

Further to my objections dated 23rd January 2018 and 2nd March 2018 I would like to add the following:

CA1b, Reading Golf Club Kidmore End, Emmer Green

“The development for residential and replacement clubhouse, subject to additional land in South Oxfordshire being secured for replacement holes”

My major point is that the proposal is not deliverable anymore. Why?

The Golf Club made a statement that they want to relocate the Club and therefore wish to sell the whole course for housing development. The appointed developer is Wates, and they made a statement and produced a plan for a development of 700 dwellings covering land in both Reading Borough and South Oxfordshire.

It is now absolutely clear that the Golf Club is not looking for additional land to build two replacement holes, nor are they looking to build a new clubhouse. They are therefore NOT looking to secure the future of the Golf Club at Emmer Green, quite the reverse.

As the conditions in the Pre-Submission Plan cannot be met, the proposal is not **deliverable** and should therefore be removed from the Plan.

At the very least, if the proposal were to remain in the plan, those two conditions should be made hard and fast stipulations.

They must be adhered to before any possible planning application could be considered.

There are further points I would like to raise to demonstrate that the proposal of a housing development of 90 to 130 dwellings in this area is not sustainable.

1. Protection of leisure facilities and public houses

DLP,LP001 ,Page 113, RL6:

Reading Golf Club is an urban club in the middle of a built up area, and in easy walking distance from many members homes. It has two bus stops outside the car park and other bus stops a few minutes walk away. This is unique as most golf clubs are only accessible by car, as indeed would be the case if the Golf Club were to relocate. The benefits of this are endless. Members can walk from home to the golf club. In particular juniors can walk or take the bus to the club in a safe environment. Easy access to such a facility is good for their physical and mental health and being able to get to the Club on their own must help to improve their independence.

The former Chairman of the Club made big efforts to get juniors involved.

Reading Golf Club is a members owned club and therefore fees are reasonable as there is no VAT applicable, and the Club does not need to make a profit for shareholders. The fees are therefore much more reasonable compared to some other courses in the area.

This is good for the community and should not be taken away.

2. Accessibility and the intensity of development.

DLP,LP001, page27, CC6, para 4.1.25 and 4.1.26

Employment opportunities are in Reading, not Emmer Green or Caversham. Access from CA1b to these places are not really possible on foot or by bicycle. It is simply too far and the roads are clogged with traffic.

The problem is the network of narrow roads feeding through Caversham on to the two bridges over the Thames. There is no space to add a bus lane or cycling lane.

There are two bus stops but transport is already a real problem in this area which is also acknowledged in the DLP, Page 198, 8.25 and I will address this in the next point.

3.Achieving the Transport Strategy DLP,LP001,Page 98 TR1 , para 4.5.1

As explained above, roads into Caversham and Reading are already very congested and remain one of the most significant concerns in the area. DLP, page 198, 8.2.5

Suggested Park and Ride schemes will only work with dedicated bus lanes but this is not possible as the roads are too narrow. The buses will simply sit in the same traffic queues as the cars. The frequency of the Emmer Green buses has already been reduced because they cannot keep to their timetable due to congestion.

The same applies to the cycling lane. Due to the narrow roads leading into Caversham and Reading, building dedicated cycling lanes will not be possible.

4.Access, traffic and Highway related matters. DLP,LP001,page 103, TR3 point (iii)

Any further congestion will make it dangerous for the cyclists who are using the narrow roads into Caversham as proper cycling lanes cannot added due to the narrow roads.

5. Air Quality DLP,LP001,page15, EN15 and TR1, page 98, para 4.5.1

Air pollution in this area is already high. Caversham Globe carried out professionally analysed nitrogen dioxide tests in March 2018 and July 2018. These tests were carried out at various junction, busy roads and roundabouts in Caversham. Each time the results were well above the European legal limit of 40 micrograms. On the junction between Peppard Road and Prospect Street there was an alarmingly high result of 71ug/m³ in July 2018.

Please see July 2018 results :

Church Street/Prospect St. jnc. 41 µg/m³

Church Street/Priory Avenue jnc 49 µg/m³

On Peppard Road near Prospect streetJnc 71 µg/m³

Church Road/St Anne's Road 50 µg/m³

6. Undesignated Open Space, DLP,LP001, page 45,EN8

The housing development will lead to a significant loss of open space particularly if the whole golf course is allowed to be redeveloped. There will be no replacement open space available in Emmer Green, or close by, of a similar standard or function.

Contrary to EN8.

7. Flooding and Sustainable Drainage System

DLP, LP001, page 61, EN18

DLP, LP001, page 198, para 8.2.2

The golf course is open land that allows rainwater to soak away naturally into the ground which is much needed because it is surrounded on three sides by a heavily built up area. If development of the golf course were to be sanctioned it would mean that a large proportion of rainwater would instead flow into the drains and sewers leading to an overloading of the system. This in turn will exacerbate the risks of flooding in Lower Caversham which is particularly vulnerable.

8. Landscape

DLP, LP001, page 198, para 8.2.4

NPPF 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment para 107

CA1b contrary to the above.

9. Sustainability Report

DLP, LP005, Page 290

I am puzzled by the sustainability report.

CA1b (ii): Residential development and new golf clubhouse (90 - 130 dwellings) and CA1b (iii) : expanded residential development on the entire golf course. Assessments of the Sustainability Objectives and effect are almost identical apart from point 17 (Access to Leisure) although the possibility of the whole course being developed will result into hundreds of more houses being built.

Furthermore in both proposals the effects are negative or have the tendency to be negative. I therefore find it difficult to understand why the proposal is in the DLP?

Objective: 14 (reduce the need for travel and transport by car or lorry)

According to the sustainability report the proposal will have a positive impact on the sustainability objectives.

This cannot be!

There are no employment opportunities in the area. Residents need to travel to Reading, out to the M4, or use the railway station in Reading to travel to London or wherever they work. As already discussed above, narrow roads into Emmer Green and Reading as well as only two bridges result in heavily congested roads particularly at peak times.

No dedicated bus and cycling lanes can be added as the roads are too narrow. Reading buses are already struggling through the congested roads and the frequency of some buses have been reduced as they cannot keep to the timetable.

As stated on the website of Reading buses: "This years changes have been heavily influenced by the current **challenging traffic** and financial conditions".

I therefore cannot understand how a development of 130 houses on part of the course or a development across the whole of the course (hundreds of houses) can reduce traffic!

CA1b has put the local residents into a very difficult position. It is in the DLP on a basis which suggests that the Board of the Club is trying to sustain this beautiful 110 year old piece

of land, but in reality it has become part of a well thought through agenda. The Chairman made clear that it is part of a "Master Plan". He told the members earlier this year that "Just putting land up for mass development will be embroiled in politics and debate for many years and would be unlikely to be approved"

If left in the plan, even on a false premise, it is thought that a developer can get planning permission more easily. The developer, Wates, have already made an unconditional offer for part of the land. Once the offer is accepted, the Golf Club will relocate to an unknown destination and the rest of the course will fall into disuse which the Club feels will improve their chances for development.

That is the thinking of the Club as well as Wates. Plans to this effect are already at RGC for inspection!!

A real dilemma for the residents as on the one hand the residents are expected to comment on just CA1b (as nothing else is on the table) but in reality the danger is that by leaving CA1b in the plan, it will open the floodgates for the rest of the course being built on.

In conclusion the proposal CA1b is not viable and more importantly **cannot be delivered** as stated in the proposal and should therefore be taken out of the plan.

Best regards

Sigi Teer