

## P08/W1028/O and P08/W1029/O Consultation Responses

	Traffic	Loss of Agri land Archaeology	Policy Objection	Impact on School	Impact on village character	Green Field Development	Sustainability
<b>Objectors</b>							
<b>Neighbours on Benson lane and The Street</b>	<p>Noise and air pollution from increased traffic</p> <p>Queues on the street are already heavy at peak times.</p> <p>The Old Reading Road is gridlocked between 8.30am and 9am.</p> <p>Very little parking in Wallingford.</p> <p>Crowmarsh does not have an adequate road infrastructure for a scheme this size.</p> <p>We won't need traffic calming if they don't build.</p> <p>Would create 1700-25000 additional car movements a day.</p> <p>Already traffic problems which would be increased.</p> <p>Proposed roundabout would create a rat run and further queues of cars would make an unpleasant and unhealthy environment to live in.</p> <p>Wallingford has an</p>	<p>We are constantly being asked to buy British and local produce. We should be encouraging small holders to take up food production on sites like these.</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land is unacceptable.</p> <p>This is high grade agricultural land it is not acceptable to build on land of such value. There is little high grade land in this county and people have a responsibility to maintain such land particularly in current wheat crisis.</p> <p>Removal of agricultural land will add to increased flooding risk.</p>	<p>Site is not allocated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Contrary to policies in SOLP.</p> <p>Should not be considered in absence of a completed LDF.</p> <p>Council should explore the varied and proportionate brown field options available.</p>	<p>How can the small village school cope with extra children?</p> <p>Traffic will be dangerous to school children crossing.</p> <p>Strain on Crowmarsh school and surrounding schools.</p> <p>Whilst the school is full how many of these pupils come from Crowmarsh?</p>	<p>Concern with the amount of housing in and around Crowmarsh with Listed Wilder, Howbery Farm and Carmel College Sites.</p> <p>Too big for a community the size of Crowmarsh.</p> <p>Crowmarsh is an individual settlement. The Thames is the natural barrier.</p> <p>This would double the size of the village.</p> <p>Would completely ruin the character of this village.</p> <p>This will result in urban sprawl for commuters.</p> <p>200 Scheme will inevitably lead to 420.</p> <p>The development would increase the population and physical size of the village so that it would no longer be classified as a village.</p> <p>Proposal would separate the distinction</p>	<p>This is a rural location and this development is designed for a town.</p> <p>The land is Green Belt</p> <p>Field is one of the only remaining, natural green spaces we have in the area.</p>	<p>Only one shop in the village.</p> <p>Village post office has already closed which is of great inconvenience to residents.</p> <p>There are no facilities or jobs in Wallingford.</p> <p>If children from development had to go to schools outside village, would not be a 'green' strategy.</p>

## P08/W1028/O and P08/W1029/O Consultation Responses

	<p>AQMA due to existing NO2 concentrations. Development would increase this, worsening the air quality we breath and should automatically lead to a refusal of this application.</p> <p>Parking provision in Wallingford is already inadequate.</p>				<p>between Preston Crowmarsh and Crowmarsh Gifford.</p> <p>Distinctive character of the village is omitted in the Bloor documentation.</p> <p>We paid premium prices for houses within a village. Might as well throw our money out of the window if this goes ahead.</p> <p>We already have development in Wilders and Carmel College, that is more than enough.</p>		
<p><b>Crowmarsh Residents</b></p>	<p>Traffic would increase making it hard to get over the bridge.</p> <p>Crossing for school is already unsafe, this would make it a lot worse.</p> <p>I do agree with opening up the Benson Lane junction to stop business park traffic through village.</p> <p>Benson Lane already too busy. Additional traffic chaotic and dangerous for Cyclists.</p> <p>Proposed roundabout would be suicidal.</p>	<p>Field is grade 1 agricultural land.</p> <p>Site is Grade 2 agricultural land, ideal for food production.</p>	<p>Neither application complies with the current local plan.</p> <p>Proposals are outside the parish plans which only allow brown field or infills.</p> <p>Contrary to G1, G2, G3, G4, G5, G6, C5 and H6 of the SOLP</p> <p>Contrary to OCC structure plan.</p> <p>Contravenes Governments Green Belt Policy</p> <p>Should wait until the new local plan is put in place, not exploit the</p>	<p>School is full.</p> <p>The School does not have capacity for further pupils.</p> <p>There is no further space on site to expand the school or the kitchens.</p> <p>Developers have misled people that they have been in contact with the school.</p> <p>Crowmarsh Children would have to go to schools outside the village undermining the sense of community.</p>	<p>Crowmarsh is an independent village and should not be considered a suburb of Wallingford.</p> <p>This number of dwellings would completely swamp and ruin the village.</p> <p>This will not help house local people.</p> <p>We are not part of Wallingford.</p> <p>This development would kill the village community feel.</p> <p>Allowing 200 would lead to the second</p>	<p>Should develop on Brownfield land first.</p> <p>The green fields define the village character and give breathing space between the road systems.</p> <p>The green fields give a sense of space which is important in today's hectic modern living.</p> <p>Applicant fails to recognise the important amenity value of the field.</p> <p>Applicant fails to consider the numerous alternative sites in South Oxfordshire</p>	<p>The loss of the post office and increasing numbers at Howberry park has led to an increase in car movements within the village.</p> <p>Other areas are more sustainable.</p> <p>These proposals do not encourage sustainability or a low carbon footprint.</p>

## P08/W1028/O and P08/W1029/O Consultation Responses

	<p>Locals fought hard to get a bypass to take traffic out of the village. This will make things worse.</p> <p>Loss of the Post Office and Howberry park already increase traffic movements.</p> <p>If Crowmarsh Bridge is gated the village would become gridlocked.</p> <p>Proposed estate road will become a 'rat run'.</p> <p>Oxford-Reading road is already high in accidents, development will increase these.</p> <p>What will be done to protect school children from increased road traffic.</p> <p>If Crowmarsh bridge is gated it will cause gridlock.</p> <p>People will take the shortest route over the bridge and not go around the bypass as originally was the intention.</p> <p>The bridge is already busy with insufficient time for cyclist to cross safely.</p> <p>People won't walk or</p>		<p>current gap.</p> <p>Principle of development was drawn up on sound principles which have not changed and should be adhered to.</p> <p>This application tries to exploit a weakness in the current planning laws.</p> <p>Crowmarsh is not identified for growth under development plan, why should a development which contradicts this plan be permitted.</p> <p>This was not in the local plan for a very good reason.</p> <p>The developer should go away and wait for the LDF to be published and then come back</p>		<p>phase for 420.</p> <p>Gross overdevelopment of the village</p> <p>Historically Crowmarsh has never been part of Wallingford.</p> <p>Crowmarsh has already made a significant contribution to development of the area with the Wilder's Site and Carmel College.</p> <p>This would stop us wanting to buy a house in Crowmarsh.</p> <p>Would make village noisier, busier and less desirable.</p> <p>Surely the Wilders and Carmel college sites fulfil the village's quota for housing.</p> <p>A development of this scale would completely desecrate our village.</p> <p>One storey dwellings adjacent to existing houses would be a valuable gesture towards existing residents.</p> <p>Those of us with young families face the prospect of our</p>	<p>which are more sustainable.</p> <p>Ministers have said that the Green Belt is safe.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--

## P08/W1028/O and P08/W1029/O Consultation Responses

	<p>cycle they will use the car, and cycling is increasingly dangerous through Wallingford.</p> <p>It is already difficult to leave the village especially over the bridge when drivers won't let you out as they have been queuing for a long time.</p> <p>Existing noise from bypass is a nightmare, increasing traffic will only make this worse and more hazardous for children crossing to main village.</p> <p>Proposed new road layout is not environmentally sustainable.</p> <p>Difficult to exit Howberry farm with existing traffic queues</p>				<p>children being forced out. This does not have to be a bad thing.</p>		
<p><b>Other local residents</b></p>	<p>The proposals are not well related to infrastructure such as roads.</p>	<p>A dangerous precedent would be set by building on this agricultural green field site.</p>	<p>Core strategy to be adopted July 2011, this site must be compared alongside others in the site allocations document.</p> <p>These plans are premature when insufficient work has been done on the LDF</p> <p>Contrary to current Local Plan policies</p> <p>The issue of housing</p>	<p>If the school expands further this will have a detrimental effect on the children already attending.</p>	<p>New development is already planned which will put a strain on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Residents have invested in premium priced properties for a rural village location and this will turn it to suburbia.</p>	<p>Councils Housing strategy requires brown field sites to be developed in preference to Greenfield</p> <p>This will spread built area further into countryside and will harm small villages and hamlets.</p>	<p>This is not a particularly sustainable location as highlighted in settlement hierarchy (Nov 2007)</p>

### P08/W1028/O and P08/W1029/O Consultation Responses

			targets should not be overriding policy				
<b>Outside the Wallingford area</b>	Increase in traffic						
<b>Other Developers</b>							

## P08/W1028/O and P08/W1029/O Consultation Responses

	<b>AONB</b>	<b>Pollution</b>	<b>Wildlife</b>	<b>Pavilion</b>	<b>Services</b>	<b>Flooding</b>	<b>Impact on other villages/settlements</b>
<b>Objectors</b>							
<b>Neighbours on Benson lane and The Street</b>	This would destroy the landscape of this village.	<p>Reduced air quality by the bridge.</p> <p>Increased traffic along the Street will only exacerbate existing air quality issues.</p> <p>50% more vehicles on Wallingford Bridge would be very bad.</p> <p>Would mean an increase of at least 800 cars.</p>	<p>Applications play down the importance of wildlife and flora on this area of amenity land.</p> <p>Field home to many species; bats, roe deer, barn owls, stag beetles, shrews, bank voles, field mice. Hedgerows are a notable landscape feature. Research in landscape ecology show s that disruption of natural pattern of connectivity is counterproductive to biodiversity.</p> <p>Essential to retain green spaces to keep access for wildlife to travel between the two.</p>	<p>We don't need another pavilion.</p> <p>Will create a centre for vandals to hang out.</p>	<p>Only one shop in the village</p> <p>This and other developments would turn Crowmarsh into a small town but without the facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Not sufficient services to support this increase in population.</p> <p>Insufficient infrastructure to cope with increases.</p> <p>Inadequate medical and sewerage provision.</p>	<p>Very large area of buildings and roads would lead to an increase in floods.</p>	<p>Wallingford needs development as it is like a 'ghost town'.</p> <p>Wallingford, Crowmarsh, Benson and Preston Crowmarsh would all be severely adversely affected by these proposals.</p>
<b>Crowmarsh Residents</b>	<p>Although not within the AONB the scale of building would have significant impact on this area.</p> <p>This area is an important Green Belt between our village and the Chilterns.</p>	<p>This application is not an eco development and would emit significant GHGs and increase pollution.</p> <p>Carbon omissions will be more than doubled.</p>	<p>Deer and wildlife throughout the site.</p> <p>What action will be taken to preserve habitats of bats, owls, red kites, deer.</p> <p>Site has important hedgerows and wildlife corridors. Likely to result in habitat deterioration compromising its ability</p>	<p>We already have a pavilion.</p> <p>They did not even look to see that we already have a pavilion. Who will run this? Inevitably council tax will go up to fund this additional facility.</p>	<p>Health services are already stretched.</p> <p>Existing facilities are stretched and would not cope with further housing.</p> <p>This proposal fails to consider the needs of existing residents as a whole. Inc electrical grid, sewerage, schools, doctors and</p>	<p>Building on fields would contribute to an increase in risk of flooding in the area. Building so near to the Thames floodplain is ridiculous.</p> <p>This are has a shallow water table and sufficient soakaway drainage cannot be guaranteed. Could lead to local flooding</p>	<p>The proposal would not only damage Crowmarsh but also surrounding villages.</p> <p>With all new developments proposed in surrounding villages and towns the area does not have sufficient infrastructure to cope.</p> <p>Creation of a conurbation would have a huge impact</p>

## P08/W1028/O and P08/W1029/O Consultation Responses

			<p>to support existing flora and fauna.</p> <p>We enjoy walking across these green fields, open space, wildlife and fauna. Housing estate would destroy this.</p> <p>Bats and stage beetles as well as roe deer can be seen down Marsh Lane.</p> <p>Would cause catastrophic disruption to the bats that periodically roost in the trees around the existing fields as well as Great Crested Newts in the stream to the top of Benson Lane.</p>		<p>dentists.</p> <p>Crowmarsh Sewerage already backing up.</p> <p>We have to look outside for our amenities e.g. Didcot, Reading, Benson and Oxford</p> <p>We do our main shopping in Didcot.</p> <p>Services in Wallingford are used but also in Benson and Nettlebed.</p> <p>Surely other areas with good facilities would be better suited to cater for extra population.</p> <p>This would not add to the economy of the village. Crowmarsh is not part of Wallingford.</p> <p>Should have joined up thinking between planners and primary care trust.</p> <p>Without population growth we will continue to lose amenities.</p>	<p>problems.</p> <p>The proposal includes a stream to the back of existing houses on Benson Lane, where will the water come from and why is this necessary.</p>	<p>on Wallingford's infrastructure.</p>
<b>Other local residents</b>		Increased pollution	Loss of wildlife		.		
<b>Other Developers</b>	Proposal would be a detrimental feature in the landscape setting of the AONB.						This site would be supported by the emerging LDF. However, any development should

## P08/W1028/O and P08/W1029/O Consultation Responses

							not impact the potential development of land to the south east corner of the site.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--