

## Question 26 'Any Other Comments' Site Selection

Fifty eight comments were on the theme of 'site selection.' The comments included a wide variety of issues – support for the St John's site, concerns about traffic, loss of amenity for people living close to the site, preference for a more distributed solution, preference for small sites (5 -15 homes), loss of rural character, for and against infilling.

Comment
<p>Mortimer is a very successful village with a strong community that has developed and evolved over 100's of years. Whilst I accept the need for 110 houses, the option of placing these in one site (site 7) will create a large housing estate that will not be an integrated part of the village. The option of moving St Mary's would create even more traffic and is not required as the village has coped with the schools being on separate sites for decades, this is part of the reason they are so successful. It is obvious that the parish favours option 7 as this will be the easiest to sell to a developer, as the increased economics of scale of developing on one site will increase the profit opportunity for the developer. This will NOT be in the best interest of the village as it will NOT create the integrated village community that we currently have and must keep. Alternative sites for smaller developments to make up 110 houses MUST be sought by the village if we are to maintain our community. Current small developments are already being built away from the village centre, so I fail to see how proximity to the village centre is an overriding priority. By allowing these smaller developments you have already set a precedent. There is no valid reason why this cannot continue.</p>
<p>I believe there has been only one option considered and we have been asked to vote yes or no. I think a large development of over 100 houses in one location so close to the heart of the village it would have a negative impact on the character. I understand the need for more housing but believe there are more viable options that you have not offered. I think the land west of Kiln Lane a site that already has a development plan with proposed access that can supply the number of dwellings needed has been overlooked. It is closer to the station and between both schools and with in walking distance to the centre. It means people will not drive into the centre of Mortimer as much as the proposed plan behind St John's.</p>
<p>Future new developments should be limited to smaller sites with only access to existing roads. Such a large amount of houses one one site too close to the centre of the village will change the character of Mortimer. The current proposal in the questionnaire offers not options to parishioners and no future for the village as it is. Viable sites have been disregarded to force through Plot 7 regardless of feedback from people who live here. Development in the centre of the village will only cause huge impact and further congestion, changing the whole character of Mortimer.</p>
<p>Any larger scale development will change the character of Mortimer forever - any future development should be limited to smaller sites with access to existing roads. The current "proposal" in the questionnaire offers no options to parishioners and no future for the village as we know it. Viable sites have been disregarded to force through "Plot" regardless of feedback from people who live</p>

in the village. Mortimer is a unique "rural village" in this area and risks now becoming like any other satellite of Reading with all the facilities of a modern town. The future of the village is now in the hands of developers and landowners and the village of Mortimer will Loose. We have been asked to decide on a site that has no access identifies and no overall plan to show the impact on the centre of the village - any new development in the centre of the village will only cause further congestion and impact the character of the "village" of Mortimer

Any development should be as close as possible to the village centre, preferably as smaller sites and with maximum variety of housing styles.

We need to keep Mortimer as a village, too many houses in the centre will not be convenient too many junctions in and out and will ruin village life as it is, we will soon be connected to Grazely and Burghfield

If there is a need for additional housing through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment we consider that Stratfield Mortimer PC should consider allocating Site 5 (land adjoining West End Rd) as a reserve site. This site could be provide with good access, is close to the village facilities and would fit in well with the existing form of the development

Mortimer must stay as close as possible to its present boundaries. If most of the new development is built behind St Johns school hopefully the village will remain largely unspoilt More parking is urgently needed at the station, St Marys School, St Johns School and the surgery. This would also make Mortimer a safer place to live

I feel angry that the recreation area in Stephens Firs (No4 in the NDP plan) is even being considers. We were turned down in 2011 for a 2 storey extension in Stephens Firs and we were told that it would not be in keeping with the area

I would like to see the village envelope of the village maintained

I would like the village to remain within existing boundaries to stop a creep towards sing swallowed up as a part of Reading

Concerned additional housing will further exacerbate the traffic issue getting to the M4 (gravely roundabout) and the new park and ride will also add significant volume. A massive appeal of the village is access to reading/ M4 and not addressing this will negatively impact the village and quality of life. Any new developments should contribute to addressing this issue. Ensure that garden infill is not affected by these plans subject to usual planning permission.

Garden infill should be permitted if wishing planning regs regardless of theses plans

We have literally just bought our first home in Mortimer and now find plans to build over 100 new properties here. While I understand that UK population is growing, with Reading in particular a popular area due to commuter links, the volume of houses in Mortimer seems unnecessary. If it must go ahead, I also feel that placing all or the majority of these in one site is detrimental to the people that live in the immediate area (including the value of their homes, how they perceive where they live and their quality of life

We recently moved to Mortimer for our first home together based on multiple reasons, of which my most important was to feel I had space around me for walking. I am utterly gutted that there seems a good chance plot 7 has already been designated for multiple developments and am currently feeling deep regret for the house we stretched ourselves to buy and do up. I fear these questionnaires will do little to impact/determine the outcome.

My concern is: If as seems apparent from the nature of the questionnaire the chosen site is 7 where is the entrance? I suspect through the halted Fisher Development. I suspect there will be negotiations between Englefield Estate and Fishers to gain this plot of land. Being cynical I have my suspicions another plot of land may be offered in return namely plot 5. If we are using Plot 7 the total development a halt needs to be called on further in-fill otherwise 'ribbon development' will begin. Lets use Plot7 and halt further in-fill.

Question 7 - I chose 7(a), site 7 only, to ensure there is enough incentive for the landowner/developer to agree to make land available for the provision of a new St John's school and surgery. If the land necessary for a new school and surgery can be assured, I would opt for 7(b). If St John's school and/or the surgery move what will happen to those sites? Will development applications be rejected? I also wonder if applications for infill development or Kings Street development come forward can they be/will they be rejected. There is the prospect of not 110 but 120, 130 or more. Can these be part of any new demand from WBC for more homes arising out of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment?

comment next to Q7 - should King St be considered careful thought would need to be given to 'access' for vehicles. Suggest - Bungalow type retirement dwellings which would minimise the number of cars. Windmill Road & King Street are not always easy to negotiate. comment in Q8 - (b) houses allocated to existing St John's site or conversion to small units retirement homes or likewise Similar to take place at The Doctors current site. These two sites could offer a large number of retirement / young person/ single people units in attractive central locations.

too many in fills would give an overcrowded feel to the village

I understand that land to the west of kiln lane is available for development and development of this land (? 50 houses) in conjunction with site 7 would appear to offer the best compromise in leaving sufficient space for future development of the two schools - St John's and St Mary's adjacent to village centre. This additional land is available via Hallam Land Management.

Using sites 3,5 and 6 only would not have such a visual impact on the village, as the use that site 7 would have, and would disperse the buildings and traffic, through out the village and not keep all future development to the East end of the village, to add to the recently developed, very large estate of Strawberry Fields.

is WBC's decision that 110 new homes need to be built to a minimum requirement? - how does the proposal by Hallam Land Management for a residential development on land west of Kiln lane effect WBC's decision? - How many more proposals for residential development are in the pipeline, as yet unseen by the public?

The new housing should be built in section 7. This fills an obvious gap within the 'round' nature of the village. However access to The Street needs careful thought.

Bus Services Footpath to St M's and St schools Site Selection The Reading transport bus service needs to go to the railway station. If a turning circle cannot be found at the station itself, the site at St Mary's School should be used once the school is moved alongside St Johns. The remaining space can be used for housing. Moving St Mary's school must be the TOP priority of SMPC and they must petition WBC and show that this can be done and show that space is allocated for it. The sale of land at St Mary's school will help fund this. Any development in the village will mean more school children and make the existing arrangement more entrenched, with both schools needing to expand and the parking around St Mary's getting worse. Is Stephens Firs really a potential site for

<p>housing? That's just unacceptable for anyone who has bought a house in that area. Regarding area 5, it would be a shame to spoil this border of the village , which leads to attractive tranquil countryside, horses and wildlife. Building here would diminish the close rural access enjoyed by the village.</p>
<p>Maintain the village boundaries, no need to sprawl. Develop in between the top and bottom of the village. Focus on infill.</p>
<p>Why has the plan concentrated on the Common and ignored the many open spaces down The Street which could be developed for housing?</p>
<p>Try to use brown field sites, rather than green field sites, for future development.</p>
<p>This questionnaire feels like the decision of developing on the field behind St John's has already been taken. It would be a real shame to extend there and make the village so much bigger.</p>
<p>Comment q8 - add consequent brownfield sites of existing infants school and doctors surgery to 7(b), thus reducing need to use all of site 7. Consider two-tier schools - infants on ground level and junior on 1st floor, thus reducing land area required for schools - hence cost. Also use existing infants school for doctors surgery &amp; car parking It is crucial that this NDP does not lock out a suitable location for a new junior school, albeit someway into the future.</p>
<p>Comment next to Q8 - further to question 7(a) suggest for consideration sites 3 and 5. Site 3 - access through Strawberry Fields and a roundabout at end of Windmill Rd. Roundabout would exercise speeding vehicles. Site 5 - good access onto West End Road. Site 6 - no into Drury Lane unless considerable expense in widening Drury Lane in both directions.</p>
<p>The woodland designated by the no. 3. Should be preserved as woodland and therefore preserved from any possible future development</p>
<p>It is disappointing to see that the concept of infill with the sale of gardens has been included as one of the options in this survey when this was not part of the consultation. Who made the proposal and have they declared any potential financial gain?</p>
<p>Keep us as a rural village, no street lighting and space around us so we don't join to the next villages. If the houses, new school &amp; doctors surgery gets built on the site at the back of the St Johns....what happens to ST Johns school &amp; the doctors surgery....do these get sold off to build houses...do these come off the 110 ??? Could you move the doctors surgery to ST Johns School ??</p>
<p>To my knowledge, the infill/sale of back gardens was not part of the original consultation and am somewhat surprised to see its prominence in this survey.</p>
<p>Thorough in filling will change the nature of the village more than ribbon development.</p>
<p>"Mortimer Station Development" Car Park for station "for school" To open Mortimer up, not compress it</p>
<p>Using sites 3, 5, and 6 only, would not have such a visual impact on the village, as the use that site 7 only would have, and would disperse the buildings and traffic, through out the village, and not keep all future development to the East end of the village, to add to the recently developed, very large estate, of Strawberry Fields. can I assume that the the use of site, no 7, has already been agreed upon , and Fisher's building site may be used as a possible entrance into the new development?</p>
<p>If Plan 7 is considered a roundabout or traffic lights - should be considered for car drivers exiting that area, which will not impact on traffic flow from village centre or</p>

x 2 roads built for exiting or entering said site.
When considering future housing development surely it would be more prudent to develop near to the station.. This stops the use of cars to get to the station and reduce the amount of car parking space. The schools and Doctors surgery should be kept to the centre of the village
I am not in favour of infill, as this changes the spacious feeling of the village.
No housing developments adjacent to Mortimer Hall (RG7 3NS)
I overlook an area of green in the middle of Stephens Firs - I understand that this was highlighted for potential development but we oppose this as it will have a detrimental effect to the play area that the children of the street have - it would be nice to get a neighbourhood scheme together to maintain and develop this for the benefit of the local children, residents and wildlife
Please do not build a mass centre of new housing in the centre of the village
I feel that as Victoria Road and The Street are already extremely busy roads especially at school start and finish times, to put another 110 houses on site 7 with access from The Street would be a potentially dangerous thing. Particularly as the entrance to this site is very close to St Johns School. 110 houses =180 - 200 ? vehicles. As we are trying to retain a village feel and looking at the map, smaller developments rather than one large one , would help to retain the character of Mortimer.
NDP + Site Selection 1. NO STREET LIGHTS PLEASE!! 2. We must accept that new houses will be built and as such the area at the back of the school is the natural choice.
I am concerned that the only two options open to a general questionnaire are both based around site 7. I feel the development should involved all 7 sites.
I think that site 5 along West End Road should be allocated for development - the King Street site will add to congestion, whilst site 7 has roads more able to cope with extra cars. King Street and Windmill Road are already very congested
Having lived in the village for 18 years, I've seen many changes some for the good, some for the detriment of the village. Accepting that the village needs a future and that future generations want to live here is important. However, there has to be a balanced approach. My over-riding fear is that the rural characteristics of the village will be eroded with increase housing & development. Imposing larger facilities such as bigger commercial premises or enhanced health care suggest 'urbanisation' - the situation where rural communities take on the characteristics of urban areas. Budgens is big enough! Infill developments are painful for many residents. Scattering and imposing new builds on brownfield or windfall sites has become the norm for Mortimer. Replacing one old house with 3 + homes & ignoring the concerns of local residents is becoming too common place. Locating all new homes in one place reduces this situation.
I would also add support here for site 7 as the sensible choice. Site 2 could be helpful as it is already developed as units/storage etc. Site 1 and 3 used as grazing, buffer/woodland have no merits. 4 might be seen as over development. 5 and 6 are best next to 7.
NO building on area '1' Spring Lane. This will cause drainage issue, disrupt wildlife and ruin the tranquil and old fashioned feeling of this part of the village.
Responded (a) in Q7 but also comments in Q8: Why have you not asked our opinion on the other potential sites 1, 3, 4, 5, 6? Choosing (a) or (b) in Q7 seems a restrictive choice

Any new development should be as small scale as possible. Maximise in-fill. Only small 10 - 15 house estates spread across the village. (Could put scattered developments down The Street up to station)

I would love to see the relocation of St Mary's school by a newly developed St John's, close behind the current St. John's site. More school resources could then be shared and a dire parking situation along The Street resolved. I think that there would still be room on the proposed site 7 to build the required number of houses, plus an expanded surgery and school drop off and pick up more considerately managed. The current surgery site could then be developed for retail and the current St mary's site (with the exception of the listed buildings) could then be earmarked for future development in the village without substantially altering the character of the village, needing to take from existing green space such as woodland, or adding to the parking issues at the station as new residents there would be able to walk to it.

NDP + Site Selection Two Comments! 1. The Village Must Grow!!! We don't have a choice if the population keeps growing then we need to build somewhere and as long as its in tune with the rest of the village then we gotta get on and just do it in one hit boom done then the rest of the Village can remain the way it has for the long term rather than putting new homes everywhere changing the scene more generally than just one part of the village like the Strawberry Fields development has done! (The Mini Roundabout for most is all that has changed in this case). 2. Health NHS Facilities! It a fact we ALL have to face that a whole generation (The McDonald's Generation) is going to soon be getting to the age where things break down fast and the need for local easy access help will be crucial to the lives of so many as we all start hitting our 40's 50's and 60's so if we in Mortimer can provide something for not only us here in the village but those from Burghfield Silchester Beech Hill can be helped reducing the stress and travel during the bad times then im very much all for that!!! Thanks!

I understand the need for housing but am just sad that it is going to be taking away from the semi rural village feel of Mortimer and in particular will be potentially devaluing my home and others around it on The Avenue which will now back on to housing estates. ... There are a number of smaller development sites around the village which fit in nicely with the existing style of houses, however another large housing estate such as Strawberry Fields would definitely give Mortimer more of a town feel than village.

Developing in small areas such as Stephens firs and king street is pointless. There is not enough space for new homes and parking, it will also annoy the people already living there. It may cause more people to leave the village because of the changes to the places they have lived in so long being built on.