

For the attention of Mr. Timothy Jones (Independent Examiner)

c/o Mr. Sam Townley

From Sarah Jane Dexter a member of and behalf of the Wallingford Road Residence Group.

21 November 2018

Re: Goring Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2033) Supplementary Directions 5

Dear Mr. Timothy Jones

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the emails between Ms Sara Bembow and Bramhill I have revisited and revised some of my most important points in the emails, as the recent letter sent to you by the GPC implied that I was muddled - so I have made it much more clear - I have also added extra comments to this and in some places attachments as I was also criticised by the GPC for not having them. My apologies for this it was of my understanding that the Examiner had all the documents supplied to him in the ICO ruling. All documents that I referred to are on the GNP website and not new documents that I am presenting.

21 Nov 16 - 10:32

The houses get put on the triangle as a result of or to justify the road.

GNP 6 - 3) "If road access at that point is mitigated with,.....would it also become acceptable to build houses in the triangle along Wallingford Road as shown in the concept drawings?"

The road access get put in on the Wallingford road *because the developer says it is the only preferred access route.*

GNP6 - 1) "It seems no other road access is possible."

This appears to be the first time Bramhill have been made aware that the access road needs to come out onto the Wallingford Road.

No date presumably around 21 - 22 Nov 16

GNP6 - Bramhill say "Alternative access would be preferable though."

No alternative access route was given to them after this request *because the developer says it is the only preferred access route*. (The summary given by Origin Transport can be found in their report - Draft Commentary to GNP Group - Jan 16 page 5 and the dialogue from the developer on page 4(attached). The Origin Transport consultants report was not revealed in its entirety until Dec 17 GNP reg 14 consultation were it was made publicly available. It then became apparent that no other comparisons have been done to any other alternative access roads - this was not evident from their summary)

Also the developer states “We propose a vehicular access directly onto Wallingford Road only, not on to Springhill Road.” - (Draft Commentary to GNP Group - Jan 16 GNP-GNP6 Landowners’/Prospective Developers’ Board 25 Nov 18.

Presumably after 30 Nov - 09:37

Bramhill after looking at the requested houses along the frontage of the triangle (not under the impression of 25dph) say “ houses along the triangle frontage should be resisted, as the land is very elevated.

This is in line with the recommendations from Bramhill Landscape Capacity Report Sept 17 - Kirkham report 2015 - The Chiltern Conservation Board report submitted GNP reg 14 Dec 17 and the WRRG Liz lake Associated Report Submitted in GNP reg 14 Dec 17 and SODC consultation Jun 18.

7 Dec - 13:00

Bramhill say in preparing their report for the 10 Dec GNP public Exhibition (revealing the sites chosen. “I’m just sorting out the commentary on the triangle” at this place in the emails you can see that the houses on the triangle frontage have now been accepted in the plan.

There is a gap between the emails 30 Nov were they were recommended to be resisted to the 7th Dec were they get accepted.

In a letter from Bramhill attached to the GPC 12 Nov 18 comments to the Examiner - on page 4 para 5 Bramhill explain “these emails were never intended to provide a record of the process that was being followed”

Para 4 “During the course of this period, there was ongoing email dialogue and also telephone conversations which were written up by the steering group representative, and circulated as a record of our conversations, to

provide the steering group with indications of our findings at the earliest possible opportunity in order to meet their meeting schedules and exhibition preparation timetable between 22nd Nov and 10th Dec 2016”

I suggest that as these gaps in the emails between Sara Benbow and Bramhill leave a critical void in the turn around justification of the houses on the triangle. It pushes the necessity of these other forms of communication between Sara Benbow and Bramhill between this time scale to be revealed. At least to the Examiner if he feels this is correct.

The emails from 30th Nov to 7th Dec 16 Also reflect my concerns about the amount of houses proposed in the Southern part of site GNP6 in regard to them showing above the ridge line and being visible from the Wallingford Road and the mitigation proposed for the road access. This is also reflected in our report done by Liz Lake Associates.

30 Nov 18:07

Bramhill after being sent a cross section from the developer comment (referring to the proposed houses in the Southern part of the site) “note how the sight line clips the ridge line of the nearest house. It's rather on the cusp”

“I think they need to offer up several of these sections, see suggested lines on our mark up attached to previous email “

“We suggest a point further north on Wallingford Road,”

“It is up to them to convince you/us”

6 Dec 11:41

Bramhill receive 2 further cross sections sent by the developer - not the 5 as was Bramhill's request or from the point further north on Wallingford Road.

The details to the plan then go ahead without these other cross sections provided although Bramhill had said “ It's up to them to convince you/us”

7 Dec 13:00

The needed cross sections then seem to be left to the Development proposal stage of the plan which I presume is at a later stage as there hasn't been any evidence of any more cross sections since that date.

Development Proposals should therefore:

2nd bullet

“Be presented with a series of cross sections to confirm that this can be achieved“. Explaining the different angles the from the Wallingford road were the cross sections should encompass.

Mitigation of the access road.

Bullet point 2

Bramhill talk about grading and profiling which should enable the road to sit down into the landscape. (As the road rises up the hill there is no way you will be able to hide its visibility from the Wallingford road.)

Bramhill give examples of many types of planting to try and hide the appearance of the road - (obviously it would not be possible to do a lot of mitigation at the mouth of the road because it would cause visibility problems).

“a small amount of additional land take will also help to achieve a well-graded access road with a land buffer on its north side.”

Also in their email 22 Nov 16 Bramhill say “No trees to be planted along Wallingford Rd - would interfere with views to & from new junction.

I now question why after these points raised by Bramhill are not reflected in the developer's new GNP6 Potential Modifications to Illustrative Master plan and Potential Modifications Western Side Dec 17 (1 year later) in relation to their original plan page 26 presentation 7th Nov 16. There appears to be no change given to the access road entrance in this modified plan (only modification given to the orchard.)

Bullet point 4

Bramhill say “It will be important to ensure active management of the roadside vegetation on the east side of the road approaching the triangle, (who is going to do that?)

An observation.

At no point here or anywhere else in the emails between Sara Benbow and Bramhill - or from the developer, regarding the access road, is the subject

of the street lighting brought up! There is no discussions about the lighting pollution and furniture that will be required of the access road proposed. There seems to be so much concern about the roof tops of the houses showing above the ridge (quite rightly so) but nothing written about the street lighting that will be visible in a normally dark open down land landscape in views from the Wallingford Road.

At the bottom of this page its says (see notes below in relation to proposal for houses on triangle) I don't see the notes in these emails.

I note from the GPC comments 12/11/18 to the examiner that they said "It should be noted that the Police expressed concern about vehicle access from the site onto Springhill Road." This also needs to be compared to the Police view on whether they have a concern about vehicle access from the site onto Wallingford Road.

In conclusion I wish to say that the Wallingford Road is one of the main entrances into our village the rolling hill visible on the entrance and therefore needs to be protected

I would like to thank the examiner for taking the time to read my comments.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Jane Dexter

On behalf of the WRRG