

From: [REDACTED]
To: [LDP](#)
Subject: Reference LDP2021NN
Date: 21 June 2020 15:01:18

I strongly object to the removal of this land from the Green Belt and to developments OP1 & OP2. The proposed area is Greenbelt designated. Other sites are available in the local area which are NOT Greenbelt designated. Development Meeting stated that a National Requirement or Established Need for the use of Greenbelt is required IF NO OTHER SITE IS AVAILABLE.

The LDP admits that there is insufficient sewage capacity for all the proposed housing sites. It also admits that the site suffers from surface water so the housing would be at risk from flooding.

It suggests that “improvements” might be required both to B999 and the C-Class road east of the development, a clear admission that this development will generate significant additional traffic. The C-class road which is used mainly by farming traffic and local residents would not cope with 400+ cars. Potterton currently has an average 1.7 cars per household - based on that assumption, there would be an additional 396+ cars

Transport Note commissioned by [REDACTED] on behalf of Barratts considered

1: NO IMPACT TO COMMUNITY FROM CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC

I categorically dispute that conclusion as we are only now beginning to get back to normal after the considerable 3 years of disruption from AWPR development ie Noise, Heavy Traffic (lorries), dust inside our home, ruined car tyres and many more.

2: POTTERTON HAS A FREQUENT BUS SERVICE

Frequent is less than 15 min according to Local Bus Service Policy. Stagecoach currently provide 10 buses [Monday-Friday between 07.03 and 20.35](#) hours and 5 buses [on Sunday between 11.30am and 22.03](#).

3: THERE ARE NO CONSTRAINTS/ISSUES OR BOTTLENECKS ON EXISTING ROADS ON ROUTE TO AWPR

With an approximate additional 400 cars using a class road there would indeed be bottlenecks/constraints.

A 60% increase in housing and increase in the population in the village will require a more pro-active police service. We chose to live in a safe rural setting, benefitting from a sense of community and a low crime rate.

AMENITIES WITHIN VILLAGE

There is no provision in this Plan for increased amenities within the village. Current schools, roads and infrastructure could not support this development. It is noticeable that planning permission has been granted to erect 4 Units in the car park of The Stead Inn Public House which will logically reduce the car parking facility for this establishment. This approval flies in the face of current planning permission to have adequate parking facilities for patrons. These 4 units will again add to the increase in traffic on Manse Road

which is narrow and primarily used by farming traffic and residents. It is also worth mentioning that the proposed entry to the site is directly opposite the entrance to the Stead Inn Car Park. It should be noted that there is access to the proposed building site between the houses at [31-33 Denview Road](#). Should Barratts decide to also use this for access this would seriously add to the volume of traffic in Denview Road.

WE WILL LOSE OUR VALUED GREEN SPACE

The [REDACTED] report proposes that the Ancient Woodland counts towards “Green Space” - this would allow for less green space on site. It is also worth noting that the proposed Plan is for 233 houses but the site plan only shows 180 which is 53 houses short.

Our environment and wildlife will suffer the impact. Our Ancient Woodland is home to some important biodiversity and is being put at risk of preservation.

STRATEGIC GROWTH PLAN

It is interesting to note that the 2019 Local Housing Land Audit stated that a minimum of 5 years land supply is required to meet the Strategic Growth Plan and in 2019 they had 7.5 years of supply of housing land (excluding this LPD) and we're now in an economic downturn which will last for at least the next few years.

I hope that these observations will bring to your attention that there is a strong and valid case in objecting to LDP2021NN.

Ray Barnett



Sent from my iPad