

## **20/07932/OUT: FURTHER COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE PUBLIC**

### **Further comments received via email**

*PS*

I am writing in reference to the above resubmitted outline planning application, to register my objection to the above development.

This objection is based upon a number of areas:

Road Safety , the current proposed access to the site is located at the west end of the village , this area is already well developed with housing and further access onto what is a very busy road at all times as it currently serves as a cut through from the A361 to the A360 as well as local school and commuter traffic .

The village does not have a complete foot path of adequate width on either side of the road throughout the village nor is it wide or safe enough to have a cycle lane , children therefore have to cross the road to keep on a footpath at least once if not twice when walking to and from school .

Again there is in my opinion inadequate lighting throughout the village, substantial amounts of street parking also creates irritability of drivers which also leads to increased speeds and tailgating. The proposed access will increase traffic in the area and in a place of poor road visibility and lack of adequate footpaths and poor lighting.

It is well documented that traffic is not only busy in the village but a lack of any form of traffic calming results in a high proportion of vehicles exceeding the speed limit at all times of the day and night. Village life is not just for those able to buy high end larger houses , this is a rural community with a range of local lower paid jobs , a solid spread of high quality yet reasonable priced housing is required , the village does not have a good bus service no village shop and poor local play amenities doctors surgery , this will require most residents to have access to at least one car , more likely several cars if they are able to buy more expensive housing.

I cannot see any improvement to the local and services in this development.

It sits fundamentally beyond the designated development area and outside what was deemed necessary and or acceptable as part of the original Local Development Plan. High Quality farmland should not be the first choice of development land, it should be the place of last resort when all other areas of infill and low grade or brown site land has been exhausted.

We are already poorly served from amenities and the current housing stock impinges on many of the views of open countryside for many of the residents , this proposed development increases this impact as it sits on the higher ground in an area where the views are some of the better ones in the village on this side of the road .

When added to loss of natural habitats, increased light pollution and potential redirection and or loss of public footpaths the Development has no merit in the area.

Villages across the county and countryside need to be protected from large consumerism , we are generally the last areas to benefit from enhanced services , yet the first to be considered fit and ready to accept additional larger scale ad hoc housing .

The answer is not there, not now, possible not ever.

*CM*

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the above quoted planning application for the following reasons:

1. An application was made in 2017 (No: 17/01905/OUT) for planning at the same site for the same number of houses and was refused by Wiltshire Council deeming the number of 'dwellings and location of the site outside the defined limits of development for Worton within the open

countryside would conflict with the settlement strategy of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy'<sup>1</sup> and was therefore deemed to be 'in conflict with the Council's plan-led approach to sustainable development'<sup>2</sup>.

The Notification Of Refusal letter of 2017 goes on to justify the Council's decision based on the fact that the previous application was in conflict with Core Policies 1,2, 3, 12, 43, 51, 57, 58, 60, 61 and HC34 and in conflict with chapters 6, 11 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.<sup>3</sup>

This 2020 proposal is for the same number of houses, at the same location, with almost identical designs even though the development company is no longer Jewson Ltd, but Walsingham Planning. I fail to comprehend how, based on the above reasons for refusal last time, this application is being given consideration by the same Council which designed a sound Core Strategy document by whose guidelines for appropriate planning the previous proposal for such a large development 3 years ago was rejected.

## 2. UNSUSTAINABILITY

Worton, despite being labelled a large village is in fact not. It is small (housing some 600 residents), has no shop, a limited bus service and a small primary school. We have a pub, which opens infrequently and does not serve food.

If 26 more dwellings are installed, residents of those would have to get in their cars and drive to either Market Lavington or Potterne (which both have small grocery stores) or to Devizes for larger supermarket shopping. Parents of children older than primary school age would have to drive their kids to school. Adults would have to commute to work using their cars, as there are extremely few employment opportunities in the village.

Most households homing more than one adult means more than one car per household. The increase in traffic due to all of the above will significantly damage not only the environment but also the safety of Worton's residents:

## 3. ROAD SAFETY

Cars speed through our village. Drivers ignore the 30mph sign as they round the blind bend into Worton from Cheverell Road often only slowing down due to parked cars on the left hand side of the High Street. At busier times of day (early morning and late afternoon/early evening) traffic is often at a standstill due to cars having to wait behind residents' parked cars in order to let traffic from the other direction pass. Engines turning over on stationary vehicles are noisy and pump polluting gases into the air. Our village already has a chronic traffic problem and with 26 more households using approximately 35-45 cars between them, the problem can only get worse.

The turning opposite the sharp bend from Cheverell Rd/Worton High Street which leads to Potterne (Worton Road), is also cause for concern. For traffic waiting to turn out in any direction at this junction, the jeopardy would be increased. The same would be true for traffic attempting to enter Worton from Potterne.

The proposed access to the development is at this very point on the road - through the front garden of Sandlease Farm bungalow and directly adjacent to the aforementioned dangerous bend. As a resident of Sandlease Court, I have experienced near collisions many times whilst simply trying to pull out onto the High Street. Two of my neighbours have actually suffered collisions attempting the same move and sometimes I can sit in my car and be waiting for 5 minutes for a gap in the speeding traffic before I can pull out.

It's unconscionable to even imagine putting another road here. It's irresponsible, inconsiderate and downright inhumane. It would just be a matter of days before a serious accident occurred.

The pavements in Worton are not continuous to each side of the road meaning a parent walking

---

<sup>1</sup> Notification Of Refusal of Outline Planning Letter Application Number 17/01905/OUT, Wiltshire Council Director For Economic Development And Planning, dated 11<sup>th</sup> August 2017, page 1, article 1

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> Notification Of Refusal of Outline Planning Letter Application Number 17/01905/OUT, Wiltshire Council Director For Economic Development And Planning, dated 11<sup>th</sup> August 2017, page 1+2, articles 1-4

children to the primary school would have to cross the road twice before reaching the school. It's already a terrifying prospect without adding more cars to the equation. Not to mention the narrowness of these pavements. When an HGV or tractor runs past (often at speed), it's extremely frightening.

#### 4. AMENITY

The residents of Sandlease bungalows would suffer from loss of natural light and light pollution from streetlights at night. The latter would also affect our particular house as the proposed development places buildings to both the side and rear of our property. Our privacy and the privacy of those looked down upon in the Sandlease bungalows by the proposed two storey houses, is of great concern. Whilst our "Loss of a private view" is not deemed "relevant to planning matters and cannot be considered"<sup>4</sup> I would like to point out that in the Notification of Refusal of Outline Planning 17/01905/OUT letter of August 11<sup>th</sup> 2017, I quote:

"Furthermore, the development would have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the residents of the properties overlooking the site".<sup>5</sup>

The 2020 designs for buildings are exactly the same as they were last time, and therefore this reason for refusal should be repeated when reviewing 20/07932/OUT.

This concern for loss of natural light and privacy was expressed by residents of Sandlease at our Parish Council zoom meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> Oct 2020. Their fear of being completely overshadowed and due to the small size of their properties, their gardens which are vital for their emotional wellbeing would not be places for them to enjoy as they now do.

#### 6. VISUAL AMENITY

Our community has a right to expect our Council to protect our rural and natural environment. We need to be feel connected to our countryside, especially now when so much else is uncertain and restrictive. The building of 26 houses on this agricultural site would benefit no-one but the farmers who are selling the land, and the developers' bank accounts. It does the opposite for the people who live here – it would cause a direct loss of visual amenity to nearly 20 village households and to any users of the footpaths. It would be a disfiguration of the rural character of Worton and a permanent scar on the on the landscape both from within the village and looking at it from afar. You cannot see Worton from the higher ground to the east and south, but if this development went ahead, it would be entirely visible. An irreversible blot on a beautiful landscape.

#### 7. MENTAL HEALTH

This was another very serious concern raised by some residents of Sandlease, due mostly to the above. But this is an extremely important subject which I believe should be taken very seriously by the Council.

This is as important as the danger to our physical welfare posed by the access point and increase in traffic volumes.

People are suffering. People are afraid. I have experienced this first hand helping villagers during the March lockdown and since. We have a very strongly supportive and kind community in Worton. We are living through a terrifying time and there are residents for whom the proposed new buildings would have serious emotional and psychological consequences. It would be nothing short of criminal to further restrict and damage the lifestyles of those who are already struggling with mental health issues. Some Sandlease residents are already severely restricted through disabilities. Take away their visual amenity and their light, and what do they have left?

#### 8. COVID AND TIMING

It is not coincidence that this application has been lodged at this particular time. It is a deeply cynical and greed-driven move by both the farmers and the developers. They hope to turn a horrific time of social fear and isolation entirely to their advantage.

---

<sup>4</sup> Wiltshire Council, Notice of planning Application No: 20/07932/OUT Letter, dated 5<sup>th</sup> October 2020, page 2

<sup>5</sup> Notification Of Refusal of Outline Planning Letter Application Number 17/01905/OUT, Wiltshire Council Director For Economic Development And Planning, dated 11<sup>th</sup> August 2017, page 1, article 2

3 years ago when planning application 17/01905/OUT was made, we came together as a community in the village hall and also in the school. Groups of friends met and talked it through. Over 200 residents attended one of the public meetings and everyone needed to be heard as is right and proper. We had a public parish council meeting via Zoom on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of October 2020 and a mere 23 people joined that meeting. Many of our villagers are elderly and some, whether elderly or not, don't have the technological abilities to engage in virtual communications. And now, as of last night, we are entering another lockdown for a month with only 4 days left by which to register our views to the Council. It is a deeply cynical move and one which does not suggest having the best interests of our community at heart.

This proposal is a money-making opportunity dressed up as something which would 'benefit' our village when nothing could be further from the truth. They don't care about their community, they care only about making money regardless of the cost to the environment and the physical and mental well-being of the people who live here.

As for Wiltshire Council, I want it noted that the pressing ahead with the time sensitive deadlines for views to be sent and the date of 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020 given as 'decision' date, is also extremely non-public spirited. We are living through a pandemic the fallout from which is causing local, national and worldwide poverty, unemployment and serious mental health problems. This is not the time to throw a community into more uncertainty and fear. It's irresponsible and cruel and I would hope Wiltshire Council would consider the timing of this sickeningly avaricious proposal in it's Covid 19 lockdown context.

*RW*

1. The bend at turnpike is not blind, the average speed of traffic coming into Worton is 27 mph.
  2. The trucks travelling through in the main are very respectful. On the other hand, the agricultural vehicles are the opposite, they are breaking their speed limit of 25 mph and show disregard for others
  3. Journeys by car is a silly argument, almost everyone going out will use a car. This country is built to commute.
  4. This country desperately needs housing.
  5. As you come into Worton from Lavington you can only get glimpses of the area not enough to notice. When down the fields you can see plainly Gaisford Chase, Sandlease and as the 3 storey you can see plainly Sandlease Court and from down there it is nothing to hurt anybody.
- if the building application was allowed the new estate would enhance the income of the parish council and they would be able to do more for the village.

*CIM*

I was shocked and extremely angered to receive the proposed planning application for 26 houses at Sandlease Farm in Worton, not only because a fair and comprehensive plan-led and sustainable decision had been made in 2017 to reject it as completely unsustainable [with 11 major points of objection from your office, and the contravention of at least 46 points in the Wiltshire Core Strategy] but also because now it has been re submitted at a time of National Crisis where we are forbidden to meet as a village to debate the rights and wrongs of such a development, as was such a feature in 2016/17.

This application is a cynical move by the developers, and cleverly timed by them to sneak under the radar and deny the considerable voice of the villagers, whatever their viewpoints. At the very least a delay must be granted until proper consultation has been allowed, public meetings held, and those most affected by this plan have had a fair chance to counter it.

We are one of those properties most affected, as our house and garden will be wrapped on two sides by the planned buildings, our amenity will be wholly removed. We have no voice in this decision other than a letter of objection to you, and yet our way of life and that of at least 20 other households will be blighted forever because of this repeated and totally unnecessary planning

request.

If the Developers argument holds true, that the Wiltshire Core Strategy 2015 is out of date [due to a small drop below 5 year Housing supply from slower delivery elsewhere] and therefore they can submit with renewed abandon, they are ignoring the fact that the majority of the WCS contents will be carried forward to a new version whenever it appears. The Developers must believe that the reasons for objection ruled by you before on so many grounds have now been rendered completely unenforceable because we await the new WCS. That is patently untrue. The reasons for objection remain absolutely.\*

\*I refer to the planning application for Purton Road, 6<sup>th</sup> April 2020 [Appeal ref; APP/Y3940/W/18/3202551] where when the WCS was claimed to be out of date, the planning and appeal were rejected anyway because it did not override the key elements of clauses 1 and 2 of WCS.

Surely the thing to do is to accelerate the new Core Strategy document, if indeed this one *is* out of date, and hold off any decision making until it appears. Otherwise we are all going to find we wake up in villages all over Wiltshire with 'carbuncles' added almost overnight because of a technicality. And there will be no going back. And when the new Core Strategy does appear it will make a nonsense of rushed and unworthy decisions made in haste and error.

Is the new Core Strategy going to be so very different from that already in place? No, I think not. These plans failed in 2017 on at least 11 counts as listed by you and your office, and to imagine in the intervening three years that those 11 counts have been successfully surmounted by the farmer and his developing partners is another impossible fiction.

This rush to get permission is unseemly and completely predictable I'm afraid. At a moment when the Nation is quite rightly concentrating elsewhere, with a deadly National Pandemic to counter, planning decisions seem a little lost in the scheme of things. They are nevertheless of critical importance to those affected, and to future plans for villages throughout Wiltshire which would suffer from a hasty decision made here, with developers able to hold Worton up as an example of what has been passed. That would be a travesty. For us, and for them.

#### **SUSTAINABILITY. OR LACK OF IT.**

The proposed development is completely unsustainable in terms of the Wiltshire core Strategy 2015 and very significantly the NPPF.

There are no jobs in the village for the 75-100 people who would live in these 26 new houses. Every person who works from those households will have to travel away to work. To 'out commute.' *Not sustainable.*

The public transport system is impractical and inadequate to move any new workforce to shops, offices and industrial estates in towns at the times they need, and would result in more cars, vans and lorries in and out of the village, adding to the already hideous traffic congestion during rush hours with the Devizes rat run in full operation on a twice daily basis. *Not sustainable.*

There are no shops for the 75-100 residents to walk to and get even the basics. So every loaf of bread and bar of chocolate will either be delivered by supermarket van, or collected elsewhere by the residents, and if their partner has gone to work in their car, a second car will be needed just to keep that resident in touch with the amenities of Devizes, Melksham or Trowbridge, Market Lavington and West Lavington. The last two only adding to the chaotic traffic situation at the 'Black Dog' crossroads.

So, 26 new homes with two cars each will only add to the 'out commuting'. *Not sustainable.*

The school is at the other end of the village and the pavement is not wide enough for a parent and child to walk hand in hand to school which is necessitated by the huge volume of high-speed traffic at school times. If pushing a baby in a buggy as well, the schoolchild would not be able to walk by their parent's side and I am afraid it would only be a matter of time before an accident occurred.

Meaning that even the school drop at the other end of the village will be made by car. *Not sustainable.*

It is not possible for a parent to walk continuously on pavements on one side of the road to the

school, necessitating crossing the road twice to do so, against busy traffic in both directions. There are no pedestrian crossings or traffic lights to calm the twice daily rush.

Some residents towards the Seend end of the village may think the Sandlease development would not impact them but they would be wrong. The school is a very important facility at that far end of the village, [it is actually 0.7 of a mile, or over 1,100 metres to the school from the proposed site, far further than the 800 metres suggested on the wrongly scaled map supplied by the developers] The school is a valuable amenity to all residents, but proves a notable hazard for passing speeding motorists blocked by school coaches and parent drop offs. Impatience is a common feature of behaviour from motorists around the school, and their poor decision making whilst trying to negotiate the hazards will only be exacerbated by extra parental car journeys and drop offs.

The nearest secondary education options for the older children of the proposed development would be in West Lavington, Market Lavington and Devizes, all necessitating more travel and further unsustainable car journeys. *Not sustainable.*

So, no jobs in the village, not enough public transport, no easy way to school, a massive increase in 'out commuting,' all of which point to the absolute need for new development to be located on brownfield sites near jobs, transport, shops, leisure facilities and secondary education.

**Not in a green field site in Worton - Outside the village limits.**

***It is not sustainable.***

I would categorically ask, if, in the 'Development Management' department's opinion, that 'Sustainability' will be as integral part of a new Core Strategy as it so gloriously is in the WCS 2015. If it is, then this proposed development must be turned down yet again, and a message sent to both farmer and developer that this is an area not to be touched. *It is unsustainable.* It is time to accept that and move on, and ban further application for at least 10 years.

I would request you reconsider the following, which are all concerns you raised taken from a letter you wrote to Mr Chick of Ian Jewson planning on the 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2016;

- The plans are to build in Open Countryside, outside the village Limits. Not acceptable.
- All new builds should be confined to 'Within the Limits of Development' that already exist for 'Large Villages in Wiltshire', except in exceptional circumstances. These are most definitely NOT exceptional circumstances.
- This plan, in your words, "would not accord with the sustainable development strategy outlined within Core policies 1 and 2 of the WCS."
- Large village developments, where needed, should be for up to a maximum of 10 dwellings, and set within the village boundaries. [CP43 rural exception site for up to 10 houses doesn't apply in this case] This plan patently exceeds this important limit, and is not only excessive but totally unsustainable. There are places already identified in the village for modest building consideration in terms of numbers. One has just been built, one has permission, and a community led plan to develop affordable homes on the allotment site at the Seend end of the village, has the unanimous support of all canvassed, there are no dissenting voices concerning this plan. It is a community led housing project which is to be run by a housing association and community trust, and has been recommended by the Council for the Protection of Rural England [who are against the Sandlease proposed development] It is a few dozen yards from the school and village hall, and in the perfect position to solve the affordable housing need of the village. It would bring the number of new houses within village limits to 10. Exactly the figure needed for Worton to play its part, and more importantly provide the affordable housing requested by some at the most convenient location near our scant amenities. This plan was progressing well until the Covid crisis hit, and as a result has not progressed, but I understand is still viable.
- Development outside the 'Limits of Development', will only be permitted once identified through community-led planning policy documents like a neighbourhood plan. No such demand has been asked for by the community, because there is no need from the community.
- The planned development is not identified as a site within the 'Wiltshire Housing Site DPD- Draft Site

Methodology [Feb 2015] working to find Wiltshire's future sites in sustainable locations.

- Dramatic loss of Agricultural land. Once it's gone - It's gone forever. Whether grade 3a or 3b, it is a valuable asset and should remain in the Agricultural stock, whether run by these present farmers or subsequent owners.
- This development will not make a 'positive contribution to the character of Wiltshire.' It will do exactly the opposite.
- It is an unnecessarily dense housing plan, and is simply designed to be intimidating in volume so it can be resubmitted at a later date with a reduction, so as to appease fears, and for villagers unaffected to say 'Well at least it's not 26 houses.'
- Zero is the appropriate number on this site. It is farmland outside the village lines and must remain so.
- I quote your letter. "The proposed development will have to be designed to ensure no detriment to the residential amenity of the residents of adjoining properties..." I need say very little in respect of this, except that this proposal will destroy our residential amenity – *Totally* destroy it.
- We will be overlooked by at least 8 of the new houses who will have elevated positions further up the hill looking down into our ground floor and bedroom windows.
- Approximately 20 houses around the proposed site would suffer severe degradation in quality of life from the shadowing, noise and urban lighting. Put simply, *A gross intrusion on our way of life.*
- The residents of Sandlease would be just as affected as we are at Sandlease Court, if not more so. They are in bungalows and will be looked down on and into by a wall of two storey houses, not only shattering their privacy but blocking the light to the rear of their houses.
- There will be a severe effect on the Mental Health and Wellbeing of the households surrounded by this proposed development. The fight to reject the proposal both in 2017 and again now in 2020 really takes a massive toll which is not to be underestimated. It may not dominate the thoughts of the majority of the village, but for the 20 households surrounding it is a constant worry.
- If, as we hope it is rejected again, we need some reassurance that these plans are quashed if not for good, then for a very long time. We can't go through this turmoil every 3 years.
- Visual Impact. The proposed development will shatter the current rural landscape which surrounds the East end of the village and goes directly opposite to WCS Core Policy 51 on 'Landscape,' where, in your words, "development should conserve and where possible enhance landscape character and must not have a harmful impact upon landscape character. This site lies within the open countryside on the edge of the village and the development of the site would have a significant impact on the character of the landscape."

I totally agree with you and your choice of words, but would add that in my opinion, this plan would *destroy* rather than enhance landscape character.
- The site would be extremely prominent from not only close by but from distant views, and the scheme will have a significant negative visual impact. Worton for the most part hides cleverly in the folds of the glorious Wiltshire landscape when viewed from places like Pear Tree Hill, and this development would sit astride a prominent hilltop and be an enormous visual blight, which would severely affect the 'Visual Character' so beloved of residents, tourists and visitors alike.
- Impact on Heritage assets. Core Policy 58. The Conservation Area Appraisal for Worton specifies that "a large amount of development has taken place in Worton in recent years thus the potential for further development or redevelopment in the village is limited. The threat to the character of Worton is from an accumulation of minor changes bringing non-rural and discordant elements into the village, which will diminish its special character." This again you quoted in your letter to Ian Jewson. I don't understand that anything has changed since you quite correctly expressed that.
- Highway Safety. There will be accidents if the proposed access is granted in the location as outlined on the plan. *There really will be accidents.* The turning out of our houses from Sandlease Court is dangerous enough, as residents here have found to their cost. [Clare Coleman. Nick Stokes] We barely make it to the far lane sometimes to travel to Devizes before a speeding car, or worse, van or

lorry appear round the corner from the Lavington direction. The proposed access will be over 20 metres nearer and will lead to a Russian roulette lottery of vehicles pulling out into oncoming speeding traffic. The applicant's claimed Sight Stopping Distance is incorrect. The actual distance is below the minimum required.

- The speeds of vehicles need to be accurately recorded exactly at the proposed access point to impress on the Highway planners the absolute danger of the suggested access.
- If we wanted to turn right out of Sandlease Court, we would be at complete odds with a vehicle turning left out of the proposed development, just over 20 metres away. This would only add to the chaos, and I fear litigation would follow the inevitable accidents that will result. And should injured and wronged parties win their cases, the compensation won't be paid by the farmer or the developers that's for sure.

Any lawyer worth their salt would point out in court the mass of well-meaning warning letters about the extremely dangerous nature of this access point. I take no pleasure in pointing out that there will be accidents and quite possibly injuries as a result. I note that you agree, and again I quote from your letter, "...the proximity of the access to the existing Sandlease Court access is not considered acceptable. The layout would pose a danger to highway safety as it would be likely to an increase in conflicting vehicle movements. So what has changed?

Couple the speeding traffic from the Lavington direction with the traffic trying to emerge from the Potterne road - Add the exodus of 'out commuting' from the new development, our vehicle movements from Sandlease Court, and the busy two way traffic already on the main road, and you have a recipe for disaster. All contained in a 100 metre stretch of road with a 90 degree bend introducing speeding traffic.

Where a proposed Housing development of any size at Sandlease Farm directly contravenes the 'Wiltshire Core Strategy' are as follows.

1. Goes completely against 'Sustainable Development' ethos as first mentioned in the Strategy Introduction at 1.1
2. No jobs will be created inside the village as a result. As at Intro 1.2
3. Appropriate balance of jobs, services, facilities and homes is ignored in their proposal. As at 1.2
4. Would lead to insufficient employment opportunities. As at 1.2
5. Would lead to massive increase in 'Out Commuting'. As at 1.2 and 2.7
6. Sustainable travel options are not good enough to cope. As at 1.3
7. No employment land delivery provision. As at 1.3
8. Will not manage development to ensure that jobs and the right infrastructure are delivered at the right time to ensure that out commuting, in particular to areas outside Wiltshire, will not be increased and development does not have a detrimental impact on infrastructure. As at 1.3
9. Will not work towards lowering Wiltshire's carbon footprint. As at 1.3
10. Will not be a protection of Wiltshire's enhancement of the natural and historic environments or a move to expand Wiltshire's network of green infrastructure. As at 1.3
11. Does not fit with local opinion about new planning proposals. As at 1.3
12. Goes against Strategy need for new developments to be self contained. As at 1.7
13. Adds to Wiltshire's CO2 emissions. As at 1.8
14. Not a growth area targeting Tourism. As at 1.8
15. Does not create an economy that is fit for the future. As at 1.10
16. Does not target the cause and effect of climate change.
17. Goes against the quality of the environment. As at 1.19
18. Goes against the quality of life. As at 1.19
19. Goes against the way Wiltshire looks. As at 1.19
20. Goes against need to ensure careful stewardship of our environmental assets. As at 1.19
21. No facilities to shop or work or for leisure activities, so every single resident of Worton already has to commute out of the village for food, for work, or for play. As at 2.5
22. Wiltshire's carbon emissions are already far greater than for either the South West or for the UK. As



at 2.11

23. No planned necessary support for infrastructure. As at 2.12
24. Wiltshire's population growth already well over the National average. As at 2.14
25. No infrastructure for ageing population and their ensuing needs. As at 2.14
26. Reliance on the private motor car, public services extremely limited. As at 2.15
27. Does nothing to cope with social exclusion. Will only exacerbate the problem. As at 2.16
28. Only puts more strain on sustainable transport, highway improvements, water management, green spaces, power supply internet connectivity, access to emergency services, sustainable waste management facilities. As at 2.19
29. Does not respect the local character. As at 3.6
30. Does not comply with reuse of Wiltshire's previously developed land policy. As at 3.8
31. Does not respect and enhance Wiltshire's distinctive characteristics. As at 3.9
32. Does not direct development away from our most sensitive and valuable natural assets, habitats and species. As at 3.9
33. Severely affects a Wildlife corridor. As at 3.9
34. Won't add to improvements in air quality. As at 3.9
35. Won't protect or enhance the Landscape character of Wiltshire. As at 3.9
36. Will put extra pressures on flood alleviation, sustainable urban drainage, health care. As at 3.10
37. Does not enhance the public realm or street scene. As at 3.10
38. An already very dangerous sharp and speedy corner, will get even more dangerous for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians alike. As at 3.10
39. Does not maintain existing residents quality of life. As at 4.2
40. Does not maintain Wiltshire's high value environment. As at 4.2
41. Is outside village settlement boundaries. As at 4.13
42. Goes completely against the council's Local Development scheme. As at 4.15
43. Would impact greatly on the local community and the fabric of the existing built and natural environment. As at 4.35
44. No safe access to proposed site. As at 4.37
45. No healthcare facilities. As at 4.41
46. Will add considerably to traffic congestion through village at key times. As at 5.68  
And, there is a suitable, non-controversial location, opposite the allotments able to supply the affordable housing needed and the quota demanded by WCS. It is available, and would bring the number of new dwellings within the village limits to 10.

I wish to record that I am absolutely against this planning application, and request that in good faith the relevant Wiltshire local government and planning departments reject it wholesale and forthwith, and negate it's re-emergence for at least 10 years to give clarity to all parties, and for the 20 households most affected, some lasting and well deserved peace of mind on the matter.