

1. The form and overall scale of development is excessive  
proportion of high buildings across the site  
fit for purpose in accordance with the Planning and  
Pollution Control Regulations 1987 and the  
(i) result in a loss of the character of the site

(ii)

**• The buildings are too big**  
**• It will impact the country side**  
**(Loddon valley)**  
**• It is out of character**  
**with the airfield development**

and  
Pl  
De  
Wo  
Local  
August 2008; and the  
Design July 2007.

2. The form of development proposed by reason its reliance on close relationships between buildings (based upon the means of access for purpose in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1) (Control') is a sub-standard form of development. Wokingham Borough Council would be unduly cramped for residents and the development is out of character with the airfield development.
- Wokingham Borough Local Development Plan (LDP), August 2008; and the Wokingham Borough Local Development Plan (LDP), Residential Design July 2007.

**• There are too many houses  
- cramped**

**• It is out of character  
-with the airfield development**

## Brief Grounds of Appeal

The principal reasons for refusal as set out by the LPA relate to the design of the development and the effect that the development may have on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In addition, the LPA refer to the effect on residential amenity as well as referring to the condition of the land.

The appellant considers that the development site is suitable for the proposed development and that the nature of housing proposed accords with relevant national, regional and local planning policy and guidance including the emerging South East Plan, the adopted Wokingham Local Plan, the Wokingham Borough Council Design Guide, the emerging Wokingham LPA well government guidance.

The appellant will demonstrate that the design of the development is appropriate to this location and would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area or on the amenity of residential occupiers.

The appellant will demonstrate that adequate amenity space would be provided for future residents and that the site could accommodate the proposed development while providing adequate amenity space for future residents.

The appellant will demonstrate that the remediation of the site does not prejudice the development of the site and neither does it constrain the location of development within the site.

The appellant will refer to the officers' report to the Planning Committee, which recommended that planning permission should be granted for the development.

The appellant will demonstrate that the development is acceptable in all other terms and that the proposed development accords with the provisions of the development plan and material considerations.

**THEY DON'T AGREE**

# Appeals

- Written
- Informal
- Public Inquiries

“Retrieved appeal”

In accordance with Rule 6 (12) of the Town and Country Planning (Inquiries Procedure) (England) Rules 2000 I set out below the matters about which the Secretary of State particularly wishes to be informed for the purposes of her consideration of the appeal. These matters are as follows:-

a) the extent to which the proposed development would be in accordance with the development plan for the area;

b) the extent to which the proposed development would be in accordance with Government policies in Planning Policy Statement 1: *Developments*, and accompanying guidance *The Design of Buildings for Energy Efficiency* with particular regard to whether the design of the proposed development, in its site and its wider context, including the layout, landscaping, will preserve or enhance the area, having regard to the advice in the guidance.

c) the extent to which the proposed development is consistent with Government planning policy in Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) *Housing*, with particular regard to whether the proposed development is consistent with the following:

that is well-designed and built to a high standard;

housing, both market and affordable, particularly in terms of price, to support a wide variety of households in all areas, both urban

**DOES IT FIT WITH LOCAL AND NATIONAL POLICIES**

iii) a sufficient quantity of housing taking into account the need for choice and seeking to improve choice;

iv) housing developments in suitable locations, providing access to community facilities and with good access to public transport and infrastructure;

v) a flexible, responsive and efficient and effective approach where appropriate.

d) the  
Plan

**WERE THE COUNCIL'S  
REASONS FOR REFUSAL  
SOUND**

f) plan  
propo

**ANY THING ELSE SHE WANTS  
TO CONSIDER**

g) wh  
these sho

h) any ou

Inspector considers relevant.

al of

panied by any  
if so, whether the

to any conditions and, if so, the form

# Why be a “party”

- Can provide evidence
  - Can cross examine the applicant
  - We do not necessarily trust the officers to make a good case
- Cost, time and effort

# Limitations

- Need to have good evidence – if we are “unreasonable”

→ could be liable for costs

# Approach

- Provide evidence where we are strong
- “partner” with council if possible
- Use public representations where the evidence is less robust (can you help)
- The appeal starts 23<sup>rd</sup> June and you would need to be there at 10.00am to speak on any day

# LVAG Evidence

- **The Planning Context Case**
- **Scale Case**
- **Access Case**
- **Environmental Case**
- **Conditions**



# SCALE

- LVAG will demonstrate that the proposal represents overdevelopment consistent with its location at the edge of town in the Valley.
- LVAG will demonstrate that the proposal has been provided with the necessary resources for operations to allow for the remediation process.
- LVAG will demonstrate that the proposal is consistent with the edge of town.
- LVAG will demonstrate that the proposal is consistent with the remediation process.
- LVAG will demonstrate that the proposal is consistent with the lodge wood.
- LVAG will demonstrate that the proposal is consistent with enlarging the school.

**ITS TOO BIG**

- edge of town
- the remediation process
- lodge wood
- enlarging the school

# ACCESS

- LVAG will demonstrate assessment by statement of transport difficulties of community
  - LVAG demonstrate how emergency access is poor
  - LVAG demonstrate how emergency access to roads, public transport etc
- single access  
emergency access is poor  
incorrect statements about roads, public transport etc
- public  
ent and  
has not  
emergency access to  
with a single

# Environment

- LVAG will show that the team failed to draw together all the information regarding the environment and the impact of the full range of phases.
- they haven't used all the information
- Phased approach is wrong
- LVAG will show that the proposed four phases put the residents of early phases at risk of contamination of subsequent phases.

# Conditions

LVAG also plan to present conditions that should be applied should the appeal be allowed

# Public Representation

- We have evidence – but do not consider we would be protected from costs if we included in our formal case.
- There is no risk if it is raised by a concerned resident so....
- We need volunteers
- We will coach you on the issues and what to say

# Public Representation

- Close to Ashenbury Park Landfill
- The Health Impact Assessment is flawed
- Impact on the important aquifer from excavation and piling activities.
- Plans to deal with hazardous waste
- Threat to the natural environment
- Risk of damage to existing properties - subsidence
- The extension of the settlement boundary in 2000
- insufficient capacity at GP surgeries or dentists in the area.
- The site is of county importance for birds and reptiles and that the application will have an adverse impact on biodiversity
- That the risk of this project failing has not been assessed and that the exposure of Wokingham Borough Council Tax payers in any disaster recovery must be considered as part of the planning process.
- That the applicant will not be able to satisfactorily monitor the operations of the remediation.
- That the flood risk has not been fully assessed