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Representation

Please use a separate form for each representation.

Which part of the Publication Plan does your representation relate to?

MAW02 / RA/174
As a resident of Mawsley, I wish to object to the proposed housing allocation RA/174 – Land to the West of Mawsley. I object for the following reasons:

. This will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in Cransley Rise, Malaslea and Birch Spinney. This location is currently agricultural land, and the development of the land into housing would potentially result in additional noise, disturbance, overlooking and loss of privacy in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the orientation of some of the houses in Cransley Rise is such that they are designed to front onto open space. Whilst I appreciate that householders have no right to a view, the enjoyment of this view is an important part of the residential amenity of these properties, and as such, should be protected.

. One of the unique features of the village is the design layout. The proposal for infill development would materially harm the character of Mawsley and I believe that this is directly contradictory with principle (a) set out in Policy MAW01, that development in Mawsley will “Be designed to reflect the distinct character of the village”.

. Further to the point above, KBC have imposed an Article 4 direction in place in certain areas in Mawsley to “control works that could threaten the character of an area”. This development is undoubtedly a greater threat to the character of the village than that which the Article 4 direction aims to control.

. I have concerns about the proposed number of dwellings, in terms of density and possible over-development of the site.

. There is poor drainage in the vicinity of this site resulting in waterlogging and flooding in existing gardens and public open space when it has been raining heavily. If this development goes ahead the problem will worsen in the immediate area, as the existing site is self-draining.

. The development may lead to a significant impact upon road safety. The proposed access point for the development is in Cransley Rise which is already a busy and winding road, where access is regularly restricted by parked vehicles. The increase in traffic to a new junction within Cransley Rise and passing along Cransley Rise to and from the junction with School Road will make the situation even worse to the point of being dangerous.
For the reasons above, I believe that Cransley Rise is an unsuitable access point for construction traffic.

The roads in Mawsley are still not adopted, and therefore the authority is not under any obligation to pay for maintenance. I am concerned that any construction traffic associated with this development may damage the road surface in Cransley Rise and that the responsibility for the cost of repairs will then rest with the frontagers in Cransley Rise.

KBC has previously stated that Provision of schools and adequate medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. The village currently has 930 households, which is an additional 230 over what was originally planned. The local amenities and infrastructure would have been designed to meet the need of the original number of households and they are already overstretched. It is inevitable that a further increase in the number of households in the village will stretch the infrastructure even further. It is unacceptable for primary aged children who are resident in the village to have to go to school outside of the village due to lack of capacity at the village school.

The development will not be connected very well to local services such as public transport, since the bus service to the village has been recently reduced. This will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic on the roads as residents have no option other than to drive to leave the village.

A poor decision on this proposed allocation could set a precedent for a pattern of development that is not sustainable and could lead to a further expansion of the village.

There is very strong feeling in the village against this development, as per the comments for Mawsley on the Site Specific Proposals for Housing Allocations made in 2013. These should be taken into account by KBC when making a decision since it is existing residents who will have to live with the consequences of any decisions.

Policy 11 of the Joint Core Strategy states that “development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement”. Unless evidence can be provided which shows that this proposed housing allocation is actually needed, this proposal directly conflicts with the policy.
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