

Question 6 – Comments on questions 3 – 5 particularly if disagreed/strongly disagreed with anything.

Development Site

Fifty four responses concerned 'Development Sites'. These response must be seen in the context that 997 of respondents strongly agreed/agreed with the principle of minimising the expansion of the village settlement boundary, 996 of respondents strongly agreed/agreed with disallowing ribbon style developments and 1099 supported the principle of encouraging and enabling cycling and walking to the village which is best achieved by being close to the village.

18 respondents advocated a distributed option/not in the centre of the village with expansion nearer the station suggested by 10 respondents. A number of respondents raised the issue of what happens to the surgery site if the surgery moves.

Comment
Your questions are heavily weighted to approving all developments in the village centre. It is totally unrealistic to place 110 homes, a new school and a doctors surgery in the centre of the village. The road infrastructure cannot cope with the traffic. Residents will still drive to their kids to school on the way to work as they do now. I assume the old school site would then be developed as housing, increasing the size of the village again. You say the bank and post office are the centre of the village. Both of these are under threat of closure
I strongly disagree with the NDP 3rd Principle. To suggest development in the two identified areas will facilitate re structure of schools and surgery and parking is romance
If you have residential property in the centre of the village this will increase traffic because people drive to their houses. The optimum distance is between 500 - 800 m to encourage walking. The village needs to move closer to the station this is so important to people so developments between the centre of the village and the station should be considered. The doctors surgery is private and they will not fund a move and they provide a good service and are close to the village centre.
If St Mary's junior school moves we would oppose any potential development (or other commercial development) on its site. Mir should remain green field site.
Any larger new developments should be between the centre of the village and the station to keep congestion to the minimum. The doctors have no reason to relocate - have just gone through resideration and the schools are not full
Mortimer has traditionally been a linear village - any development should be split on a number of sites and infill. Existing school are not full and the Doctor have no reason /requirement to relocate. Any larger new development should be between the village centre and the station to keep congestion in the centre of the village to a minimum
Bringing development into the existing settlement boundary will only make the "village" feel enclosed and noisy. The beauty of the quiet community feel of the village will be lost. IT will become built up like a fringe city town and not at all nice to live in. Concentrate on community and social facilities such as welfare, GP provision, better transport links rather than excluding these aspects by "encouraging non-motorised transport". Not every one has the ability to walk and/or cycle and need good transport

links

Any future residential development should be within the existing envelope boundary. We have already allowed a major breach of the envelope with Strawberry Fields development and this should not be allowed again.

We are a village let's keep it that way - new houses can be built on the outskirts of the village. Why not combine St John's School with St Mary's as there is plenty of land at St Marys that hardly used.

While I accept that we need to take additional housing in Mortimer, I do not see the need to put them all in site 7, instead they should be shared amongst the various plots in the village. Access to site 7 has not been properly addressed and I can only presently see that this would have to be somewhere along Drury lane which would undoubtedly lead to increased car use and not increase walking/cycling in the area. In terms of a ribbon development, we already live in a ribbon of a village and none of the proposed sites exacerbate this to any extent. I would also question why the Kiln Lane site has not been taken into account - I've read the new statement and I don't see how (as Strawberry Fields is already in existence) this could contribute anything other than infilling the ribbon that we already have. St John's may be at capacity, but the school is still advertising for pupils. This trend in recent years has been due to the Strawberry Fields development, producing an influx of young families to the area, unless those families move out for new ones with infant school age children to move in it's a bubble that will move up through St Mary's and the Willink. St Mary's does not need to be in the centre of the village. We have coped with it being down the hill for 100 years and it in fact helps foster independence in our children as they learn to make their way up and down the hill independently. People live in the country for a quiet peaceful life, they do not expect a bustling metropolis with everything on tap. For example I did not return here expecting to be able to work within walking distance of my home. We already have an attractive village centre, so the NDP does not need to provide for it.

Whilst I agree that we don't want to extend the boundary of Mortimer, we must also ensure this doesn't come at a price of tightly compacting every space within the boundary. I didn't move here thinking I'd have everything on my doorstep and we have simple bus routes to Burghfield and Tadley, and a brief train journey to Reading for our convenience.

I don't think development should be too focused on the centre of the village if it leads to the centre becoming too busy and having too much traffic movement - i.e. becoming more like a small town. If some development was a little farther from the centre it would retain more of a village feel, and there would still be housing available for those who need to be near the centre.

1. why on earth should St Mary's be relocated in centre of village!! if its not planned until after 2026 there will be no space as houses will have been built. It's hardly now a stones throw from centre of village as it is! 2. Why does everything need to be in centre of village, we wont be able to move for schools, business and health centres. 3. Development needs to be spread evenly around the whole of Mortimer parish to minimise the impact and keep the rural village community.

Principle 2 I have answered questions 3-5 in the context of providing 110 new homes. However, looking forward and the expectation that WBC will demand a further tranche be provided, which should be strongly resisted, if further developments have to be supplied then the development of homes near the station should be considered but in a manner that does not enable ribbon/infill development down The Street maintaining 4(e) and 4(f) that are essential parts of the vision of Mortimer.

Principle 1 Prefer it to stay as it is. New settlements should not be at centre of village as this will alter character of village. Place them further away eg opposite Turner's Arms or down hill nearer to station if they must be built at all. Do not agree that all ages

should be able to live in Mortimer. It is a superb village and you cannot expect to house everyone. It is something for people to aspire to and work hard to be in a position to buy a house in Mortimer.

Q4a) a site on Hammonds Heath, with parking space off the road utilises the old school for surgery etc. c) doubt if this could be achieved

I like being within five minutes of open countryside at the heart of the village. It would be sad if we infilled all this away.

I think the village developments should be spread to maintain a village feel and avoid compact estate living.

When planning new housing it would be better to position the houses in areas of lower housing density. This would help to keep the village "feel" as opposed to making it feel like a small housing estate. With regards to the health and education facilities, it would be preferable to reduce the intake from outside the Mortimer boundaries to allow them to operate within their original parameters. Continued expansion will only lead to further overuse.

I disagree that the new developments should necessarily be at the centre of the village as it is right now. A second centre could be developed close to St Mary's schools and the railway station with a doctors surgery. This would spread the population more evenly and would strengthen the axis between the station and the green and also enable easy access to the station for the residents of the new development.

Land closest to the village centre (NDP area7) needs to be safeguarded for the development of essential services & facilities such as junior and primary schools and colleges, health care and leisure facilities, police and council offices, shops and car and bus parking to provide easy access for all residents.

Building houses close to the centre of the village is important maintaining the village togetherness, not spreading out towards other villages.

With parking an issue at the schools and station new housing should be between the station and the centre of the village.

I am strongly of the opinion that developments need not be in the supposed centre of the village. On the contrary, I think having developments more spread out would help to maintain the rural nature of Mortimer, which is its prime attraction and what makes it a desirable place to live. Development at the East end of Mortimer, around the station, seems most logical to me, as there are many residents who commute by train, myself included, and having housing near the station would encourage more of these people to walk/cycle. Having no additional people driving to the station would also not worsen the problem of overcrowding in the station car park and the overflow that stretches along the road from the station. Local business in Mortimer is not a primary factor in these developments; residents have little need of more than what already exists. Without huge investments in developments of things like leisure complexes, clothes and electrical goods shops and other such buildings, there will be very little gain for Mortimer residents, who can find all of these services in nearby villages and the town of Reading, only a 12-minute train journey away. The only business-oriented development I feel would be beneficial is another grocery store at the East end of Mortimer, if a housing development is conducted there (both to ease the traffic through the village and for the convenience of the people living in the vicinity). However, though I am no expert on the subject, I find it difficult to see how another grocery store would get enough business to be sustainable unless there was substantial development on the East side of Mortimer.

There are a few areas to develop housing, however I believe Mortimer is a commuter/retirement village and with public transport being limited it will not suit everyone as a

place to live. Keeping Mortimer small ensures that the centre is within a few minutes walk so it will encourage people to walk along with their children to school, doctors etc.

I think the doctors surgery is well placed and central to the village. Do we need a larger surgery for increased population? 2. Protecting unused sites from future development seems a priority. If this is not completed this development plan is futile.

station development with car parking for station and school

i don't think new development necessarily needs to be near the centre of the village

Develop houses near to the Station

Why can't infant and junior school be built together, and the land it free's up have a surgery built on it,ie St. John's and then allow houses to be built on st.marys Mary's?

I do not agree with the premise of every proposal being near and emanating from the current village centre. A network, or criss-cross development has its merits and avoids hub transport movement, too.

I do not believe that there is a need for St Mary's to be relocated, but for Mortimer to develop further down the Street. The thoughts behind this it that at present the School and Rail links seem segregated from the village, but increasing housing near to the school and train station will make the Street safer and bring these into the village.

West Berkshire should be pressured into giving priority to the immediate merger of St Mary's and St John's Schools on to a new site behind St. John's School, Well away from 'The Street' the new enlarged doctors surgery should be located there as well. The old site of St Mary's school should be given over entirely to the development of family houses of which at least one third should be affordable housing. The land should become part of a land swap agreement with land owners and developer to achieve this result. The only housing on the central site should be bungalow for elderly long term residents of Mortimer who are downsizing and need to be within walking distance of amenities as they get older.

If St Marys is moved - what will happen to the land the school is on? Would this then make space for even further development which would be unfavourable

Every effort should be made to merge St. Mary's and St. John's School, away from the Street, on land behind St. John's in the centre of the village and the land currently occupied by St. Mary's used for Private housing with appropriate planning gains for the village.

The centre of the village already has traffic problems without adding to them with the total development being option 7 Further development should be in keeping with the village and spread between other options where it will integrate with the village and not a very large housing estate. Two or three smaller developments would be much better. St Mary's junior school should stay where it is and where it belongs, next to St Mary's Church. Generations of villagers have been pupils at that school.

I think the location of St Mary's is fine and we have to be realistic about the spread of the village. It would be preferable to connect with the lower end of the village and improve St Mary's where it is than try and squeeze everything in the top end of the village and crowd everyone in.

I honestly think the location of Mortimer St Mary's is really fine, and we need to work on the connection between the two ends of the village rather than prioritising one end over the other.

Please do not build on the small triangle in Stephen's Firs, thus destroying the open feel of the area, woodland and wildlife. There must be more suitable areas, less crowded

Please do not use the green at Stephen's Firs as we do not want just an estate that as nothing but houses on our estate but leave the green as it is to make a pleasant looking area

I think with the restricted land available it will be impossible to keep housing, schools, a new doctors surgery with additional parking, for all these, near the centre of the village - where? An enlarged surgery does not need to include an optician, the inclusion of the pharmacy has had an impact on the other chemist in the village. No further business developments such as this, should not have a bad impact on current businesses

Relocation of existing surgery will provide additional land for housing

'Ribbon style' development already exists. The 'old' Mortimer was originally down by the railway station. Q5 5. By implication, St Mary's Junior school should be developed when necessary in its existing position - there is space within the 'ribbon'

I don't think having the development in the centre of the village will reduce people using cars. This is already proved at present. The majority of parents who take their children to St John's could quite easily walk. The same with the surgery.

Current surgery is adequate but parking is dangerous. Ribbon development is desirable choice.

Concern the village will become too squashed up & over developed. Also, I was under the impression that the Post Office is closing down so being close to it is irrelevant. The outskirts of the village towards the train station are under developed.

it is too optimistic to believe that sufficient land will be available to meet the criteria set out in the third principle. Alternative should be considering provision of additional sites to supplement existing parish

Extending the village envelope & developing on land that is more accessible, results in fewer building challenges, would be more practical and result in better homes. Additionally, it would also not concentrate congestion into the middle of the village and if the sites opposite the Turner's Arms were considered, it would not push traffic down tight narrow country lanes.

Extending the village envelope & developing on land that is more accessible, results in fewer building challenges, would be more practical and would result in better homes. Additionally, it would also not concentrate congestion into the middle of the village and if the sites opposite the Turner's Arms were considered, it would not push traffic down tight narrow country lanes.

Principle 3 These facilities should be located where most people live to minimise the need for people to travel to them by car

Principle 3 It would be beneficial to locate schools and services where most people live minimising the need for people to drive to these facilities.

I am concerned that with the option of a) [single site behind St John's school] this will encourage more building and move us from a village to a small town.

Principle 2 There is such a desperate shortage of housing that it houses need to be built wherever possible where there is least objection, without worrying about the shape, size or boundary of the village. Without housing, aspirational and hard working people can achieve little for themselves.