" "New housing development will have a flexible approach to densities, using those which are appropriate for a rural village and are directed by the Vision statement, the current adjoining densities where they abut existing properties" "To maintain the rural character of Mortimer and to achieve the vision of itself it is important to reflect the current pattern of housing density and specifically that of existing properties local to the proposed new development." "Concern was expressed that the design of a site would be 'formulaic', based on developers standard models more suited to urban or semiurban situations." "New developments can be perceived to have detrimental impact on existing residential properties abutting the new development and without care this impact can be genuine and significant. If a new development is to be supported, it is vital that all reasonable effort is taken in the site design to reduce such detrimental impact."</p> <p>I recently attended the Parish Council Planning Meeting where the committee discussed the views that would be put forward to the Newbury District Planning consideration for the development of the Tower House and FairWinds site. The views the planning committee put forward were supposedly those that would represent the interests of the village. The planning proposal put forward by the builder is to replace the existing 2 houses on the site with 17 homes. Despite many objections from those present at the meeting, the Mortimer Parish Council Planning Committee recommended that these plans were approved on behalf of the village. This decision is clearly not in line with the wishes of the village as quoted above from the NDP related to development being sympathetic with existing housing density in the</p>	<p>See Site Allocation Evidence in Evidence Base</p> <p>This planning application is not an NDP issue as it was being considered prior to NDP approval by the council/referendum</p>

IR5/2	surrounding area. My concern is that the results of the NDP, for example to provide a mix of housing styles in the village, are being applied using a broad brush approach without taking into account where such development is allowed, specifically in this case recommending a more than 8 fold increase in housing density on an existing site.	With or without an NDP, presumption is in favour of development inside settlement boundary. But in future NDP policies will apply.
IR5/3 1443	If the NDP is to be successful, it must be applied sensitively to new planning applications, and from the evidence I have seen, this is not the case. The NDP is a fruitless exercise if it is not applied sensitively to real planning and development	Noted, this will be addressed by SMPC and WBC as planning applications come forward once the NDP is in operation
Foster Wheeler on behalf of National Grid 0003	See Appendix 1 for the full statement An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites	No action This will be addressed at the detailed planning stage for The Site
Historic England HE/1	See Appendix 1 for full submission Has the West Berkshire Historic Environment Record been consulted for any records of non-scheduled archaeological remains on the site and/or the views of West Berkshire Council's Archaeological Advisor sought	Search of the Heritage gateway does not show any non-scheduled remains. WBC SA/SEA reports no archaeological issues with The Site and states "The site is unlikely to have an impact on the District's cultural assets"
HE/2	SDB1 is statement 110 new homes too rigid	This is a requirement placed on the NPD by the WBC DPD
HE/3	Policy C7 to include an additional requirement that proposals will retain and respect any architectural or historic features of the building (s).	Commercial policies altered to take into account
HE/4	Have any buildings, structures or features of local interest been identified in the Parish ? Non-designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity.	None identified; this is part of the Heritage Trail project
HE/5 1299	There should also be a greater reference to any non-scheduled archaeological remains, information on which is available from the West Berkshire Historic Environment Record, Would welcome a reference to the West Berkshire Historic Landscape Characterisation. (The National Planning Practice Guidance states "...where relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions.").	Revised Heritage section "Mortimer has a number of areas identified as 'high' and 'medium-high sensitivity' in WBC Historic Landscape Characterisation" added at end of second paragraph
IR6	The development will have a huge impact on our current outlook.	Action – write to individual explaining:

1444	<p>I know an enormous amount of work has been put into this by village members and it is much appreciated. It does not mean to say that I agree with the outline plans as suggested. I understand that homes have to be built in Mortimer and I agree with this. I feel that since the majority of the houses to be built are on the land between St Johns Road and The Avenue we, the residents of these roads, should have more of a say as to how this is developed so as to minimize the impact on those of us living in those roads. There was no consultation or visits from those drawing up these plans.</p> <p>I would like there to be a larger buffer between the development and our boundaries. Most of the development has been shoe-horned into the northern part of the field. If the development were to be thinner and longer then the buffer zone could be larger.</p> <p>I feel that this has been a "paper exercise" with reference to looking at maps and no thought given to the topography. Has anyone bothered to look at how this may look from current houses and gardens – NO- we have had no visitations to see what impact this might have. I appreciate that we can object to planning applications and maybe a Government Inspector will look, it seems to me that this has been "Rubber Stamped" by both the NDP and Parish Council. I attach some photographs to show that the field is far higher than my garden and higher than part of my house.</p> <p>Hundreds/thousands of tons of earth would have to be moved to make this a level and acceptable site. This could be moved further down the field to make this a longer, thinner site.</p> <p>This site was the easy option for you to put forward. You knew that the volume of objections would be small in comparison to the population of the village thus your "Democratic" questionnaire would allow you to do what you always wanted with minimal opposition.</p> <p>There are also rumours around that the Garth Hall land may be used as an access. I hope that these are only rumours and that no discussions have taken place concerning that land without letting anyone know. Maybe someone could let me know by email that this is not the case.</p> <p>All that I am asking is for more of a say in how this development will be planned and built rather than leaving it to people who do not live adjacent to it and are not affected by it. I am not against this development now since it will go ahead but it is how it is done. The finer details of parking, lighting and house design seem well thought out.</p>	<p>1.A Site Design Brief consultation meeting was held, over 70 people attended 2.Refer to NDP requirement for fuller SDB prior to planning application will be an opportunity to influence design 3.Confirm SDB does not include access to the site via Garth Hall. 4There was a consultation where plans were put forward. Comments were received and acted upon in the SDB The view from The Avenue gardens was considered a potential issue and SDB sought to address this. Did not think sight lines from St John's Rd an issue because of the existing tree line.. Draw your attention to part of policy GD1 New development will consider the amenity of existing residents adjacent to the new development</p> <p>This was not a reason for selecting the site</p> <p>There is nothing in the NDP or SDB for The Site which references Garth Hall.</p> <p>Draw your attention to part of policy GD1 New development will consider the amenity of existing residents adjacent to the new development</p>
IR7/1	1.This is an ill thought out proposal on green belt land outside the village development envelope.	This is not green belt land. There is insufficient land available for the required 110 home within the Settlement Boundary
IR7/2	2.There is insufficient infrastructure in place at the present time to support the extra 110 houses. St. John's School is already under sized for the children at present attending and we are told that there is no money in the funds to rebuild it larger elsewhere. The Doctors do not wish to relocate from their present accommodation and even an extra 250 to 300 people in the village, will not allow the NHS to provide any extra Doctors. So that is a no go idea. One gets the feeling that it is the "cart before the horse" situation. Surely it would be wiser to put the supporting infrastructure in place before considering an increase in the housing and the population.	<p>Plan includes opportunity to have new St John's school. WBC and Governors support the plan and have a reasonable expectation that funding will be forthcoming in the development period of the NDP</p> <p>Relocating the doctors' surgery would allow better parking and possibly future expansion to cater for additional and/or devolved services. NHS England are a year or so into a 5-</p>

		year study into devolving certain services currently provided by hospitals out to doctor's surgeries. At this stage feasibility studies and fund sourcing for the surgery are ongoing. It is prudent to reserve land at this stage.
IR7/3	3.To allow a very large development via what was the Tower House access road, onto The Street, very close to a blind bend near the War Memorial, is a formula for a major accident in the future. It is very close to the school with parents dropping off & picking up children morning and late afternoon. The Community Centre traffic & the Horse & Groom PH all add an already very busy section of road in that area. A mini roundabout might improve things but I doubt it. I know it is in theory a 30 mph limit road but in my experience very few vehicles adhere to that restriction.	WBC highways are satisfied at this stage suitable access can be provided. "... the site promoter has confirmed that access will be gained to the site via TA Fisher site to the North of the site. This access point is way from the infant school and therefore would reduce any possible road safety issues with having access close to the school" (WBC SA/SEA 5th November 2015). Following discussion an engineering drawing of the access is in Site Design Brief section Planning Application which will address detailed access design issues.
IR7/4 1329	We as villagers, have been presented with all these figures collected via surveys and we are told that they are a cross section of what people in the village have replied and said that they want to see in the future, but nowhere has there been any mention of the name of the independent Auditor from outside the village, who was appointed to vet these figures and this then naturally throws into doubt all of the percentages that we have been given.	All questionnaire details available for inspection. Exhibition report includes map showing distribution of where attendees live. SMPC is the legal authority and has accepted the figures; there is no legal requirement for external audit
IR8/1	We would like to provide the following comments regarding the Pre- Submission Consultation process of the Mortimer NDP. As residents of Mortimer we have made an active contribution to the NDP by attending two public meetings held in the village hall, a meeting held in the old Budgens shop and visited the stand at the Mortimer Fun Day. While supporting the original concept of Mortimer having a development plan and the influence that this potentially provides over future housing development in the village, we are dismayed at the lack of transparency of the consultation process adopted by the NDP and their approach to public meetings. The plans now proposed by the NDP have no logically argued derivation from the original alternatives proposed and certain aspects, such as the Doctors Surgery and New School, appear to have been wilfully embellished in order to mislead residents into 'over valuing' the NDP proposal. We further develop our concerns below.	See consultation and site selection and site allocation evidence which has been prepared to clarify this issue It has been clear all along that funding is an issue. St John's has support of WBC and Governors with reasonable expectation funding will be available in the life of the plan. Relocating the doctors' surgery would allow better parking and possibly future expansion to cater for additional and/or devolved services. NHS England are a year or so into a 5-year study into devolving certain services currently provided by hospitals out to doctor's surgeries. At this stage feasibility studies and fund sourcing for the surgery are ongoing. It is prudent to reserve land at this stage.
IR8/2	In the NDP consultation process the residents of Mortimer were given information of a number of possible sites surrounding Mortimer. A questionnaire with a covering letter was then sent to residents with a simple sentence saying that other than two sites all had been rejected due to access issues and impact on woodland. By whom? We have been told by a Parish Councillor that this came from a Parish Council meeting where these options were discussed. Residents have not been informed of this discussion or the details of the rationale used to select/deselect sites. There are two issues here:	Reason for not including other strategic options was: received little support at 2015 exhibition, central site overwhelmingly supported. Appendices attached to questionnaire referred to sites that had been dropped after the exhibition feedback PC agenda, minutes and documents are available to the

		public
IR8/3	<p>why was this discussed at a Parish council meeting when the sole purpose of forming a NDP committee is to delegate this sort of discussion to the appointed NDP committee who are charged to consult with residents in an open, fair, unbiased and transparent way about potential development sites and that no pre-selection or rejection of sites can be made by other parties;</p> <p>2) notwithstanding the foregoing point the said discussion at the Parish Council meeting was not openly reported by either the parish Council or the NDP committee, so where is the transparency?</p>	<p>PC is the statutory body responsible for the NDP..</p> <p>PC agenda published, NDP minutes published, PC minutes published, public could attend</p>
IR8/4	<p>1)Residents of Mortimer, as part of the 'consultation process', had a feedback questionnaire that neglected to mention any of the original sites for development and very much gave an impression that a New School and Doctors' Surgery would be part of a development South of the Horse & Groom Public House. This omission was raised to the NDP representatives, at the public meeting, all of whom gave the impression that this issue wasn't important and needed to be dismissed so that the consultation process and the timetable for a plan for the development of the site could be met. All of this was despite input from Councillor Lock questioning if there was any money for a school and Parish Councillor Kylie reporting that the Mortimer Surgery would not want to be part of the proposed development. This 'highly charged' public meeting resulted in shameful responses from the NDP representatives on the panel. Colourful graphics of conceptual ideas for the NDP's view on a development in Mortimer surrounded the meeting, with little acknowledgement that neither school or surgery would in reality be part of the development, but there was an acknowledgement that these protected zones (Doctors Surgery and New School) would be developed for further housing development.</p>	<p>2015 Exhibition suggested 3 options for consideration. Two options received little support. Questionnaire responded to that feedback offering three options - 2 suggestions and option to reject both. Of respondents less than 15% rejected the two options</p> <p>Please see minutes of this meeting in Evidence Base</p>
IR8/5	<p>Another distressing part of the same public NDP consultation meeting occurred when an objector to the plan raised a point about 'her haven', an area of natural beauty and an area for wildlife. The response from the NDP Chair was dismissive and derogatory in the extreme. This was a shameful response to someone who had invested their retirement income into a pleasant rural place to live. An observation that was commented on in the meeting from the floor.</p>	<p>Please see minutes of this meeting in Evidence Base</p>
IR8/6	<p>Perhaps most importantly, the NDP proposed development has major complications with regard to access, some of which have been miraculously solved by a developer already present adjacent to the proposed site. Curiously this same developer now seems to be the preferred developer for the whole NDP proposal. However, this still leaves the need to place a roundabout on Victoria Road to allow access to the proposed site for the expected 200 additional cars and this is in a highly congested village with a chronic lack of parking.</p>	<p>The choice of developer is the responsibility of the landowner not the NDP. A means of access has been established . See detailed plan for access in Residential Site Access section Part of the rationale for selecting this site was that it is central and to encourage people to walk.</p>
IR8/7 1447	<p>Never did we expect a consultation process to feel like a fait accompli! It would appear that many interested parties have been compliant in focusing the NDP on a convenient development site at the expense of residents' feelings and fair and transparent processes. As part of the NDP Pre Consultation process we object to furthering its progress due to</p>	<p>Please see minutes of this meeting in Evidence Base</p>

	questionable due process	
Mortimer St. Mary's Junior School	<p>It was confirmed that based upon current and projected pupil numbers, there is limited capacity within the current school provision to accommodate higher demand for places generated by the proposed housing development.</p> <p>It is understood that the current plan considers this constraint with regards to Mortimer St John's by providing an allocation of land within the village design proposal, but does not consider a proposal for Mortimer St Mary's; we indicated when consulted that we were not in a position to relocate the school in the immediate future.</p> <p>The governing body now considers that further reflection should be made as to how the entire Key Stage 1 and Key Stage 2 primary school provision could be achieved for the benefit of the children of Mortimer. We agreed that in the event that sufficient Land and funding was available, consideration to co-locate the two schools on a single site should be explored.</p> <p>The Governing body requests that the Village Development Planning committee and Parish Council take due consideration of the possible options for primary school places as part of the consultation and explore how an option to co-locate the schools could be facilitated.</p>	<p>Lack of a reasonable prospect of funding in the life of this plan remains.</p> <p>The Steering Group has always recognised the potential benefits of such a development. However, due to the very low probability of funding for a new relocated St Mary's reservation of land could not be justified in the NDP. At this time there is no evidence that the position on funding has changed. If after further discussions between to the schools and the Benefice a reasonable prospect of funding is identified then the PC will investigate the potential of such a scheme with all the interested parties and a project to that effect has been included in the Infrastructure section</p>
1345		
IR9/1	<p>I feel that this was a "done deal" from the outset. Despite other areas of land being offered for development, you have always wanted to promote this one, Your argument being that it was at the centre of the village</p> <p>That in my opinion is the very reason that we don't want the development there. The centre of the village already often has enormous congestion and insufficient parking for the Community centre, The Horse and Groom pub, St Johns School, St. Johns Church, and the shops. If there is a church service or a funeral on, and when school starts or ends, people are already reduced to parking on double lines and in side roads.</p>	<p>If new homes not in the centre greater chance people will drive to the centre and make congestion worse. Being near the centre is to encourage walking and not the use of the car</p>
IR9/2	<p>Regarding the extra infrastructure required for another 110 homes, you say you will provide land within the new development to provide a larger School and Doctors Surgery. However this is just lip-service,, as we all know that the Council have said that they cannot afford to build a new school, and that the Doctors, who own their present Surgery site, have absolutely no intention of moving. So that was all just a waste of time, and waffle to make it look good!</p> <p>Mortimer Village just could not support this number of new residents</p>	<p>WBC informed the NDP a new Infant school; is near the top of the listl. WBC and the school governors of St Johns support reservation of land and consider chance of funding a reasonable prospect</p> <p>Relocating the doctors' surgery would allow better parking and possibly future expansion to cater for additional and/or devolved services. NHS England are a year or so into a 5-year study into devolving certain services currently provided by hospitals out to doctor's surgeries. At this stage feasibility studies and fund sourcing for the surgery are ongoing. It is prudent to reserve land at this stage</p>
IR9/3	<p>Planning was originally granted for 8 homes on the Tower House & Four Winds site, but I understand that a new application has now been submitted to increase it to 17 properties, together with a road which would provide access to the site in your draft proposal. This is duplicity on a grand scale, and you wonder why I think this is a done deal?</p>	<p>This planning application is not an NDP issue as it was being considered prior to NDP approval by the council/referendum etc This site is within the Settlement Boundary and hence there is a legal presumption in favour of development.</p>

IR9/4	<p>2 other sites on the outskirts of the village have also been offered and proposed for 2 smaller development - the far side of The Avenue, and a field opposite the Palmer Memorial football ground.</p> <p>These would affect far fewer neighbouring properties, and distribute footfall and traffic throughout the village. However, there still won't be the infrastructure to support it!!</p>	<p>Smaller distributed sites was the least-favoured option at the 2015 Exhibition.</p> <p>The Kiln Lane site of c50 homes was not proposed to the NDP. HLM initially proposed 110 homes, then reduced it to c70 and during the questionnaire consultation period produced the third proposal without informing the NDP and conducted their own consultation. Over 60% of respondents to that consultation rejected the proposal.</p> <p>Footfall volume is only an issue for Mortimer to increase support for local retail and services. Central site will enable walking to the centre more attractive with less use of cars to get the village centre. Peak traffic issues are at school drop off and pick up times Being able to walk to the school from the new homes will keep any increase to a minimum whereas the sites mentioned would exacerbate the problem</p>
IR9/5	<p>Finally, your draft proposal development will affect over 60 existing homes who currently overlook this area with copious wildlife and far reaching views, and will automatically devalue them by at least £60 - 100,000 each!!</p>	<p>Less than 40 existing houses will have boundaries with the built area of The Site which could affect their views.</p>
1446	<p>This is an ill thought out plan and should be abolished.</p>	
IR/10	<p>Thank you to SMPC for arranging this public consultation. My concerns relate to the issue of St Mary's School and the land behind St John's School feel that the draft NDP does not satisfactorily address the issue of where our schools should be located for the next generation of children. Unless this issue is confronted now, any new housing development will prohibit any future change.</p> <p>Although the questionnaire revealed some strong feeling against moving St Mary's school, the majority of people would like it to be nearer to the village centre. I believe that it would be sensible to locate the junior school on the land behind the infant school. Child safety should be of paramount importance to the village and the land could be adapted to include a safe drop-off point for buses and cars. As the area is in walking distance for most villagers, junior school children are less likely to be taken to school by car, unlike the current situation. Some parents with children at both schools are compelled to use a car simply because they cannot walk their younger children along what may be a long distance up and down the hill from the other end of the village. Most importantly is the hill itself, which is not a particularly safe walking route for any child. Are we not going to address this serious danger?</p> <p>If St Mary's did move to the land behind St John's, both schools could share facilities. The vacated land could be used for a bus turning-circle to service the railway station and also provide space for some new housing.</p> <p>The land behind St John's seems to be ear-marked in the draft NDP for a new surgery and housing. Do we really need a new surgery? The Mortimer surgery is expanding because it is trying to cater for the residents of Burghfield too. Rather than add to our traffic congestion and utilise our precious land, I think that Burghfield should be seeking an expanded surgery</p>	<p>See 1345 St Mary's School representation above. Review of options is to be included as part of NDP as a project</p> <p>Space required for surgery is very much smaller than that required for a new St Mary's School</p> <p>This is not in the Mortimer NDFP's gift. If the Burghfield population expands and continues to use the Mortimer surgery then expansion of the surgery and better parking will</p>

1448	of its own. This would help better serve the residents there who want to walk to a doctor and also provide better choice for the area as a whole. Our house has been without electricity for the last week, so my response is more limited than I had planned!	become more pressing
IR/11 1449	This is to let you know I fully support the plans proposed by the Mortimer NDP and appreciate the efforts you have made keeping the village informed about decisions that have been made and the reasons why.	
Barton Willmore (on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd)	See Appendix 1 for full text	The submission is in two parts. First are the representations that are specifically about the NDP and the policies included therein. These have been considered and the NDP responses are listed in the table below. The second part concerns how their proposal for the Kiln Lane site satisfies the NDP. These appear to be a justification for the Kiln Lane site. They are not pertinent to the NDP as this site has not been allocated.
BW/1	HLM are aware that Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council have prepared its NDP to ensure that it is in conformity with the policies and general strategy of WBC's adopted Core Strategy. On this basis it is clear that the current NDP will not be looking to meet this higher housing need. However if the NDP is adopted in its current form, then from the day it forms part of the Development Plan it will not be NPPF compliant as it is failing to assist in meeting the full OAHN for the Borough. On this basis HLM consider that it is imperative that Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council should make it explicit within this current NDP that an early review of the Plan will be undertaken to ensure that it is meeting this higher need	WBC Housing Site Allocation DPD (November 2015) based on the up to date OAHN and need for land for 5 years supply requires Mortimer to provide up to 110 homes. The NDP satisfies this obligation. If and when WBC requires Mortimer to allocate land for additional homes it will do so in compliance with policy NDP1
BW/2	We note that draft policy NDP1 of the Stratfield Mortimer Pre-Submission NDP does provide the opportunity for an up-date to the NDP, however we do consider that the wording of this draft policy should be amended to make it clear that the NDP must be reviewed to ensure the parish is able assist in meeting the Borough's OAHN. We therefore suggest the following text: NDP1 – <i>An early review of the NDP, including all policies, must be undertaken to ensure that the Plan is able to assist in meeting the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough.</i>	The NDP is fully compliant with WBC DPD 5 th November 2015. The DPD states "The Council reserves the right to identify opportunities to address any shortfall through the DPD process if the [Mortimer] NDP is not adopted within 2 years of the adoption of the Housing Site Allocations" A review will be conducted if and when WBC Mortimer to allocate land for additional homes it will do so in compliance with policy NDP1
BW/3	Residential Site Allocation HLM are in agreement with the objective on page 18 which states that new residential developments should retain the existing compact nature of the village. However we do consider that the extent of the proposed Settlement Boundary will need to be reconsidered in the future to ensure that appropriate sites are able to come forward within the parish to assist in meeting the Borough's OAHN	If and when WBC requires Mortimer to allocate land for additional homes it will do so in compliance with policy NDP1.
BW/4	Although we support the need to protect the countryside, we consider that draft policy RS2 is too restrictive and does not consider the presumption in favour of sustainable development which forms a golden thread through the NPPF. This is particularly relevant for a Borough	Policy RS2 is compliant with WBC policy WBC Policy C1 Location of New Housing in the Countryside Which states

	which currently cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing against its OAHN	“There will be a presumption against new residential development outside of the settlement boundaries. Exceptions to this are limited to rural exception housing schemes, conversion of redundant buildings, housing to accommodate rural workers and extension to or replacement of existing residential units.”
BW/5	Draft policy RS6 makes reference to small residential developments windfall sites within the Mortimer Settlement Boundary. We would like to inform the Parish Council that if they are to rely on a windfall allowance, it should be both justified and realistic having regard to historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends. This is made explicit at paragraph 48 of the NPPF which considers windfall allowances in regards five-year housing supply. Merely assuming windfalls can deliver a quantum of development over the plan period without justification or enabling this to come forward (for example Through a shift in policy approach) will not be justified or supported.	The NDP is aware that windfall sites cannot be counted unless supported by evidence. No assumption has been made in the NDP, explicit or implicit, in the development of policies that rely on windfall sites.
BW/6	HLM note that draft policy DS1 states that windfall or brownfield developments will prepare a Site Design Brief that adheres to the policies set out in the Plan in totality. We consider that this policy should be redrafted to include potential greenfield developments which are likely to be required to ensure that the parish is meeting the OAHN. We therefore consider that additional text should be included to draft policy DS1, as follows: <i>‘Any site including windfall, brownfield or greenfield developments will prepare a Site Design Brief that adheres to the policies set out in the Plan in totality. This brief will be included in any planning submission after consultation via the parish council. (additional wording underlined)</i>	There is a presumption in favour of windfall and brownfield developments within the settlement boundary. For these developments applicants will be encouraged to prepare a SDB. For housing developments outside the settlement boundary applicants will prepare a SDB which will be included in the application after consultation with the Parish Council
BW/7	Sustainability Appraisal which supports WBC’s draft Housing Site Allocations DPD concludes that if development is to come forward on this site [MOR006 St John’s Site] then access issues would need to be resolved. Based upon the ‘Initial Development Concept’ Plan (page 32 of the Stratfield Mortimer Pre-Submission NDP) HLM are concerned that access to the site remains inappropriate especially for a development of 110 dwellings plus a school and doctors surgery. Until there is greater certainty regarding the access to this site, HLM therefore question the viability and deliverability of development on ‘Land to the rear of St John’s School’.	Suitable access to the site has been confirmed. The most recent sustainability appraisal confirms this
BW/8	In regards to ‘Land West of Kiln Lane, Mortimer’, although we did not prepare a Site Design Brief, the layout of the proposal was heavily influenced through discussions with the Parish Council and via a public engagement process which provided an opportunity for residents to comment on our proposal.	HLM presented ideas to the NDP Steering Group. The Steering Group listened to the ideas but did not consider these were in anyway a consultation on design or could be considered as a replacement for an SDB. Nor does the NDP accept that the engagement process represent a consultation on the design of the site either as an alternative to an SDB or to circumvent the need for one.
BW/9	HLM are supportive of the Parish Council’s objective to keep Mortimer a ‘dark village’ by limiting the extent of lighting from new developments however we consider this must be balanced against ensuring that the safety of pedestrians is not compromised.	The lighting policies state that there will no street lighting unless required for safety reasons.

BW/10	It should also be noted that our proposal includes a foul water pumping station which is supported by draft policy IS6 which states the need to provide adequate infrastructure for both water supply and wastewater provision within the parish.	It is noted that a waste water pumping station is proposed. However that statement does not make reference to noise levels or what happens on any failure of the pumping services.
St. Mary's Benefice	<p>Since the PCC's initial response to the Mortimer NDP, which we made on 11th September 2015, the PCC has asked the governing bodies of the two church schools for which it has special responsibility – Mortimer St. Mary's Church of England School and Mortimer St. John's Church of England School – to work together to agree a coordinated response which is clearly important for the benefit of the education of the present and future generations of children of this village.</p> <p>We understand that the governing bodies of Mortimer St. Mary's Church of England School and Mortimer St. John's Church of England School are considering how best to achieve this united response and when the PCC receives this united response it will confer with the Diocesan Board of Education and form its own view and be in touch with you again.</p>	See response to St Mary's School governors representation 1345 above
Wokingham Borough Council WDC/1 WDC/2 0473	<p>The Council's response will be considered at an Individual Executive Member Decision meeting on the 14 January 2016. In advance of the meeting and close of the consultation, please find below the Councils provisional response. Wokingham Borough Council welcomes clarification on the following areas: That the education needs for primary and secondary schools arising from the proposed development have been assessed and appropriately addressed.</p> <p>That the transport impacts potentially arising from the proposed allocation have been assessed and appropriately addressed. Once agreed I will send you a copy of the IEMD report setting out the Council's agreed response</p>	<p>No formal assessment has been made, Policies included for expansion of Infant School provision. Lack of funding made allocation of land for relocated Junior School inappropriate. See response to St Marys School Access to site confirmed; WBC assessed traffic movements at 60 vehicles per hour peak; this is not considered a problem (Strawberry Fields of an equivalent size has not caused congestion problems) Detail design as part of planning application</p>
Englefield Estate EE/1 EE/2 EE/3 EE/4 EE/5	<p>See Appendix1 for full submission</p> <p>Settlement Boundary change request</p> <p>Affordable Housing – Request that NDP includes 'adjoining parish' with all the classes of people that WBC are asked to give priority to when allocating affordable housing.</p> <p>Biodiversity Policy B1 – Object to the policy as in contravention to NPPF and WBC strategy policies</p> <p>Commercial policies C7 and C8 – Object to these, C7 inconsistent with NPPF and C8 on the grounds that NDP ruling out light industrial development in reuse of rural buildings.</p> <p>Commercial Policy C3 – Englefield suggest this could lead to pressure for conversion of residential buildings because new buildings appear to be ruled out.</p>	<p>Considered and refused by SMPC</p> <p>Included in revised section</p> <p>Same point made by WBC. Biodiversity section revised</p> <p>Similar point made by WBC. Commercial section revised</p> <p>C3 removed</p>

1457		
IR12/1	I must again express my deep concern with regard to the proposed development of land between The Avenue and St John's Road, behind the Horse and Groom public house at Mortimer Common. The erection of at least 110 houses on this site will have a huge impact on this area, and will change the shape of our village completely	Noted
IR12/2	The proposed entrance to the site by the old Tower house is, in my opinion, very dangerous, as it is only approximately 60 metres from the crown of the bend on the Street, and although there is a 30 mph speed limit in place there, vehicles do approach that spot at far greater speeds, and I am sure this will become an accident black spot, if the development is permitted to continue.	WBC assessment does not identify any road safety issues. Access to this site has been confirmed with WBC and the developer of the 'Fairwinds and land at Tower House' site as being via the 'Fairwinds and land at Tower House' site which is located to the north of the north-east corner of the allocated site.- A proposed access design for the Fairwinds and land at Tower House site is shown in the Site Design Brief
IR12/3	We do have a great amount of wild life in and around the proposed site, including deer, red kites, buzzards, heron, and bats, and ,although we are led to believe that there are plans in place to site new bat boxes, they need to be in large trees, which do not exist on this site, so most of this wild life is likely to disappear completely..	Requirement in the NDP to protect and enhance wild life on the site policies B2, B4, and SDB. Planning policy requires protected species to be catered for (bats). Existing trees to be maintained and new ones added. Larger area of wild life/green space to be provided (approx. 3ha). SuDS will probably provide increase water/pond feature. Will be addressed as part of Planning Application.
IR12/4	The extra number of vehicles using the station car park must be taken into consideration, as it is dangerous at present at the bottom end of the Street during most days,with a great number of cars parking on the road until late into the evening, what will it be like when we could have an extra 50 - 100 cars attempting to use this car park ?	Policy and project included to address station parking
IR12/5	I am sure that the local schools and surgery will need to be enlarged to cope with the extra numbers moving into the village, and although we understand that a site will be left for redevelopment of both, where will the money come from to complete this task ,certainly not from Newbury Council's budget.?	WBC have indicated Infant School is near the top of their priorities for funding. Also possible diocese will provide funding. St John's and WBC strongly support the reservation of land for a new school. Relocating the doctors' surgery would allow better parking and possibly future expansion to cater for additional and/or devolved services. NHS England are a year or so into a 5-year study into devolving certain services currently provided by hospitals out to doctor's surgeries. At this stage feasibility studies and fund sourcing for the surgery are ongoing. It is prudent to reserve land at this stage
IR12/6	Is the sewerage station at the bottom end of the village capable of coping with the extra load, as it was not many years ago that it overflowed and left raw sewerage on the road, outside St Mary's school. This was before the development of the Strawberry Fields site.	Policies to address this are included IS6 and Thames Water have submitted very strong recommendations to place requirements on developer prior to planning application
IR12/7 1450	The above are just an example of problems that I personally envisage if this development is permitted to go ahead, and i strongly advise that it be rejected by all concerned.	It is not an option for Mortimer not to provide 110 new homes
Pro Vision on	Appendix 1 for full submission	The site shall be allocated for a period of 5 years from the

<p>behalf of TA Fisher</p> <p>1452</p>	<p>School and Surgery Review Period –</p> <p>As drafted, Policy SDB3 requires a review of the whole allocation “if no progress has been made at the end of the period in providing the facilities”. However, that would be unreasonable if the landowner and/or developer had secured planning permission and were working towards the delivery of the development.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>formal adoption date of this NDP. If, at the end of this period, outline planning permission has not been obtained for the development required by policy SDB1 a review of the allocation shall be carried out via a review or partial review of the NDP. In addition, if within 5 year period outline planning permission for the development has been obtained, but no progress has been made to secure the relocation of St John’s Infant School or the doctor’s surgery, a review of that part of the allocation shall be undertaken through a review or a partial review of the NDP</p>
<p>IR13</p>	<p>I ask the Parish Council to review the standard guidelines for storm rainfall that inform flood management design and to consider strengthening the flooding policy in the NDP if worst case conditions are significantly worse than the standard design criteria, in particular by :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Establishing the base storm rainfall (mm over an extended period onto saturated ground) that must be accommodated with an allowance for climate change (+30%); 2.Requiring the flood management design to be able to handle a short intense rainfall e.g. similar to that experienced in 2007; 3.Requiring the planning application flood management design to demonstrate that the design does not increase and ideally reduces flood risk on the site and downstream. <p>The requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) regulations are that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, ...” (paragraph 99 NPPF) 2.Using opportunities offered by new development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding” (Paragraph 100 NPPF) 3.A site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. (Paragraph 102 NPPF) 4.When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. (Paragraph 103 NPPF) <p>From the above regulations it is clear that the intention is that flood risk on the site and elsewhere is not increased and should seek to reduce the flood risk taking into climate change.</p> <p>The storm of 2007 might provide a minimum base on which to assess flood risk and to design the flood management systems..</p> <p>In Mortimer, the storm had two distinct elements (see reference 1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The very high rainfall over the longer period <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a.On the 19th July 26mm of rainfall saturated the ground b.On the 20th 58mm in 3 hours. c.Over 81 mm fell over the two days (19th and 20th July 2007) 	<p>Included in new General Design section</p>

1215	<p>2.Intense rainfall on the 20th over a short period a.15mm in 15 minutes b.20 mm fell in 30 minutes c. 0 mm in 60 minutes.</p> <p>In West Berkshire, East Shefford had a rainfall 136 mm over the 2 day period with 111mm on the 20th (Reference 2). At Marsh Farm, Reading the rainfall was 73 mm over 4 hours (reference 3)</p> <p>The Barton Wilmore Monkey Puzzle application flood design appears to be based 100mm over a 24 hour period.</p> <p>I suggest these figures or similar together with the standard tables/guidlines for the 100 year event could inform the base case for determining the flood management designs. The worst case figures +30% for climate change should become the base case for any design. The design also should be able to cope with a short period of intense rainfall.</p> <p>Reference 1 Burt http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wea.151/epdf Reference 2 http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/climate/uk/interesting/july2007 Reference 3 http://www.metlink.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/articles/rainfall_20july07.pdf</p>	
IR14	<p>Firstly and most importantly I would like to congratulate everyone involved with this and thank them for their hard work on putting this plan together. It is comprehensive, well researched and very nicely presented. Clearly an inordinate amount of work went into the by the NPD volunteers and parish council and I feel grateful to live in a village where there are so many community minded people.</p>	Noted
IR14/1	<p>I would also like to raise a couple of points in the hope that someone maybe able to clarify them. Once you have the plan published how binding is it?</p>	<p>Letter to be written When plan approved by referendum becomes a legal planning document as part of WBC policies.</p>
IR14/2	<p>You mention that developers are not legally bound to extend St Johns school or the surgery so purely from a business point of view why would they incur the extra money expenditure. Also if St Johns was extended where would the additional children go in year 3 if St Marys wasn't also extended by the same amount? I understand that it wouldn't move location according to the plan but surely it should be added that both schools should be extended by the same number of additional pupils</p>	<p>Developers will provide land for infant school, not the building. Building will be funded by WBC and/or diocese. St Mary's governors aware of the issue. It is their responsibility to provide the capacity. There may be the possibility of extending the existing junior school on existing site although a project has been included to look at moving St Mary's School nearer to the centre of the village</p>
IR14/3	<p>The plan makes no mention of affordable housing or if the survey we completed highlighted a need for affordable housing for local people?</p>	<p>Section (and policy) on affordable housing was included; this has now been amended to be compliant with WBC policies.</p>
IR14/4	<p>Finally does WBC have its five year housing plan in place? I understand if the local authority hasn't mapped out how it's going to meet its five year housing target then neighbourhood development plans do not hold much weight which would be a terrible shame given all the work and consultation that goes into this process.</p>	<p>Yes - WBC DPD 5th November has up to date Objectively Assessed Need and land allocation.</p>

1451	All in all though a good plan and again we done on all the thought and process that has gone into this.	
IR15	By implementing a neighbourhood development plan (NDP) the residents of Mortimer have control over future development requirements for the village. I fully support the NDP including the requirements and constraints detailed in the draft document dated 23 August 2015. I further believe that all residents have been given the opportunity to engage in the consultation process and that evidence is available to support the equitable approach to this.	Noted
1453		
IR16	I'd like to provide the following feedback on the August draft of the Mortimer Neighbourhood Development plan. 1. I am very impressed with the efforts made by the NDP team to capture residents opinion and refine the recommendations through the process of creating the NDP document. As a volunteer (working to create the on-line version of the questionnaire) I have become aware of the significant research and efforts that have gone into the process and this is obvious too from the written output, including the "evidence base". 2. I note that the NDP questionnaire is more thorough and detailed than others I have seen, It is a testament to the level of engagement that so many people completed the questionnaire, given it would probably have taken them quite a lot of time to do so.	Noted
IR16/1	3. concerning the possible uses for the Community Infrastructure Levy referenced on page 48, I strongly suggest that the station car park is made top priority, rather than third. I also suggest that community run CCTV be purchased for the central areas of the village, including the fairground. The widespread availability of 'cloud based' WiFi and 4G products may this a cost effective idea. 4. Although I sympathise with the concerns of those villagers who live close to the proposed development, I believe that the proposed site will a) have negligible impact on traffic flow on Victoria Road (The Street) and b) give the maximum chance for St John's school to be re-housed. It also meets the clear wish to have the homes close to the centre of the village. 5. I note that Mortimer is leading the way in West Berkshire in formulating an NDP. I see nothing but gains to the village through the hard work that has been done - notably the automatic "extra" funding the village will get for new infrastructure solely through the existence of an approved NDP. 6. no other site(s) that I have considered meet the needs of the villagers, as expressed in the NDP questionnaire, in addressing the requirement for 110 houses between now and 2026. 7. The process of formulating the NDP was extremely well publicised via multiple means, as was the questionnaire process itself. I note the very high return rate of the questionnaire. Although I am on the Parish Council I joined in May, after the questionnaire was published.	Priorities to be determined by Parish Council .Uncertainty as to when CIL will be available.

1454	My comments listed above are based on my awareness of the NDP as a member of the public and as a volunteer assisting mainly with the on line questionnaire.	
IR17	We would like to object, in the strongest possible way, to the proposal which involves land to the South of St. Johns Infant School, earmarked for 110 houses. The areas of our concern are as follows:- 1/ The requirement / need for the NDP proposal 2/ Infrastructure overload 3/ Access + Traffic problems 4/ Adverse effect on nearby residents 5/ NDP Consultation process	<i>Noted</i>
IR17/1	1/The story that we have been fed, is that unless Mortimer went down the NDP route, then WBC would implement/enforce their policy based on land that had already had been earmarked, namely site MOR006. This had a potential deliverable period of 11-15 years., And this was for 177 dwellings (But no School or Surgery) This was published in 2013.	WBC would allocate St John's (90) and West End Rd (47) sites (see DPD)
IR17/2	Also all the other possible sites, ie MOR002, MOR004, MOR005, MOR007 & MOR008 had also been allocated for potential development.	Sites were not allocated they were put forward by landowners for consideration.
IR17/3	However, the WBC stated under suitability:- for MOR006, "The site is well related to the centre of the village, with residential development on three sides. Access to the site is a considerable constraint.	Access to this site has been confirmed with WBC and the developer of the 'Fairwinds and land at Tower House' site as being via the 'Fairwinds and land at Tower House' site which is located to the north of the north-east corner of the allocated site. A proposed access design for the Fairwinds and land at Tower House site is shown in the Site Design Brief
IR17/4	A tree preservation order is present to the west of the site and a public right of way borders the site. The site is close to prehistoric burial mounds and archaeological features, meaning consideration of the historic environment would be required. Potential landscape impact and loss of grade 3 agricultural land".	WBC SA/SEA states not a concern
IR17/5	It would appear now, that both St. John's School and the Doctors Surgery cannot/do not want to move. The whole premise for the need has gone.	St John's and WBC strongly support the reservation of land for a new school. Relocating the doctors' surgery would allow better parking and possibly future expansion to cater for additional and/or devolved services. NHS England are a year or so into a 5-year study into devolving certain services currently provided by hospitals out to doctor's surgeries. At this stage feasibility studies and fund sourcing for the surgery are ongoing. It is prudent to reserve land at this stage
IR17/6	If all these sites had already been identified , then what benefit has the NDP given to the community? - Basically - NONE!	By NDP selecting the site, strongly influences site design, gets additional 10% of CIL money, able to create policies affecting many other aspects of the village and future developments.
IR17/7	2/The main problem with any development of this size is the impact on the village. Nowhere,	No more homes is not an option. Land reserved for new

	<p>either in the NDP or from West Berks, is the effect that an influx of 200+ adults and potentially 100 + children, including the possibility of at least a hundred cars, will have on our village. The Schools are at bursting point. It seems to everybody, that West Berks and the NDP are oblivious to the effect that this potential increase has on all the aspects of life in Mortimer, e.g., Traffic, play areas, parking, Doctors, Dentists, litter, anti social behaviour, dog mess and petty crime, plus the need for easy access for Emergency services, which has been steadily rising over the years.</p>	<p>enlarged school also for enlarged surgery if that is considered necessary in the longer term. WBC highways are satisfied extra traffic not an issue</p>
IR17/8	<p>Also, as has been acknowledged by West Berks, that the potential for flooding is a distinct possibility, particularly as the land has a significant slope, so water disposal due to high run-off, will be a significant problem, not necessarily in the immediate area, but downstream</p>	<p>National and WBC policies require that surface water flooding does not make matters worse and preferably to reduce the risk of flooding Modern design can manage flooding issue and is a requirement under planning regulations The NDP include specific reference and requirements regarding flooding</p>
IR17/9	<p>3/The access to the site, from and to the Street, for motor vehicles, is one of the biggest problems. Although the site lines seem adequate, it will be obvious that a roundabout is the only device capable of assimilating traffic from 3 directions. This would mean a much bigger roundabout than at "Strawberry Fields" as significant roadside parking is taken up with parents taking children to & from St. Johns School - twice a day. All the traffic surveys hitherto, have not taken this fact into account, as it was thought that the school would move. The whole safety aspect of this scenario is too complex to contemplate, particularly as there will be pedestrians (including young children) crossing the new site access road, with potentially, traffic crossing the pavement in two directions. The only safe option would be 3 way traffic lights with pedestrian options. The delays this would cause to the main road, would be horrendous, causing significant traffic back-ups, with lorries, vans and cars polluting the very area where children are walking. This is NOT an option. And of course, emergency services trying to get to the main part of Mortimer, or beyond would have serious problems.</p> <p>In addition to parking for the school, on Tuesdays and Wednesdays there is parking on the Street for the Walking for Health groups, as the car park at the village hall cannot cope. Plus many times with events at the hall, The Street is the overspill, which will making exiting from the access road very difficult.</p>	<p>New homes will be within walking distance of St John's and should not increase school traffic</p> <p>Access to this site has been confirmed with WBC and the developer of the 'Fairwinds and land at Tower House' site as being via the 'Fairwinds and land at Tower House' site which is located to the north of the north-east corner of the allocated site.. A proposed access design for the Fairwinds and land at Tower House site is shown in the Site Design Brief</p> <p>New homes will be within walking distance of St John's and should not increase school parking</p>
IR17/10	<p>4/Very little attention has been focussed on the effect to nearby residents like ourselves. Our eastern boundary will be the service margins of the new access road. This is our garden fence, so we are going to experience traffic up and down, day & night right next to our garden. We know we are not entitled to a view, however we have a right to clean air and low noise, especially when we are sitting in our garden, some 6 metres from the access road. If the development ever gets approval, then we will insist that the developers provides us with a 6 ft fence with acoustic screening so that at least we can continue to enjoy our garden, which we have for nearly 27 yrs. The costs for which, is a drop in the ocean, compared with the cost of development.</p> <p>Similarly, "Greengates" and "Dudley House" to the east of the access road have similar</p>	<p>Site Design Brief contains policies to cover mitigation</p>

	concerns. And in particular, the entrance to their driveway, is right next to the access road, which would cause them significant problems.	
IR17/11	5/The NDP has, in our opinion, not served this Parish well. Despite all the fanfares, exhibitions, so called surveys, etc etc, they have come up with plans which had been with West Berks for several years. And, almost to a man, they all live quite remote from the intended site. What is even worse, they promoted stories, that their plan would have a lesser impact than that from WBC and we have to accept it. Well we don't.	See consultation evidence base WBC preferred options is MOR006 site (90) and West End Road (47) = 137 homes. Have to accept 110 new homes is the lowest that can be achieved
IR17/12	What is one of the worst aspects of the way the NDP went about their consultations and meetings, was that they usually met at 10.30 AM, when working people could not attend. AND what is worse, they posted only a single small notice on the Library Notice board, not all the notice boards in the village like they should have done. So for the best part of a year, the general public were not aware what was going on.	Developing plans were available regularly in PC minutes, PC newsletters, at the exhibition, in the questionnaire and on the website at each stage before finalisation. No request to change meeting times ever received - it could have been done. The 10:30 meetings were working meetings of the Steering Group, open to the public; public consultation meetings were held at weekends and in the evenings
IR17/13	It wasn't until the stormy meeting in St. John's Hall, that many more people finally found out the truth.	The v high response rate to the questionnaire shows that the majority of the population were aware
IR17/14	Also, the rather underhanded way, that the "Initial development concept" which saw the light of day at the same meeting, included the School, Surgery and the T.A. Fisher development for 17 houses (which had nothing to do with the NDP - supposedly) It is our intention, and many more people as well, we will fight this expansion to our village and certainly will be voting NO when the referendum comes	School and surgery were a significant part of the exhibition and a major part of the questionnaire Tower house development was not part of the design it was shown for completeness and being transparent. It is not part of the NDP.
IR17/15 1455	Also we strongly object to sending this e-mail to a closed address, where other members of the public cannot read it. Surely a proper website could have been done in the timescale. And there was no shortage of money	All submissions and responses will be published when NDP is completed and approved by the PC
IR18 1456	Just a quick note to thank you for the excellent work done to put together this document. I entirely agree it's contents. It is well researched and is the result of a fully democratic process.	Noted
Environment Agency 194	Low risk – no comment	
Health & Safety Executive 1292	Checked and have no representations	
Office of Rail and Road 1306	Not relevant to us	
Office of Nuclear Regulation 1438	Down to WBC who are responsible for off-site emergency planning for AWE	

Appendix 1 – Longer Representations

Click on the PDF icons below to view the original submissions which were too long to put in the table on previous pages.

West Berkshire Council



WBC presub
Response (Final)



WBC - NDP Basic
Conditions compliance

IR 4 Proposed change to settlement boundary



N. Kiley - Note to
neighbouring homes



Map of proposed
boundary revision



Larger scale map



N. Kiley presub
comments 9 Dec 15



N. Kiley presub
comments 21 Dec 15

Foster Wheeler on behalf of National Grid



National Grid pre-sub
response NDP

Historic England



Historic_England_rep
resentations

Barton Willmore on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd



Barton Willmore -
Covering Letter



Barton Willmore -
Representation

Englefield Estate



Englefield Estate - re
Spring Lane site



Englefield Estate
Surface water floodin



Englefield Estate
representations

Pro Vision on behalf of TA Fisher



TA Fisher
representations

Appendix 2 - Notes of a Meeting with WBC

Review of WBC Pre-Submission Representations 5th January 2016 in WBC Offices

Present:	Liz Alexander	WBC
	Rachael Lancaster	WBC
	John Cornwell	Mortimer NDP Steering Group
	Mike Dennett	Mortimer NDP Steering Group
	Pat Wingfield	Mortimer NDP Steering Group
	Tennant Barber	Mortimer NDP Steering Group

Purpose of the meeting was to review WBC major representations and Mortimer NDP (NDP) concerns, and to agree a satisfactory way forward.

1. As the WBC submission is a public document and it has been stated that WBC could not accept the NDP because it is non-compliant the Mortimer NDP Team were concerned as to how this apparent impasse could be resolved. WBC advised that following discussions revised sections of the NDP can be submitted to WBC. If WBC confirms that the revisions are acceptable this is recorded in an exchange of letters and is added to the consultation evidence and statement.
2. WBC advised that WBC policies (in the Core Strategy) should be omitted from the NDP in order to simplify planning officer's task when considering a planning application. This avoids cross referring between the NDP and WBC and National policies.
3. Agreed to send WBC the initial draft of the pre-submission consultation for comment. In regard to publishing the representations it was advised that
 - a. The statement should identify the categories of people/organisations consulted
 - b. List the NDP responses to submissions within each category
4. WBC advised that the NDP should include in an appendix a list of the evidence statements and cross reference to the parts of the NDP for which it is relevant.
5. WBC confirmed that the Site Allocation Evidence statement fully met the requirement.
6. **Affordable Housing Mix**
 - a. WBC confirmed that HD2 is non-compliant and would have to be amended for the NDP to be accepted
 - i. HD2 should be removed
 - ii. In the context and justification there could be included a statement along the lines
 1. The starting point is compliance with WBC policy CS6
 2. If evidence indicates an alternative mix is appropriate or government legislation is such that affordable (ownership) is to be favoured
 3. Then the mix would be reviewed at the planning application stage for a greater percentage of ownership.

It was noted that such text would be taken into account by the housing officer. The debate would be between the developer and WBC.

- b. Definition of 'Starter' home – it was agreed that this is a combination of
 - i. newly built compact houses or flats specifically designed and built to meet the requirements of young people buying their first home
 - ii. a first-time buyer below the age of 40, with a discount of at least 20 per cent off the market value capped at a sale prices of £250,000
- c. Rural exception site – though advantageous and would meet the wishes of the NDP the Mortimer NDP understanding is that such a site cannot be included within the proposed development; Mortimer NDP understand it has to be on a site provided at low cost and

adjacent to the settlement boundary. *WBC are to establish whether a rural exception site can be included within the allocated development site.*

7. **Commercial Policies**

- a. C3 Advised remove
- b. C7 Advised that reference to expansion of the net floor area be removed
- c. C8 This is non-compliant and any policy must positively support economic activity
- d. Include supporting text that supported development as long as it respected the status of a Rural Service Centre

8. **Access and Parking**

- a. **Access Evidence** – This will be included in the NDP
- b. **Parking Standards** –
 - i. WBC parking standards will be adopted and garages will not be included in the count.
 - ii. NDP will be amended to reflect WBC preferred provision of supplying drop off space not parking space for the school.
 - iii. Concerns over the clarity of some of the terms used in the NDP were noted e.g. definition of a kerb and tarmac

9. **Green Space Selection**

- a. Identification of evidence of the legal status of land as a common is available in the national register
- b. Selection of Green Spaces must be justified by evidence that the criteria for designation as a green space are met. Must be included in the NDP

11. **Flood Policy**

- a. Additional factors that NDP might wish to be taken into account in the anti-flood design were listed – assumption rain falls on saturated ground, worst case rainfall evidence should be the base case, short high intensity burst should be catered for. WBC did not object but pointed out the costs of this might make the development of the site uneconomic or too high a cost.

12. **Policy NDP1** NDP1 was not a problem and could be included (We think)

13. **5 year Review of Reserved land for school and surgery** – agreed wording needs to be clarified.

14. WBC advised that a section at the end of the NDP should be included stating how the delivery of the NDP will be monitored.

15. **Heritage Pack** – WBC drew attention to the suggested wording provided by the archaeology team

16. WBC stated that there needs to be a statement of the changes made and why.