

## Site Selection – Site Commentary

<b>Spatial Area:</b>	EKV	<b>Settlement:</b>	Mortimer	<b>Parish:</b>	Stratfield Mortimer
<b>Site ID:</b>	MOR006	<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to the south of St John's Church of England School, Victoria Road, Mortimer	<b>Development Potential:</b>	<del>90-110</del> dwellings (3ha at 30dph)

### Recommendation:

The site is [not](#) recommended for allocation

### Justification:

~~The site is located to the south of Mortimer, surrounded by residential development on three sides. Close to local services and facilities within the village.~~

~~Access issues would need to be resolved.~~

~~[Mortimer Parish Council are in the process of producing a Neighbourhood Development Plan which will allocate a site or sites within Mortimer for approximately 100 dwellings. The Council will not be allocating development in Mortimer.](#)~~

### Discussion:

#### Site Description:

The site is well related to Mortimer village surrounded on three sides by residential development. The site has good access to local services and facilities as well as the open countryside.

A footpath runs along the eastern boundary of the site and would need to be preserved should any development take place.

Telegraph poles cross the site and would need to be taken into account.

[Only the northern part of the site is proposed for development.](#)

#### Landscape:

No landscape assessment has been done.

#### Flood Risk:

The site is within FZ1. The site is at risk from surface water flooding along two small linear lines. An FRA and appropriate mitigation, including SUDs, would be required.

#### Highways /Transport:

~~[Access to this site is a significant issue, with no obvious access point. The Avenue is a private street, which is unsuitable for additional traffic without being brought up to an adoptable standard. Sight lines at The Avenue / The Street junction are also limited.](#)~~

~~[There is concern regarding additional traffic impact in close proximity to the infant school.](#)~~

~~[At preferred options access was a significant constraint to development of this site. However, the site promoter has confirmed that access will be gained to the site via the 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.](#)~~

There are bus stops with a regular bus service to Tadley, Burghfield, ~~Mortimer train station~~ and Reading near to the site.

#### Ecology:

The site is close to a site with Great Crested Newts. ~~An extended phase 1 habitat survey is required.~~ [An extended phase 1 habitat survey would be required together with further detailed surveys arising from that as necessary. Appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures would need to be implemented, to ensure any protected species were not adversely affected.](#)

There are trees protected by TPOs adjacent to the site, but with appropriate buffers this should not have an impact on deliverability.

## Site Selection – Site Commentary

### Archaeology:

There is no known archaeology on this site.

### Education:

The Infant school in Mortimer is at capacity. There is a small amount of capacity at the Junior School. Secondary school provision is provided by The Willink in Burghfield Common which is close to capacity.

### Environmental Health:

There are no known air quality, noise or contamination issues.

### Minerals and Waste:

No known mineral deposits.

No known waste issues.

### Land use planning consultation zone:

The site is in the outer AWE consultation zone, but due to the development potential consultation with ONR is not required.

~~General consultation with ONR on the principle of development within Mortimer will take place as part of the Preferred Options consultation.~~ [ONR have not raised any concerns regarding the proposed level of development in Mortimer.](#)

### Environment Agency:

The site is within SPZ2 and [there is](#) an ordinary watercourse [present on the site](#).

### Thames Water:

~~No comments regarding water supply have been received.~~ [Concern regarding Water Supply Capability. The existing network is unlikely to be able to support the demand. Water supply infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development.](#)

Concern regarding Wastewater services. The existing network in this area is unlikely to be able to support demand. Drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development.

A [water supply and](#) drainage strategy would be required

### Parish Council:

This site is seen as the most logical site for the village. Access is considered to be ok. The proposed 170 dwellings are considered too many for the site. Traffic is not seen as huge issues, as long as a smaller number of houses are proposed. Access to the railway station is not good.

[At preferred options the Parish Council did not comment specifically on this site. However, they stated that the allocation of development should be done through the Neighbourhood Development Plan, rather than through the DPD.](#)

[Discussions with the NDP steering group suggest that this site is their preferred site for allocation, to include land safeguarded for a new infant school and doctors surgery.](#)

### Preferred Options consultation key issues:

- [NDP should allocate development](#)
- [Impact on character of Mortimer](#)
- [Level of development is not justified](#)
- [Spatial strategy](#)
- [Use of brownfield land before developing on Greenfield sites](#)
- [Pressure on infrastructure \(Schools, doctors, sewage\)](#)
- [Should move the junior school to this site and build on the junior school site](#)
- [Traffic/congestion](#)
- [Access cannot be achieved](#)
- [Parking](#)
- [Limited public transport](#)

## Site Selection – Site Commentary

- [Loss of green space](#)
- [Flood risk](#)
- [Impact on wildlife](#)
- [Consultation process](#)

[Response from the site promoter supports the allocation of the site, and is willing to work with who even allocates the site \(the Council or the NDP\).](#)

[For the consultation responses and the Council's response, please see the Statement of Consultation.](#)

### **SA/SEA:**

The SA/SEA indicates a predominantly neutral sustainability impact and does not highlight any significant sustainability issues. Due to its central location within the village the site scores positively in relation to opportunities for walking and cycling and healthy, active lifestyles. There is potential for flood risk on the site, which could have a negative impact unless appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. Mitigation would also be required in terms of ecology and biodiversity to ensure there would not be a negative impact on environmental sustainability. [The development of the site for housing will have a neutral effect on economic sustainability. Whilst housing development contributes towards economic development in the short term through the construction of the site, it is not seen to promote key business sectors and business development in the longer term.](#)

~~There are many positive impacts as the site is well related to local services and facilities within the village. A small area of flood risk is a potential negative impact, but with appropriate design and mitigation measures, including SUDs, this impact would be minimised. There is potential for a negative impact on ecology and biodiversity, but with appropriate mitigation again this impact would be minimised.~~

### **Proposed development (from SHLAA submission):**

The site is proposed for a mix of dwellings types and sizes, including affordable housing.