

Response to consultation on proposals for Roughmoor Lane build January 2022 – David and Clare Mather

Firstly we are concerned that this consultation exercise has been rushed through. We are not happy that the session with the Church Commissioners was conducted by zoom and feel that it should have been delayed until face-to-face meeting is possible under covid restrictions.

Numbers – LP II says min of 40. 60 represents nearly 20% increase on number of dwellings in the village which will unnecessarily burden infrastructure, roads and amenities. Density will be significantly higher than in much of the rest of the village and not appropriate for rural setting. Propose maximum of 40 dwellings.

Affordable housing – this needs to be truly affordable. Social housing requirement should be built in. Single storey dwellings also vital to benefit cross section of residents. Priority should be given to local people.

Height – no more than 2 storeys – this is a village, not a town. There are virtually no examples of buildings higher than 2 storeys so any flats will need to respect this. Average of 2.5 storeys not acceptable.

Design – design should meet and ideally exceed the latest guidelines and meet net zero criteria including vehicle charging, solar panels etc. Would also like to see either contemporary design or quality traditional such as in Easton rather than the poor quality designs we see elsewhere that are not fit for purpose and don't reflect the local style.

Layout - drawing misleading – close attention needs to be made to width of roads, amount of parking, size of dwellings and gardens, turning into Roughmoor lane etc which will be easier once we have more detailed drawings. Roughmoor Lane traffic should have priority over traffic to the new estate.

Biodiversity - not able to comment properly based on current drawing but echo the comments from Peter Bright and others about wildlife corridors, screening and planting along the northern and western boundaries etc.

Location of potential community facilities - assume text is a typo – not big enough to support a potential village hall and vital parking and not central to the village to benefit all residents. We would definitely not support community land being in this position particularly if an entrance off Roughmoor Lane would eventually be required. East of the site would make much more sense. Understand that the agricultural barns are not yet part of the plan but these will obviously be available in the future and as a brownfield site this does not need to be identified in the Local Plan II. Positioning any community facility in the centre of the village would benefit the church, rather than the views to it being a problem. Perhaps until further land can be secured the community area could be used for car parking.

Footpath – see Colin Booth Footpath officer's comments – these supported

Lighting – none. Need to maintain dark skies policy.

Parking - village parking a very important consideration – losing Mortar Pits, likely losing Court Farm parking for church, lack of provision for houses and no room in new roads to park. Community space allocated will need to provide central parking area as well as whatever other facilities are agreed by the community.

Traffic - The A371 is far too busy to support such a large number of additional dwellings which is why 40 should be the absolute maximum. Concerned about bottlenecks in Draycott, Hollybrook and Easton getting worse and emergency vehicles being unable to gain access to Westbury. Possible problems north through the village with more people using Old Ditch as a quick route to Bath and Bristol. The proposed new junction on to the A371 would have to utilise the mortar pits lay-by. This would again take away the only off-road parking we currently have. This is used by cars, utility companies, and by cars waiting to get through the narrow part of Stoke Hill road, just past Roughmoor Lane. It is a frequent occurrence to have a queue of cars along the main road waiting to get through. This area also frequently floods. For safety reasons, it also needs to be used as off road parking and safe parking for the bus.

Pedestrians - it is vital that we gain a safe crossing, perhaps with traffic calming measures on both sides as in Draycott so that safe access to all parts of the village is available to all residents.

Drainage – we don't understand why the attenuation pond is not going to be within the allocated land red line area nor why the Council seems to have agreed with the Church Commissioners that this is acceptable. This should be agreed with the village (or not).