

On Friday 24 August, at 7:49 AM, Sarah Dexter wrote:

Dear Mr. Sam Townley

August 24th 2018

Thank you for your email dated the 20 July 18 advising me of the changes in the NPPF. I have already advised my planning consultant to look into this to see if it effects anything concerning GNP6 and the proposed Access road plus the houses in the triangle.

But I will take this opportunity to write to you and if you can pass this on to the examiner Mr. Timothy Jones please, concerning some things that were said in the Public hearing by the examiner Mr. Timothy Jones on Goring Neighbourhood Plan in the Goring Village Hall on 11th July which were not correct. At the time I felt like I could not keep on going backwards and forwards with the members of the GNP as it might have irritated the examiner - but it has been playing on my mind and I would like to correct what was said wrong by a member of the GNP.

1) Concerning our studies to bring the access road out onto Springhill road a member of the GNP said that our Parking beat survey was done on a bank holiday weekend - this is not correct as it was done on the 15th May 18 as shown in our Glanville report - Review of proposed access to site GNP6 page 4 no. 1.4 The bank holiday was on the 7th May 18 2 weeks before.

2) Following my speech about my concerns with the proposed access road onto the Wallingford road and houses in the triangle (GNP6) A member of the GNP implied that they had written 3 reports and pages and pages about this and went back again and wrote pages and pages.

To put this into context.

The main Goring Neighbourhood plan Bramhill Landscape Capacity Study report Sept 2016 was 108-page document page 59 to 63 is GNP6 in which it recommends that only part of this site has capacity to accommodate some development with careful mitigation - it excludes the triangle and access road which is considered to be Major adverse and recommend Restore.

The first GNP Landscape Capacity Study Supplementary Report Jan 17 is an 18 page document dedicated to all the sites chosen - the last 5 pages are concerning GNP6 of which 16 to 18 explains the reasoning why they changed their mind to accept development on the triangle and the proposed access road coming out onto the Wallingford road - the rest is about the Orchard and the development above Springhill road.

The second GNP Landscape Capacity Study Supplementary Report June 17 is a 10 page document for GNP6 almost all of it was dedicated to the Old Orchard - there was only one paragraph on page 7 no 30 referring to the houses in the triangle and the proposed access road which only said that previous recommendations have been made that address this area in detail and they have nothing further to add. To sum up GNP comments in the meeting were misleading because the pages and pages they suggested they wrote about was to do with the Orchard and not the Triangle or the access road.

3) We brought to the examiners attention that in the Regulations 16 response from SODC Comments and recommendations to GNP (I have attached) at No 15 is says “ we recommend that all individual site allocations policies should be amended to avoid being overly restrictive and unduly onerous” The Triangle and access road decision to change the original recommendations not to develop was on this careful mitigation - if take a lot of it away then it no longer stands valid. In the meeting a member of the GNP denied having seen the recommendation I referred to from SODC.

I understand that the examiner will of course be looking into all the evidence presented and do not wish to take away from his expertise in any way. But strongly felt the need to point out these points as they could be misleading.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email.

I would be very grateful if you can pass this onto the examiner Mr. Timothy Jones.

Your sincerely

Sarah Jane Dexter

On behalf of the Wallingford road residents group