

Land at Chieveley Glebe, Chieveley (Site Ref. CH123)

Comments on proposed development

1. The suggestion of 5 separate access points, two of which are on a relatively narrow bend in East Lane, and close to where vehicles currently park by the surgery, is a very poor idea. I assume each access would service at least 3 of the proposed maximum of 15 dwellings?
2. A single access opposite the entrance to Hazeldene (the 2nd proposed access from the west end of the proposed development site) provided with an enlarged road area with roundabout would provide the safest road/traffic access. The road should then extend back and behind all accepted developments along the northern boundary of the site (as similarly was done with properties accessed at Hazeldene (away from Est Lane itself).
3. The number of dwellings (detached/semi-detached/terrace, bungalows not specified in plan?) seems too many for the area. This is especially so if to be a single row and intended to match other existing properties along the north and mostly south side along East Lane.
4. The proposals suggest a footway fronting the site linking to an existing footway to the west of the site. This is on the opposite side of the road and would require a pedestrian crossing for safety (not mentioned).
5. How is it proposed to encourage non-car transport modes given we have almost no public transport, and main roads to nearby towns are hardly safe for bicycle modes of transport?
6. The proposals states that the "site will be required to be developed in accordance with the following parameters". These include a wide range of assessments which the document says will inform the development. Surely no approvals can be granted for such a development until such assessments have been made, detailed site plans brought forward, etc. As written it implies that some level of approval for a development at the site can be granted without detailed assessments and investigations beforehand. We have little faith in the value or adoption of some of likely assessment requirements given the past situation at the current local showground site where two restrictive covenants issued with planning approval were very quickly ignored/changed or just forgotten!
7. A pedestrian walkway/pavement is desperately needed all along East Lane, and with increased traffic rarely keeping to the current 30 mph speed limit – it should be 20 MPH and with speed bumps in the road. The increased traffic associated with the proposed development (could amount to at least 25-30 extra vehicles just with the development) coupled with existing traffic using the Downland practice facilities, as well as through traffic to/from Chieveley centre and beyond makes these road improvements essential.
8. Access onto to the old Oxford Rad from East Lane (east end) is poor (bad sighting) especially as speeds often exceed the newly introduced 50MPH limit along the old Oxford Road. There will be a serious accident at this junction one day, with many vehicles turning into East Lane from the north and south, and others trying to access onto Oxford Road.
9. How does the proposed development tie in with a proposed burial site on the land?
10. Car parking would need to be available for the burial site.
11. A public pathway from the development area directly to the recreational ground would be a major benefit to the increased population in East Lane.
12. Adequate hedging and tree planting should be considered.