

**SANDLEFORD PARK  
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

**Statement of Consultation**

**Regulation 12 (a) Public Participation of the Town and  
Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations  
2012**

**September 2013**

# **Statement of Consultation**

## **Introduction**

All Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) are required to be prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012. This Statement therefore explains how the Council has met the particular requirements set out in Regulation 12 (a) of the 2012 Regulations in the production of the Sandleford Park SPD.

This Statement indicates the formal and informal consultation and community involvement West Berkshire Council has conducted in the preparation of the SPD. It outlines:

1. the persons consulted as part of the SPD preparation;
2. a summary of the main issues raised; and
3. how these issues have been addressed in the SPD.

## **Sustainability Appraisal**

Under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009, Sustainability Appraisal is not required to be carried out for SPDs. Despite this it is still necessary to determine the need for SEA in case the SPD gives rise to significant effects which have not been formally assessed previously. Therefore a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report has been carried out to assess whether an SEA is required for the SPD. Following consultation with the three statutory bodies it has been confirmed that an SEA of the Sandleford Park SPD was not needed under the SEA Directive and Regulations because it has been demonstrated that there will be no significant environmental effects as a result of the SPD.

## **Public Participation**

Early consultation and stakeholder engagement is a vital component to the preparation of any planning document. In producing this draft SPD the Council has engaged with the Parish Council, local community, landowners, Ward Members and other key stakeholders to ensure the views and considerations of those with an interest in the document have been taken into account throughout its preparation.

## **Stakeholder Event**

An event for key stakeholders was held on 16 October 2012, attended by representatives of parish and town councils, local schools and organisations and local Ward Members. Presentations from West Berkshire Council and from the site promoters were given, followed by a question and answer session.

A number of stakeholders followed up on the meeting with more detailed comments, which are included in [Stakeholder Comments following Event](#)

### **Public Consultation Event**

A community planning event was held at Newbury Rugby Club on 25 October 2012. This was run as a drop-in event between 2pm and 8pm and was widely advertised, including a leaflet drop to the houses in close proximity to the site, posters in local shops and libraries and a press release.

Exhibition boards were displayed which included questions to stimulate comments and discussion. Visitors were encouraged to add their comments on post-it notes and a comment form was also available, setting out the questions from the exhibition boards. These could either be completed at the event, or were available to be completed on-line. The exhibition boards were also available on line on the Sandleford Park SPG page of the Council's website.

### **Statutory Public Consultation**

In accordance with the relevant Planning Regulations, the Council formally consulted on the draft SPD for a six week period. This period ran from 22nd March 2013 to 3rd May 2013.

In order to publicise the event:

- A statutory notice and press release was placed within the Newbury Weekly News.
- All documentation was placed on the Council's dedicated webpage ([www.westberks.gov.uk/sandleford](http://www.westberks.gov.uk/sandleford)).
- Posters were put up in locations throughout southern Newbury.
- Correspondence was sent to all consultees on the Council's LDF database (approximately 2,000 people, including adjoining authorities and statutory consultees), all Parishes and neighbourhood parishes; all Members, all Heads of Service and a selection of relevant internal officers. The landowner's agents were also kept fully informed.
- All relevant documentation was placed within all libraries across the District.

During the consultation period, a public consultation event was held at Newbury Rugby Club. The event ran from 3.30 pm through to 8.30 pm and was well attended throughout the event. Officers and representatives of the agent for the site were in attendance to discuss the draft SPD with members of the public.

Overall the Council received 96 representations on the SPD from 69 contributing consultees. These figures include 5 late responses from 3 contributing consultees.

The consultation representations together with the Council's proposed responses to each representation are attached as Appendix 5.

## **Stakeholder Event**

### **Introduction**

An event for key stakeholders was held on 16 October 2012, the purpose of which was to discuss the next steps in the planning of the Sandford Park development, and to give stakeholders an opportunity to give their early comments. The event was well attended and included representatives from Newbury Town Council, Greenham Parish Council, Newbury Town Council, local churches, local schools and Newbury College, sports clubs as well as local ward Members. Background information about the site was sent out in advance in the form of a briefing note. A list of attendees is set out in [Attendees at Stakeholder Event](#).

Presentations from West Berkshire Council and from the site promoters (White Young Green) were given. These emphasised that the principle for development on the site had already been agreed and focused instead on:

- The technical work that has been carried out to date,
- A discussion about detailed options for the way in which the site could be delivered, and
- Information about the proposed next stages of the planning process including further consultation events.

The presentations were followed by a question, answer and comment session. The questions and comments were diverse, and summarised below. These questions and issues raised were considered as the work on the SPD progressed.

### **Question and Answer Session**

#### **Diane Smith, Greenham Parish Council**

4 points:

- Bus stops and shelter – who will own and manage?
- Salt bins, where will they be provided
- Suggestion that get together on car club with Newbury Racecourse.
- The need for purpose built building within the development as an office for Greenham Parish council.

### **Response:**

There is potential for community facilities on site. Detailed points would be picked up in the SPD and/or the planning application.

**Peter Norman. Say No to Sandleford (SNTS)**

Development is far closer to Wash Common than Greenham, which may present opportunity to redraw boundary along A339.

**Phil Barnett, Newbury Town Council and Greenham Parish Council**

There is a need for primary schools and would like to see Park House extended. Need to encourage pupils to go to local schools and reduce the need to travel.

---

**Response:**

Educational needs will change over time; the CS Policy envisages one primary school, initially 1 form entry, however this requirement has increased. There is space on site to provide the solution.

**Roger Hunneman, - in private capacity**

If Rugby Club were to want to sell up, how would that fit in with the plan?

**Sean Bates: Newbury Rugby Club**

Rugby Club does not speak in the community, however needs to start to discuss a multi-sport facility and becoming more part of community.

**Response:**

Not aware of any impending change to the ownership of the Rugby Club but there is nothing regarding the site that would create a problem for the Sandleford development.

**Anthony Pick, Newbury Town Council and Newbury Society**

Support request for facilities for Greenham Parish Council. There is a lack of affordable social facilities for voluntary organisations. He did not think the cycle lane/shared with footpath on Monks Lane was much used by cyclists. The buses on Andover Road currently only run every 2 hours.

**Bruce Blaine, St George's Church**

Question about phasing of homes and infrastructure. Community facilities at St George's are well used so facilities will need to be provided early. Infrastructure needs to be integrated.

**Response:** The process we are now undertaking, particularly the consultation, will help shape how we establish the best locations for facilities. Delivery will be in phases and envisaged developing from north to south.

### **Eugene Futcher: Scout Association**

Need more facilities for young people. Scout groups are all full, meeting every night of the week in Wash Common. Raised the possibility of shared community facilities.

### **Gabrielle McGarvey: Newbury Town Council and Say No To Sandford**

4 main points

- On site renewable energy. What percentage of dwellings will be supplied via embedded renewables? Disappointed at Racecourse but here could have fantastic showcase for renewable energy.
  - If only 20% of households have domestic animals, could have 400 dogs and cats and questioned effect on ecological value of woodlands – impact on birds and small mammals
  - How to ensure continuity of bus service over lifetime of development
  - Each dwelling should be provided with sufficient lockable cycle store facilities.
- 

### **Response:**

- Renewables very important. The policy is clear what is required but question of balance. Need to consider appearance of photovoltaics on roofs. The West Berkshire adopted policies now being used as example of best practice nationally.
- The question of dogs and cats was raised by Natural England in context of Greenham Common and will need to be discussed with the ecologists.
- On buses, often requirement to show 35 year business case and the aspiration is that the service will become self funding.
- Cycle parking is important and will need to adhere to Council standards.

### **Jeff Beck: District and Newbury Town Council**

Concern over open spaces associated with the development, as examples where developer later devolves responsibility. Responsibility for maintenance and management should not be left to developers but with the local authority in perpetuity.

**Julian Swift Hook: Greenham Parish Council, Ward Member for Greenham and Newbury Town Council**

Sustainable non car forms of transport are of fundamental importance. How is this to happen? There are examples where bus services promised and not provided and cycling to and from town is a challenge. Walking is a non-starter.

On sustainable development, policy might be there but yet to see delivery.

Inspector's report indicated that 10,500 homes are probably not enough and figure needs to be looked at. Is a review likely to bring forward Sandleford?

**Response:**

If a review indicates higher numbers required then the housing distribution strategy would need to be reviewed.

**Jeannine Barber: CPRE**

Asked if Inquiry by Design has been considered to promote a harmonious approach to drawing up masterplan. Masterplans always came up with high density designed on grid system rather than cul-de-sac. The site should be designed so that most houses look onto pavement and across to other houses promoting a sense of community.

**Response:**

Best practice will be used, in consultation with the community when looking at design.

**Adrian Edwards: Newbury Town Council and WBC Ward Member**

There are steeper gradients in Newbury than to Sandleford and so this does not prohibit cycling.

It is important that provision for young people and for the elderly is made. Would sheltered accommodation be provided at Sandleford?

**Response:**

Discussions are ongoing with the housing service regarding the appropriate housing mix for the site.

**John Izzet: Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council**

Concern is the additional pressure on A339. Asked what measure there would be to alleviate additional pressure.

## **Response**

Traffic Assessments will be carried out which will include Hampshire junctions. There will be a combination of persuading non-car modes but recognised that some will use the car. (an email was sent to Cllr Izzet following the meeting which explained the transport assessment work which has been carried out to date).

### **Revd Paul Cowan: St George's Church**

The church is ahead of the game in that the ecclesiastical boundaries were changed to incorporate Sandleford when it was proposed in the last Local Plan. Has heard many comments from local people and transport is a major issue. It is dubious whether the two roundabouts can cope and questions why transport modelling is coming after decisions on where to put roads. On community facilities, emphasised that they were full to capacity and new facilities need to be in place at the start.

### **Peter Norman: SNTS**

- Question of loss of playing fields. Sport England may need compensating playing field – where?
- 40% affordable housing. Concern at quality - affordable is cheap housing, and how integrated with other housing. Need for development to be socially integrated.
- Would there be access to the Enborne River from the Country Park?
- Monks Lane traffic issues, access for students, Monks lane congested and dangerous now.
- Transport Assessment of Andover Road – long waiting times going into town.
- Renewable energy – possibility of ground source heat?
- Who will own the park is a critical issue.

### **Response:**

- Development is not taking any playing field and Sports England has not raised any objections.
- Quality of affordable housing is often better than market housing.
- Can look at access to River Enborne.

### **Noel Erskine: St Gabriel's School**

Felt a lot of work to do on traffic and pleased scope extended. Important concern is pupil safety.

On Country Park advocate transfer to non-political trust holding land in perpetuity. All 3 educational establishments bordering site will wish to use the park for educational purposes. Anxious about the number of green lines shown on plan in presentation. It is a sensitive area with historic buildings,



including Grade 1 Priory and Grade 2 buildings, and historic park and garden. Concern that it is not turned into a theme park.

**Response:**

The green lines represent pathways, which could be mown. It is a question of balance and competing interests but understand sensitivities and these will be taken into account in the next stages.

**Edward Gaulton: CPRE**

Considers that development should not rise above the woodland when seen from the Priory. Suggested Poundbury is good example to learn from, e.g. affordable housing distributed throughout development, and use of Home Zones.

**Richard Page: SNTS**

SNTS is looking to become more active in the planning process. Need to have assurance that details within the Core Strategy form the basis for the design, particularly regarding affordable housing and habitat. Need to see West Berkshire Council taking on a more critical role with regard to landowner. Asked for formal consultation to begin next week.

**Response:**

- Explained that the policy has been examined and adopted by the Council.
- Explained the process of consultation, informal front-loading and formal consultation when draft prepared. Statement of Consultation will include summary of consultation at this early stage.

## **Community Event**

### **Background**

West Berkshire Council held a community planning “drop-in” event at the Rugby Club on 25 October 2012. Over 350 people attended and took time to look at the exhibition boards, to ask questions and to complete the feedback form. This has provided useful information to help in the preparation of the SPD.

The event was extensively advertised with a leaflet drop to households in a wide vicinity of the proposed development. Invitations were also sent to those on the Council’s consultation database who had previously made representations on Sandleford through the Core Strategy process. Posters were displayed at prominent locations, including local shops and schools.

### **The Event**

The event was held from 2pm - 8pm in order to give as many people as possible the opportunity to drop in and view the exhibition. The event was busy throughout the afternoon and evening. Planning Officers from the Council and representatives of the site promoters were present to hear the public’s views and to answer questions.

Exhibition stands were on display with the opportunity to add comments on post-it notes. The boards contained questions in order to stimulate ideas and discussion. Feedback forms which replicated the questions on the exhibition boards were available to complete and maps of the site were made available to help in the discussions or to use to illustrate suggestions or important features.

### **Feedback Form**

Copies of the feedback form were available to complete at the event or to take away and return later. An online form was also made available on the Planning Policy consultation portal, with a link from the Sandleford Park SPD page and the Planning Policy News Update page of the Council’s website. The exhibition boards were also available to view on the dedicated Sandleford webpage. A period of three weeks was allowed for return or submission of the forms

### **Responses**

The Council received over 90 completed questionnaires, in addition to the notes posted during the exhibition, and these have been analysed. This document highlights the main issues and questions raised. This Statement of Consultation, which will accompany publication of the Draft SPD, contains the individual comments received and detailed responses from the Council - see Appendix 4.

The main issues raised in response to the Feedback Form questions are summarised below followed by a brief explanation of how these can be addressed in the SPD.

## **Landscape**

### ***Questions on Exhibition Boards***

*What elements of the landscape are particularly important to you as a local resident?*

*Are there other landscape features we have not identified?*

### **Summary of Comments**

The landscape of Sandleford Park is highly valued by the local community. A large number of respondents stressed the importance of the existing wooded areas, including the ancient woodland and wildlife corridors. The retention of trees and hedgerows along Monks Lane was also considered important. A significant number of respondents were against the principle of development on the site arguing that the area should be left as it is, or was only suitable for a smaller development.

A number of respondents referred to the "Capability Brown" landscape which should be recognised and respected and saw the proposal for a country park as an opportunity to restore the landscape.

The views from and into the site, including across to the Hampshire countryside and views from the south, from Sandleford Priory and the A339 were highly valued, as were the open fields and farmland and natural open space. One respondent expressed concern that street lighting may make the development visible from a great distance.

The provision of footpaths, including the footpath from Warren Road, and access to country walking was seen as important by a number of respondents. The opportunity for a riverside walk, by providing access to the River Enborne was also suggested.

There was some concern regarding the protection of the existing flora and fauna, and the importance of dark skies for nocturnal wildlife. The River Enborne was also identified as home to a number of sensitive species that could easily be disrupted by human activity.

### **How these views can be taken into account in the SPD**

The principle of developing the site has already been established through the Core Strategy. The development that is proposed will take account of the existing constraints and opportunities of the site. The strategic objectives for the site include the retention of trees and hedgerows and the provision of a

new Country Park to improve public access at the site and secure biodiversity enhancements.

The development of the site will respect the landscape character of the area. Protection of the historic landscape of Sandlesford Priory and the surrounding historic parkland is an important requirement of the masterplan. The current proposal largely avoids development within a large part of the parkland where it most closely relates to the Priory and registered park and garden.

The SPD will set out that there will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes, enabling features of ecological value to be protected. An important principle is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland rather than encourage its amenity usage. The draft SPD will state that all areas of woodland, including Ancient Woodland should be retained and protected, and that a buffer will be provided around all ancient woodland on the site.

Hedgerows form part of the landscape strategy for the site. They will be identified within the SPD as being of particular ecological value, to be taken into account in the design, layout and future management of the site. One of the proposed strategic objectives of the SPD seeks to retain all important hedgerows on the site.

The masterplan will include measures to ensure that views into the site, in particular those from Sandlesford Priory and the A339 will be protected, including strategic planting. The proposed layout of the site has taken this into account. Land to the southeast of the site should remain open in character. There is also potential for screen planting, linking the separate copses along the south-eastern edge of the development which would screen potential views of any built form in the southern part of the site.

The Core Strategy policy set out that a Country Park will be provided on site which will provide a significant amount of public open space, thus opening up far more of the site than can be accessed at present. The Country Park will respect and enhance the sensitive landscape character of the southern part of the site in perpetuity. The River Enborne is recognised as being a feature of particular ecological value and any proposal for a riverside walk would need careful consideration. The development will have additional green links and open spaces within the residential areas to avoid large areas of urban development.

The ecological value of the site has been assessed and the opportunities for ecological enhancement explored. There are a number of key ecological features which need to be carefully considered in the design, layout and future management of the site. There will be a number of measures to enhance the ecology and biodiversity of the site, in particular with woodland management and the creation of the country park. Lighting will be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the site.

## **Sandleford Country Park**

### ***Questions on Exhibition Boards***

*What type of opportunities would you like to see at the Country Park – for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?*

### **Summary of Comments**

There was a majority view that the park should be left as natural and undisturbed as possible, enhancing the rural feeling of the area, rather than providing a countryside playground or visitor attraction. A number of respondents saw no need for a park when there is already countryside.

A large number of respondents were in favour of educational facilities and picnic areas and a small number suggested additional facilities including an adventure playground, BMX track, barbecue areas, adventure cycle trail, sports pitches, fun facilities for children and Go APE high wires. Also suggested were pond/river dipping, bird watching and animal roaming as at Greenham Common. There were suggestions for seating and wooden sculptures in the park and provision of toilets, litter bins and dog bins.

Provision of cycle routes was considered important, providing links to facilities outside the site and links to other open spaces, with crossing points on main roads for cyclists and pedestrians.

The provision of access to countryside to which there is now very restricted access was seen as positive. A number of respondents mentioned dog walking as an important consideration.

The importance of management of the park and ecological habitat areas was stressed by a number of respondents. The prospect that the woods be properly maintained was welcomed.

It was suggested by one respondent that reference should be made to the original design behind the Capability Brown landscape.

A small number of people raised the issue of car parking for visitors to the park, with potential issues related to safe and secure parking and additional traffic generation.

### **How these views can be taken into account in the SPD**

The Country park is considered most suitable for informal recreation and some of the suggestions such as BMX track, sports fields and Go APE wires are not likely to be appropriate for the site.

Educational facilities are currently proposed to be provided within the Country Park. These will be of benefit to local schools as well as for residents and

visitors. A Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) is required for the Sandleford site. This is a play area equipped mainly for older children but with opportunities for play for younger children. It could potentially form part of the wider country park. It is possible that barbecue stations could be provided within the Country Park, but this would need to be carefully managed due to the risk of fire. Other suggestions such as bird watching can be taken into consideration in the planning and design of the Country Park – for example a bird hide could be provided. Pond/river dipping can be explored further; however the protection of the River Enborne with its high ecological value would be a key consideration. It is possible that cattle could graze at the Country Park and this will be explored further.

Appropriately designed litter boxes and seating are likely to be provided within the Country Park. Opportunities for low key public art will also be sought.

The country park is currently proposed to provide a range of opportunities including leisure trails, cycle routes, and picnic areas etc. The park will provide a significant amount of public open space, thus opening up far more of the site than can be accessed at present. It is proposed that the Country Park will include a network of green links which make connections throughout the site and its surroundings to ensure an accessible network of open spaces.

The management of the ecology on site will be considered – setting out how key habitats will be conserved and managed. One of the principles of the development is that Sandleford Park will actively manage and promote ecology.

Protection of the historic landscape of Sandleford Priory and the surrounding historic parkland forms one of the SPD objectives for the site.

It is not currently proposed to have any car parking at the Country Park. There is easy access from existing and new residential areas to the County Park and pedestrian and cycle linkages will be enhanced.

## **Woodlands and Trees**

### ***Question on Exhibition Board:***

*Should there be public access to the woodlands and ancient woodlands?*

### **Summary of Comments**

There was a majority view that there should be access to the woodlands with a number of respondents commenting that woodlands would need to be managed and some concern over access to the ancient woodland. A number of respondents favoured limited access, with some more sensitive areas protected. A significant number were against access to the woodlands with reasons given including the protection of fauna and flora and to maintain the

feeling of being in countryside. Issues of domestic animals disturbing wildlife, isolation of wooded areas, noise and light pollution were also raised.

### **How these views can be taken into account in the SPD**

The SPD will set out that there will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes. However, one of the principles of the policy which will be carried through in the SPD is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland to protect its ecological value, rather than encourage its amenity usage. Managed access and education will help to ensure appropriate access. Green links will be included within the landscape strategy. These will include connections between areas of ancient woodland, hedges, buffers and grassland which will link to form the green infrastructure

### **Public Open space and Recreation**

#### ***Questions on Exhibition Board:***

*Are there any other open space or recreational facilities that should be provided on the site?*

*Where should we provide food growing areas on the site?*

*Should these food growing areas be in the form of community gardens or privately rented allotments?*

#### **Summary of Comments**

Suggestions for open space and recreational facilities to be provided included children's play areas, adventure playground, sports facilities (including the suggestion for all weather multi-use pitches for football/ tennis/ netball), paddling pools, facilities for older children (baseball hoops, skateboard ramps etc), youth club, scout hut, library and community café.

Some respondents suggested that there should be dual use of facilities with extended sporting facilities at Park House, making Park House a community hub.

There was general support for provision of food growing areas on the site, although a number of respondents felt they were not necessary and that houses should have adequate gardens for food growing. There was no overall consensus on the most appropriate place for food growing areas - a number of respondents considered they should be near residential areas and schools in a central location, some said on the edges of woodland and open spaces making them part of a recreational landscape. The area adjacent to Monks Lane was also suggested, as were the area towards the A339 and the area to the south of the Rugby Club.

On the question of whether food growing areas should be in the form of allotments or community gardens, there was a preference for allotments or a

mixture of both. There was some concern expressed over the appearance of any allotments and the management of any community food growing area.

### **How these views can be taken into account in the SPD**

It is not the intention to provide formal recreation provision (sports pitches) on the site in lieu of significant areas of informal open space. Instead shared facilities will be sought with surrounding uses and discussions with Park House School about the potential of any shared use are ongoing.

A Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) is required for the Sandleford site. This is a play area equipped mainly for older children but there will also be opportunities for play for younger children through the provision of dedicated play areas.

There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities. A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses, which could include youth club, scout and guide groups etc.

A permanent library is not proposed for the site – there is already a library at Wash Common as well as the main Newbury Library, however additional library provision will be explored further.

The current proposal is to provide growing areas for the local community which could include allotments, community orchards and bee hives. These are currently proposed to be incorporated within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses; this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.

Appropriate management would be required for the food growing areas from the outset. The mechanisms of this are currently being explored.

### **Access and Movement**

#### ***Questions on Exhibition Board:***

*What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?*

*What are the important linkages within the site and those outside the site to the wider areas?*

### **Summary of Comments**

Issues relating to access were of major concern to many of the respondents and were the subject of a great deal of discussion at the planning event. A very high number of responses related to the perceived inadequacy of the proposed accesses onto Monks Lane and the potential pressure that the development would put on the existing transport network. Residents reported



that junctions and roads in the area, including Andover Road and Monks Lane were already congested at peak times and there was concern over the capacity of the roundabouts at each end of Monks Lane.

A number of suggestions were put forward, including provision of additional accesses, and widening of Monks Lane. A significant number of responses indicated a preference for an additional access to the site from the A339 but there was no consensus on where would be the most suitable location. Suggestions included an access from the south near or from the Swan roundabout, opposite St Gabriel's School, at the entrance to the recycling centre, somewhere between the College and the recycling centre and from the college roundabout.

Options to access Andover Road from the proposed development were seen as more limited. Warren Road and Kendrick Road were seen as potential opportunities by some, facilitating access to the A34, but a significant number of respondents felt Warren Road was only suitable as a bus access and raised safety concerns relating to the proximity of schools. A number of respondents felt even the proposed bus route on Warren Road was unacceptable.

Issues relating to student safety and vehicular access and pick-up and drop-off arrangements for Park House School were raised. There was also concern not to facilitate rat-running on existing roads such as Wendan Road with the increase in traffic on local roads properly addressed.

A number of respondents expressed concern over the impact of additional traffic, questioning the suitability of the site for a large development and the adequacy of traffic modelling. Comments included that forecast levels of pedestrian and cycle use will be unlikely to be met due to distance and gradient from the town centre.

There were some suggestions for encouraging use of sustainable transport, including improved bus services and cycle links to town centre, provision of electric car charging facilities and restrictions on car ownership.

The important linkages within and from the site that were identified were:

- To town centre and station – improved bus frequency and safer cycle routes needed.
- To A34 and M4, to A339 and A343.
- To Tesco and to the Retail park – need safe route for walking and cycling.
- To Park House School.

Safe pedestrian and cycle routes to Greenham Common and Newtown Common, could include bridges over major roads.

Some suggestions included the introduction of "Boris bikes" and the possibility of Park and Ride from the Rugby Club or New Greenham Park.

## **How these views can be taken into account in the SPD**

The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with two vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and a range of infrastructure improvements have been modelled which are necessary to deliver the development. These are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site which will accompany the SPD. However, in response to concerns raised through public consultation to date, other access options are currently being modelled.

There are no accesses proposed to the south of the site at present. The suggestions for access from the A339 to the south are unlikely to be acceptable due to the landscape impact and the distance from the proposed areas of residential development. The opportunities for an access from the A339 close to the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) and an access link through Warren Road are being further explored through technical work.

Discussions with Park House School about the school's interrelationship with the Sandleford site are ongoing.

Measures set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan based on the Transport Assessments will address issues of impact on existing residential roads.

The Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) does not make any assumptions about future bus, cycle and foot movements use. It therefore represents a worst case scenario. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. The site is proposed to be delivered with good cycle and pedestrian links throughout the site and outside the site to existing services. Development of the site will also provide the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing bus services from this part of the town to the town centre and wider area.

A requirement for electric car charging points could be included within the SPD but there is no plan to restrict car ownership. The objective will be to provide the opportunity to use more sustainable transport modes.

The SPD will look at how important linkages can be strengthened, including safe access to nearby facilities.

## **Proposed Approach to Development on the Site**

### ***Questions on Exhibition Boards :***

*What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?*

*Should each of the three areas have its own distinct character in terms of design? If so, what should the look and feel of these areas be?*

## **Summary of Comments**

A significant number of respondents expressed their opposition to the development in principle. There were also a number of positive responses with support for the country park concept and retention of woodland which would break up the housing development.

There was concern over densities and differing opinions over whether densities should vary over the site and how the development would fit into the urban grain of the wider area. There was general but not universal support for distributing affordable housing throughout the development. There were also questions raised on phasing.

A number of respondents mentioned that there should be a mixture of styles in each of the three areas, to avoid the appearance of a cloned estate and to attract a diverse vibrant community. There was support for development of a distinct character to each area

A significant number of respondents expressed the importance of design and the opportunity for sustainable and innovative contemporary design, with the opportunity for Newbury to lead the way. Minimising the energy requirements of new homes, with high levels of insulation and maximising the opportunities for solar gain were seen as important. A design competition was suggested by one respondent.

Thames Valley Police requested that community safety and designing against crime should be a major consideration in layout and design, in line with principles in NPPF.

Concern was expressed that roads would be congested as each property would have 2 to 3 cars.

## **How these views can be taken into account in the SPD**

The site is proposed to be delivered to create two new neighbourhoods which respond to their surrounding character and context. It is currently being proposed that the northern part of the site will be higher density than the western part of the site to respond to adjoining patterns of development. The proposed densities have been established during the Core Strategy process and reflect the predominant mix of family sized homes which are proposed for the site.

Sandleford Park will be designed and laid out in accordance with best practice masterplanning principles to promote a legible and permeable place. It is proposed that the layout of buildings and spaces will take priority over streets and car parking so that the highways do not dominate the development. Parking will be incorporated within the design of the street and in accordance with national and/or local parking standards.

A mix of dwelling sizes is planned for the site, including houses and apartments, to help meet the needs of all in the community. High rise flats are not proposed for the area.

There are opportunities for on-site renewable energy generation in accordance with Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and a range of solutions will be incorporated on site to provide a sustainable form of development.

Phasing is not yet confirmed and will partly depend, for example, on final decisions about the location of accesses

The SPD will set out the Council's expectations on urban design via a set of urban design principles for the two character areas, taking account of the views expressed, to deliver a high quality environment within the site. A design competition is an option to be further considered

## **Education, Facilities and Services**

### ***Questions on Exhibition board:***

*What community facilities would you like to see on the site?*

*Are there opportunities for shared use of facilities, for example shared use of sports facilities or community buildings?*

*Where should facilities be located?*

*What type of retail provision is needed?*

*Is there any requirement for provision of office or workshop space?*

### **Summary of Comments**

A large number of respondents would like to see a community hall. Social facilities for children and the elderly, provision for scouts, brownies etc were seen as important. Glendale Church would hope for a multi-purpose premise with at least an auditorium for 300 seats and other office facilities.

Schools and early years provision were regarded as very important and required early in the development. The possibility of using schools for community activities was raised by a number of respondents.

Health provision was raised by many respondents, with questions on the possibility of expansion of Falkland Surgery and pharmacy provision.

Sports and play areas were mentioned by some, with suggestions for sports centre/gym/indoor swimming pool, football pitch, skateboard facility and tennis courts.

With regard to services, the need for high speed broadband and extension of water, gas and drainage networks was raised.

On the issue of shared use of facilities, respondents mentioned that school halls should be available for community uses and sports facilities made available. Park House School has commented that there is an outstanding opportunity to focus sports and community education facilities at the school and also an opportunity to locate a Community Learning Centre (Library/Internet facilities) on the Park House site to provide a focus for both curricular and adult/community learning. The school would welcome opportunities to explore the potential for contiguous location of primary provision with existing secondary provision to maximise efficiencies, learning opportunities and offset potential health and safety issues with vehicular movement during drop off and pick up times.

The desirability of shared use of the rugby club for a wide range of sports uses was also raised.

It was considered that a community hall could be designed to have multiple uses, for sports facilities, arts activities, social services or meetings.

One respondent commented that it should be a green development and there should be a biomass district heating scheme, ground source heat pumps for the housing, and PV. This would in some way make up for the significant carbon footprint which will result from the amount of surface transport which the development will generate.

Most respondents felt that facilities should be located as centrally as possible, in accessible locations or in conjunction with Park House School, Newbury College or the Rugby Club.

Some retail provision was favoured, although the proximity of Budgens and the retail park was noted. Respondents favoured a general store/ newsagent and post office or small individual shops. Other suggestions included a pub/restaurant, coffee shop, bank, chemist, hairdressers, travel agent and filling station. A significant number did not feel that retail provision was required and that the nearby retail park and the shops on Essex Street were adequate. It was suggested that any retail should avoid replicating what is already provided in Monument Close and the comment was made that the extra residents will make the existing local shops more viable which is good, as there are many older people in the area with limited transport / mobility who depend on these shops.

There was an almost unanimous feeling that there was no need for provision of office or workshop space, with comments that there is plenty of empty office space in Newbury. Some respondents mentioned that some dwellings could include a home office/workshop and that fast broadband in all homes is essential to encourage home working and mitigate access issues.

## **How these views can be taken into account in the SPD**

It is proposed that a new small local centre be developed within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities. A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.

Regarding schools, the site is proposed to be delivered with two primary schools on site (4 forms of entry in total) and the extension of Park House School. Discussions have taken place with Park House School who have confirmed that they can accommodate the increase in secondary school numbers. This may require some re-modelling of the existing accommodation. Early years provision will also be made on the site

On health care, Berkshire Shared Services have been fully engaged in the early planning for the Sandford site. They have indicated that some town centre practices will require expansion and that Falkland surgery will need to make internal changes to create additional clinical space.

There is no proposal for formal recreation provision (sports pitches or tennis courts) on the site in lieu of significant areas of informal open space. Instead shared facilities will be sought with surrounding uses.

There are considered to be good opportunities for sharing facilities with neighbouring uses such as Newbury College, the Rugby Club and Park House School. Discussions with Park House School, the rugby Club and Newbury College are underway.

The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling. The primary schools will need to be located where they are easily accessible to the new residents in the area to encourage walking to school.

Regarding retail provision it is likely that the shops will cater for some day to day 'top up' shopping needs. The local centre within the site will include a limited number of shops. The scope of these will depend on factors such as interest from retailers and service providers.

There is potential to provide some employment space at the Local Centre. Employment provision at the site will assist in the creation of a sustainable community. The option of providing some live work units on the site will be explored further through the SPD process.

## **Other Issues Raised**

### **Summary of Comments**

Other comments included a significant number of negative comments against the development in principle, with arguments that the infrastructure in the area is totally unsuitable for such a development, that the land is greenfield, that the development will radically change the Wash Common area and that Newbury will become like Swindon, Basingstoke or Reading.

The overriding concerns regard transport infrastructure, the effect on local roads, and safety concerns, particularly for school pupils. Some respondents feel a reduced housing number on the site may be more appropriate. One respondent regarded the modelling as inadequate to assess the impact on car ownership of a large percentage of family homes.

The issue of parking and access to an extended Park House School was raised as an issue to be addressed.

The importance of safe links from the site to adjacent uses was raised by a number of respondents. Improved cycle and pedestrian links towards the town centre, to the retail park and to Newtown were mentioned, including a means of pedestrian access to Greenham Common. The importance of regular and frequent bus services was regarded as essential to encourage people to use public transport.

Standards for car parking and space standards in general were raised. The need for homes to have garages and adequate parking, including for visitors was stressed.

There was some concern expressed at the long term cost of maintaining the large amount of open space and preserving the woodlands, and assurance sought that the southern area would be protected for the public benefit in perpetuity.

A couple of respondents mentioned possible reference to the farmers (Butler) who tenant farmed Sandleford for three generations in the road naming.

The issue of protecting the river from flash flooding and contaminated run-off was raised with concern that an increase in effluent reaching the Enborne would disrupt the delicate ecosystem.

One respondent mentioned the triangle of land sold to permit road access and the issue of any Sport England objections to development on sport designated land.

The notion of reducing the current A339 dualling through Newbury to a single carriageway was regarded as misguided, leading to total gridlock through the town and an increase in accidents.

A number of houses on Monks Lane were reported to have septic tank drainage and the development was seen as an opportunity to have proper mains drainage.

The issue of access to Area 3 to the south west was raised.

One respondent queried whether there would be enough job vacancies in the area for all the additional people.

A buffer zone of 100 – 200 metres was requested between the existing properties in Wash Common and the proposed new residential development.

A number of respondents suggested that a managed housing development for residents over 55 could be included in the development.

Concern was expressed by one respondent that the development would destroy the potential for future siting of large wind turbines and that the site remains the best location for wind power generation in Newbury Parish. There was still potential for small wind turbines and the respondent asked what provisions for sustainable energy generation would be incorporated.

The question of re-aligning the parish boundaries, potentially to incorporate Sandleford into a new parish of Wash Common was raised.

Issues of wildlife access to the site and the necessity of a full archaeological study due to inclusion of areas of Civil War battlefield were raised.

The opportunity to build something special was mentioned by a number of respondents ; this included issues of sustainability and the creation of a high quality development that would be cherished in the future. Issues of design, crime prevention and community safety were regarded as important. The green travel plan needs to show imagination and vision and to have significant amounts of money put into it to make it work.

### **How these views can be taken into account in the SPD**

The issues of infrastructure, linkages and car parking provision will all be addressed in the SPD and the concerns have been noted. The reduction of the A339 to a single carriageway is not a proposal that is being put forward as part of the Sandleford development.

The implications of the scheme with regard to Park House School are being discussed on an ongoing and constructive basis with the school.

The management of the open spaces including the Country Park is a matter to be addressed.

Opportunities for sustainable energy generation will be explored through the SPD and more detailed design. Development will need to conform to policies in the Core Strategy.



There is a very small area of flood risk zones 2 and 3a adjacent to the northern park of the River Enborne on the southern boundary of the site. Surface water discharge from the site will not be increased and this will be dealt with by the provision of attenuation storage within the site drainage system. Development runoff will be strictly controlled and sustainable drainage techniques (SUDS) employed to ensure that downstream flood risk is not increased and wherever possible, reduced.

The Council will continue to engage with Sport England regarding the development and any potential impact on the provision of sports facilities.

Opportunities to improve infrastructure and services to surrounding properties can be considered in drawing up more detailed implementation schemes in conjunction with the service providers. It is not considered that a buffer of up to 200 metres from properties in Wash Common would be sustainable. While existing wooded areas and hedgerows would be retained, the objective is to utilise land effectively, to deliver a development which is integrated into the existing urban form and which will form part of the wider community.

On the issue of jobs, the evidence shows that the projected growth in jobs is significantly higher than the projected increase in economically active population. The new housing required over the plan period is primarily to meet levels of natural growth and household formation.

Provision of housing for the elderly will be considered. The Core Strategy is clear that the needs of all in the community should be considered in drawing up proposals for the type of housing to be provided.

Details on the management of the ecology on site will be included within the SPD, setting out how habitats will be conserved and managed. Any requirements for archaeological studies will be considered.

The Council is committed to a high quality, sustainable development at Sandlesford Pa

## Appendix 1 Attendees at Stakeholder Event

David Fenn	Newbury Town Council
Philip Barnett	Newbury Town Council
R Kingsley Evans	Newbury Town Council
Diane Smith	Greenham Parish Council
Noël Erskine	St. Gabriel's
Jeff Beck	West Berkshire Council, Ward Member for Clay Hill
Paul Bryant	West Berkshire Council, Ward Member for Speen
Garth Simpson	West Berkshire Council, Ward Member for Cold Ash
Ieuan Tuck	West Berkshire Council, Ward Member for St Johns
Howard Bairstow	West Berkshire Council, Ward Member for Falkland
Cllr Julian Swift Hook	West Berkshire Council, Ward Member
Adrian Edwards	West Berkshire Council, Ward Member for Falkland
Roger Hunneman	West Berkshire Council Ward Member
Cllr John Izzet	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Councillor
Fiona Henderson	Headteacher, Falkland Primary School
Barrie Prentice	Chair of Governors, Falkland Primary School
Sue Futcher	School Business manager, Park House School
Cate Robinson-Slater	Park House School
Peter Norman	Say NO To Sandleford
Tony Hammond	Say NO To Sandleford
Richard Page	Say NO To Sandleford
Gabrielle McGarvey	Say No To Sandleford/Newbury Town Council
Revd Paul Cowan	St George the Martyr Church, Wash Common
Bruce Blaine	St George the Martyr Church, Wash Common
Mel Gatward	North Hampshire and West Berkshire Joint Action group
Ian Mawer	BDBC Officer
Cliff Reeve	Glendale Church
Colin Powell	Glendale Church
Eugene Futcher	Scout Association
Peter Greenhalgh	Scout Association
Renata Bogdanowicz	St Francis de Sales Church
Sean Bates	Newbury Rugby Club
Harry Hudson	Green Issues Communique

## **Appendix 2 Stakeholder Comments Following Event**

### **Greenham Parish Council**

Meeting was attended by the following parish councillors:

Phil Barnett

Diane Smith

Julian Swift-Hook

West Berkshire Council (WBC) needs to decide very quickly whether the parish boundaries are to be reviewed i.e. whether Sandleford is to become a ward of Newbury Town or of a newly warded Greenham 'Town'. Greenham Parish Council (GPC) and Newbury Town Council will need to discuss this. The decision will affect siting of any office and or meeting room for GPC, which may be needed for this rapidly expanding parish, which currently operates from the clerk's spare bedroom and hires a room to meet in. [As stated at the meeting, there are only 2 publicly owned buildings in the parish – the portacabin on the Diamond and the Control Tower].

Provision of community space, for meetings, scout and other youth activities is essential. Existing provision in this part of Newbury is already fully stretched. These facilities need to be built at the start of the development, to help build a community. However current proposals are to place these in the more southerly second phase of the development.

The developer should liaise with the relevant parish regarding bus shelters, which are maintained by the parish elsewhere [Newbury and Greenham have chosen different suppliers/specifications], and provision of salt bins where necessary.

The Sandleford travel plan has not considered a car club, so it is suggested that the developer liaise with the racecourse developers on this.

The plans do not appear to include doctor and dental surgeries. This is a significant oversight. There is no doctor or dental surgery in Greenham. Falkland surgery and the associated pharmacy would not appear to have the capacity or possibilities of expansion to meet the needs of the Sandleford development. The surgery and pharmacy should be consulted at the earliest opportunity. Assuming that medical facilities will be added to the plans, they should be located close to proposed housing for the elderly and on the bus route.

The suggestion to reroute the 103 through Sandleford would remove bus access to the Monks Lane surgery for existing residents. Further the primary purpose of this already complex route is to provide a service for Greenham Business Park; as such it is Monday to Friday only and no evening or bank

holiday service. Surely a development of the size of Sandleford should have a dedicated 7 days a week service, including evenings.

In looking at the traffic flows on the A339, please consider the GPC request for a pedestrian bridge or underpass, to replace the existing traffic light controlled crossing just south of the Monks Lane roundabout. This crossing is predominantly used at school/college times (including lunch break) and leads to gridlock on the roundabout when the lights are red. Adding secondary school and college students from the 1450 homes at the Racecourse will worsen this. Adding 2000 another households who are to be encouraged to walk to Tesco and the Retail Park will make this a real problem. Putting in traffic light controls on the roundabout will still not give an optimum flow if this also has to include a pedestrian phase. If pedestrians have to wait too long at peak times we will have problems of people dodging through the traffic.

Whilst Park House may be willing to expand, it is already expected to grow to meet the needs of the Racecourse development (even though it is the furthest of the secondary schools from that site). But the school site has limited extension capacity without a complete rebuild, (protecting and extending all physical activity space – possibly also making use of the Rugby Club and its proposed multi-sport facilities?) including re-provisioning and extending on-site car parking plus drop off facilities. The latter is particularly important because of the existing problems at school run times in Warren Road, Monks Lane and at the Falkland surgery.

The various suggestions for the future management and maintenance of the proposed country and town parks will need to be discussed further. The options appear to be

- private management (handed over by the developers), funded by ???.
- public management by the relevant parish, or by WBC, funded from the precept
- management by a trust, funded by a dowry

Concern was expressed about the protection of the ecology of the ancient woodlands and the park land. Loss of the deer will affect the suppression of scrub in the woodlands. Domestic pets will affect the ground nesting birds, with particular concern for the skylark population. On the Common, there are already problems with protection of ground nesting birds and taking advice on best practice will be essential. Access to the River Enborne will need to be carefully considered.

### **Newbury Town Council Chief Executive**

Some comments re Sandleford Park, for consideration as part of Masterplan development.

a) I welcome a lot of what was stated the other evening – encouraging signs that this wonderful opportunity for a real community will be taken.

b) It was disappointing to hear that wind turbines have been completely discounted. I can understand why the proposed site adjacent to Monks Lane doesn't fit, but Sustainable Newbury had further discussions a while back about a potential alternative site to the south-west of the development. This should not be completely discounted yet – perhaps even as an alternative to pv on every south facing roof. It could also be community owned, with each residential unit having a community stake.

c) I didn't see anything significant about either allotment provision (there are none in Greenham Parish) or Community Growing areas. These could be located beneath the wind turbines, so getting double use of scarce land.

d) I am surprised that Core Strategy already states 2 accesses onto Monks Lane. Consideration must be given to establishing access onto A339, which would act as traffic calming for the school and college and also potentially provide a better access to the recycling site, avoiding the need for Newbury residents to travel via the Swan roundabout.

e) Community ownership of assets must be considered further ([www.communityshares.org.uk](http://www.communityshares.org.uk)). Possibly of the Country Park? Or at least put Country Park ownership in some kind of locally controlled trust. It could be managed much more effectively that way – and possibly in perpetuity.

f) A minor point – but Newbury is lacking a Parkour facility. If developers want something different, that may be it – or it may be considered too urban for the location.

g) There must be significant inclusion of renewables, in line with the various CS policies CS3, CS14, CS15. This is my biggest disappointment about the Parkway and Racecourse developments which found a way to avoid it.

h) I am concerned at proposal to provide free bikes. They will just end up on e-Bay. I seem to recall some kind of voucher scheme, subject to training for the Racecourse which will help ensure sustainability – a trained cyclist would be more likely to keep the bike...?

## **Headteacher Park House School**

Following last night's meeting we would wish to make the following comments:

### **Education**

Understand that the additional secondary school places generated would fall within our catchment area. The figures discussed included an additional 20 students per year from 2016 which would be allocated to Park House School and we have based our long term planning on the basis of the information provided. We have also been in discussions with the EFA on this subject and

have been working with the LA's Asset team to assess the level of provision at Park House School as part of the planning process for the influx. To suggest inclusion of other secondary schools within the area whilst there is already a facility on the development site would be contrary to the LA's stated objective of encouraging walking and cycling and reducing the need to travel by car whilst also having a significant impact upon local traffic volume. The only realistic alternative as a secondary school option is St Bart's School which is currently oversubscribed and, as you are aware, has been the subject of considerable investment over the past few years.

## Transport

For the past couple of years we have been in discussion with the Highways Authority about our concerns for the safety of our students on Monks Lane and the possibility of a bus stop being set back from the road and the provision of a bus shelter. This problem was again highlighted last night. There has been no alteration to the road layout and this remains an issue. We would therefore additionally welcome the opportunity to be involved in the transport planning aspect of the development

## Country Park

As suggested by Noel Erskine, Business manager at St. Gabriel's, we would welcome the opportunity to be part of any discussions on the formation of a Trust with responsibility for the management of the Park, along with St Gabriel's and Newbury College.

## **Local Ward Member**

I have lots of concerns about the development proposals. Cllr Macgarvey's point about pets eating the wildlife was spot on and I bet nothing is done! However, there are two big issues that are top of my list. (1) "At least 40% affordable housing." How can we keep them to this? We have seen erosion of the affordable housing targets so many times. This is a golden opportunity to make a big dent in the waiting list. (2) So all cars, delivery vehicles, refuse lorries etc generated by 2,000 houses are going to use two roundabouts on Monk's Lane? In a curious way, the congestion that will inevitably arise might provide the stimulus for cycle use that we would all like to see! On the other hand it may well create pressure from the developer to open up new access points to the site to the east and west, particularly when the traffic flow models are set up to assess the impact of the extra road users. We shall see.

## **Appendix 3 Public Consultation Post-it Comments**

This appendix sets out all the comments made on 'post-it' notes by members of the public during the consultation event. The display boards contained information under specific topic areas and asked a number of questions to stimulate engagement. The questions are set out below under each display board along with the comments received. Some of the comments have been moved to ensure they correlate with the correct topic area for ease of analysis. Also to note, for the most part the comments have been typed up as they were written on the 'post-it' notes unless for example an error was clearly evident.

### **Display Boards 1 – 3: Information Boards**

#### **Display Board 4: Opportunities and Constraints**

- Are you aware there are floods in development area right hand side – underground springs
- Will the developer buy these houses? Some of the home owners are trying to sell them and cannot – will the developers buy them from them?
- What is going to happen to the two pubs – the GUN and the BELL?? Are you going to make Monks Lane dual-carriageway?
- Utilities – water, electric – worry problems with energy and water
- Why is no vehicular access shown for 2 out of the three development areas?
- Public comments need to be published. Not kept in house.
- Have you considered using Newbury Rugby Club for Park and Ride?
- What will happen to houses in Warren Road? Warren Road not wide enough to take buses
- Concerns the flooding

#### **Display Board 5: Landscape**

##### **Questions:**

*What elements of the landscape are particularly important to you as a local resident?*

*Are there other landscape features we have not identified?*

*Do you have any other comments about landscape issues?*

- Don't destroy Sandleford, it's the only place I feel free
- Save our Sandleford
- How do we know site will not change and you will keep adding more buildings?
- In spite of the claim made above, there is no guarantee that the view above would remain unchanged

- The element that is important to me as a resident is the existing landscape of fields and ancient woodland.
  - The view as you pass Park House School and leave the lane into open fields is VERY IMPORTANT to many residents. Putting lots of houses at this point makes us lose a major local amenity.
- 

## **Display Board 6: Sandleford Country Park**

### **Questions:**

*What type of opportunities would you like to see at the Country Park – for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?*

*Do you have any other comments about the Country Park?*

- Why the need for 'potted entertainment'. Let children ROAM Don't MOLLY CUDDLE
- Where will people park who want to drive to the Park?
- Why have a country park when we already have countryside?
- Agree with comment above, why create a country park when countryside is already there
- A fun park for entertainment because the park doesn't look particularly exciting.
- Park is a positive asset. Will be appreciated by the wider community in south Newbury
- Managed habitat areas – cycle routes and picnic areas
- Where are people coming from to visit the park. If they need to drive – more parking needed and more cars on the roads
- We would like to get a positive feedback on everyone's comment tonight
- I think there should be more fun facilities for children. There will be lots of families with kids of all ages, it should supply entertainments for everyone

## **Display Board 7: Woodland and trees**

### **Questions:**

*Should there be public access to the woodlands and ancient woodlands?*

*Do you have any other comments about woodlands and trees?*

- Protect the woodland
- Who is going to be responsible to maintain the woodland/park etc?
- Yes there should be access to woodlands



- How will you ensure the safety of animals. Can't you clear the area of them and place them in a rescue centre before recklessly destroying their homes and them?
- The woodlands must be protected. The wildlife will all be destroyed and never by replaced
- How are wildlife corridors between the ancient woodland protected? What impact will lighting have on wildlife?
- Currently have woodland view across Monks Lane. This should be retained i.e. don't build houses right up to Monks Lane
- How will it be possible to build a road through woodland area to access from Warren Road to the southern most strip of proposed buildings???
- Of course there should be access but there should also be proper protection and adequate buffer zones and proactive ecological management
- Keep trees and hedgerows along Monks Lane
- Don't 'improve' the woodland. Leave it to do its own thing. Its called nature
- Please keep the 'green corridor' of Monks Lane. Homes should be well set back from Monks Lane.
- Please ensure that the hedgerow in Monks Lane is retained, particularly in front of Area 1.
- The ancient woodland will need wildlife corridors into them to keep them viable.
- Protect the woodland
- Please keep greenery along Monks Lane– widening a green belt to maintain a rural feel along the road as at present please.
- Any lighting will destroy wildlife in the woodlands. How will this work?
- Protect the woodland
- Please retain all hedgerows adjacent to Monks Lane to offer privacy for existing residents and new residents.
- The woodland will be fragmented and therefore a wildlife corridor is needed to link the various woodlands.

## **Display Board 8: Public open space and recreation**

### ***Questions:***

*Are there any other open space or recreational facilities that should be provided on the site?*

*Where should we provide food growing areas on the site?*

*Should these food growing areas be in the form of community gardens or privately rented allotments?*

*Do you have any other comments on public open space and recreation?*

- What will happen to the people working? Will they have supplies and the proper things they need?

- Allotments – adjacent to open space. URA – WBC recycling site for Greenham
- Are the gardens going to be so small that residents cannot grow their own food
- Surely we need a pool
- What about the future of the rugby club?
- Please consider locating houses in Area 1 adjacent to Monks Lane with rear gardens running onto Monks Lane i.e. running from North to South.
- Let's have community orchards – ask Newbury Town Council about theirs.
- Greenham Parish have asked developer for an allotment area to serve the rest of Greenham with access through the civic amenity area of the A339.
- Park House will lose its cross-country running route – how about some extra land as compensation. This will also accommodate the extra pupils at lunch time.
- We need a place for older children.
- Allotments. Youth facilities. Community Hall.

## **Display Board 9: Access and Movement**

### **Questions:**

*What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?*

*What are the important linkages within the site and those outside the site to the wider areas?*

*Do you have any other comments about access and movement?*

- Completely unrealistic provision for 2 – 4000 cars!
- What will happen to all the cars
- The bus lane in Warren Road needs a complete rethink
- Park and ride with New Greenham
- Due to the by-pass access point, Andover Road has been ruined by heavy traffic, noise and pollution – do not make it worse! Access should all be to Newtown Road
- How will more cycling up steep hills to/from town be encouraged?
- Monks Lane should not have 2 entrances/exits already grid locked. A339 better on Andover Road.
- There must not be all vehicle access on to Andover Road
- Will houses have ample parking
- Bus only access off A339
- Definitely don't make it all vehicle access down Warren Road – roundabouts on Monks Lane and right turn to ensure traffic uses the main route into Newbury.
- Andover Road at peak times already a problem – so no further access from Warren Road(including buses).

- Warren Road must not be an all vehicle access. Traffic is bad enough now on Andover Road.
- You must not make Warren Road an all vehicle access
- A cycle access to Kendrick Road has been suggested but the poor state of repair makes it unsuitable and dangerous
- There is going to be lots of traffic. This will cause problems. I recommend a number of different routes to the same place.
- Have you thought of a one way route – access from A339 and exit only onto Monks Lane or vice versa
- Any access to and from Warren Road would cause problems onto Andover Road– just where there are 2 large schools.
- Access to and from the A339 would be much more preferable than Monks Lane– which is too clogged and residential to take any more traffic
- If the development goes ahead, the old A34 will be a crucial arterial road. Suggestion that it should be throttled down to a simple lane to encourage use of the by-pass will work against that. The road and junction need improving not throttling.
- Please rethink access! Cars from 2000 houses onto 2 already very busy roads.
- The main problem is that access to the site is difficult unless road infrastructure is much improved. Both Andover Road and Monks Lane are already very busy.
- Support either an access onto Andover Road or A339. There needs to be more than just access onto Monks Lane.
- We had been PROMISED the bus route to Andover Road via Warren Road would NOT be all vehicular why are you now considering it.
- What about the bus service – it is shocking!
- Transport Links: Monks Lane is busy now. It will be many times worse unless a radical solution is provided for the new householders to exit the development with their vehicles.
- How can 2000 more houses not impact on existing highway network? Monks Lane has queues at school times/rush hour already.
- Bus service needs to be improved.
- There is no capacity on Andover Road. Currently no cycle lanes and no pedestrian path at some points.
- Need to review vehicle movement along Monks Lane in the context of student safety – Highways and Transport to consider as key issue in view of existing high volume of traffic.
- Where are all the cars going to go?
- Suggested entrance and exit should be planned for A339 – at least that would cater for the Hants and Basingstoke travellers.
- Why no exit route to the south? Complete madness to assume Monks Lane will suffice.
- Why have access points on Monks Lane? Why not via Warren Road?
- Please ease the traffic problems that now exist before adding 2000 houses – is that really possible? Extra houses are not the answer.
- Incorporate a bus route to and from New Greenham Pk with buses only access off A339 by St Gabriel's. Park and Ride at NGP.

- Bus and cycling friendly development. All houses within 5 min walk of bus stop. Covered bus shelters. Direct cycling routes to main destinations. Car and electric cycle share.
- Need safe cycle access
- Infrastructure and traffic has been under estimated. Big worry – how will people get to work?
- Have entrance to development at Warren Road to get to A34.
- There should be a road link direct from the site to the A339 perhaps at the refuse site.
- Principal access needs to be off Newtown Road
- Are buses really going to turn into and out the site onto Andover Road? How many school children do you want to kill?
- Please take the opportunity to improve cycle routes into Newbury town centre.
- Unless quality cycle lanes and proper paths provided everyone will travel by car = environmental catastrophe!
- 2000 homes = 4000+ to 5000 cars: an environmental disaster throughout the area.
- While Kendrick Road might eventually be suitable for pedestrian or cycle access, it is totally unsuitable for vehicular access.
- Putting a bus route in Warren Road/Andover Road is totally ridiculous – 1) two schools; 2) total chaos even now trying to access Andover Road from Sunley Close and Warren Road. Very dangerous.
- Warren Road access must be kept for BUS and PEDESTRIAN and CYCLE ONLY.
- Routes are needed to allow traffic to exit development on the SOUTH SIDE both south East (A339) and south West (Andover Rd).
- There must be other access – preferably onto A339 – Monks Lane and Andover Road cannot cope with more traffic.
- Improved bus service for the development and for south Newbury – bring benefits to the wider community.
- Monks Lane is already over full. Wash Common will NOT be a good place to live once 2000 houses and their cars fill our roads in rush hour.
- How can you possibly consider adding a junction at Warren Road/Andover Road when it is opposite/next to 2 schools and has such a peak flow of pedestrians and traffic at school times? This seems ludicrous and based on lack of local knowledge of traffic conditions.
- Why just accesses off Monks Lane? Also off the 'old' A34?
- My major concern is the effect on local traffic. There really needs to be a route out of the south towards the A34 possibly via A339 or develop Swan roundabout? Routed via southern boundary to preserve parkland. Without this it cannot work!!
- 2000 houses = 4000 cars trying to get out onto Monks Lane in the morning. Why not access out to A343 by the tip; so not to disturb existing residence.
- Traffic overload on Monks Lane at peak times.
- At school run times Andover Road and Monks Lane are extremely busy. Where will the 2000+ extra cars fit in to this congestion?
- Wash Common /Andover Road area needs a decent bus service.

- Need safe cycle and walking access – Map attached to this comment showing point where existing Sandford footpath meets the A339, with a route down the side of the A339 to Swan Roundabout and turning right along the road and left along A339 to meet other existing footpath.
- Tesco car park/ Newbury retail Parks are full – where will people go to shop?
- Where will these people work – there are not the jobs???
- If you think cyclists will shop in Tesco's and return with shopping you must be barmy therefore total blockage on road
- The roads are already choc-a-block, let alone more than 2000 cars extra
- Where is the water coming from to supply 2000 houses?
- The bus route is hardly suitable in such a narrow road
- Serious concerns about access particularly from Monks Lane. Both ends of Monks Lane will become bottlenecks.
- Please consider access and egress from site the 2 that are proposed are not sufficient. Access required onto A339 also access onto Monks Lane could be onto existing mini-roundabout.
- Access required onto western side of development onto Andover Road and easy route to by-pass.
- In its current design and layout the road access to the retail park and Tesco will be unable to cope with the extra cars/vehicles owned by the new residents.
- The access into Monks Lane looks very odd. Why two? Why not try to connect the College roundabout?

## **Display Board 10: Development Principles**

### ***Questions:***

*What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?*

*Should each of the three areas have its own distinct character in terms of design? If so, what should the look and feel of these areas be?*

*Do you have any other comments about how the site should be developed?*

- No relaxation in design – all to be of a high standard
- What do Areas 1-3 mean – are these different developers or different densities or different timescales?
- Maintain attractive rural feel of Monks Lane– with houses set well back behind buffer – possibly larger tree'd gardens here
- The design must be high quality
- I don't believe the density of housing should be greater at north end of the site. We need green space there!
- Houses to be fit for tomorrow's people (height size) with space for their belongings. And garages to take 2026 size cars with room to get in/out of them.
- Include grass verges and trees along the 'streets'.

- The idealist would say that the density of houses across the site should be the same but residents often prefer otherwise and so do the developers.
- What about housing for older people?
- Architecture of housing to be sympathetic to rural area.
- Rather than money on renewables, extra insulation.
- Social housing/affordable homes need to be distributed across development not as suggested for densities to decrease from north to south.
- Are blocks of flats in the plan? If so, how many stories (max)?
- High quality design is important.
- Please ensure that there are sufficient parking spaces – at least 2 per house.
- Please make sure cheaper houses are mixed in with more expensive or we could get social class difference and one part of the site a ‘no-go’.
- I don’t agree with this project however it has to take place. Are you sure you are improving lives? You’re giving them somewhere to live but also bring traffic noise and pollution.
- Affordable housing must be pepper potted uniformly. Need to resist watering it down in Area 3.
- Build to 2016 zero carbon standard of to Passivhaus levels of insulations and air tight homes rather than putting ‘eco-bling’ on roofs. You can bolt the eco-bling on later. Re-insulation is V. EXPENSIVE.
- How can we be certain the no. of affordable housing will be enforced?
- No way should Warren Road be used as a major road. Access to the Andover Rd is already difficult at times with 2 schools very close it would create a very dangerous situation, particularly at peak times.
- Build gardens with lawns not concrete
- Great disaster Sandleford be approved – Please do not build any more than 1000 houses
- The value of houses in Warren Road and Sunley Road will dramatically reduce in value
- Housing should have back gardens facing Monks Lane. Front of houses facing south
- I think it important that the development is not split into 3 sections but remains a unity.
- Houses being built in Area 1 should have back gardens facing the north i.e. Monks Lane. Front of houses facing north.
- Development should start at western area
- Affordable Housing should be mixed with other housing.
- Ref. Density of housing - proposed approach for densities to decrease from north to south i.e. higher densities in the northern part – the opposite i.e. higher densities in southern area would have less impact on existing residents and would be more favourable.

## **Display Board 11: Education, facilities and services**

### ***Questions:***

*What community facilities would you like to see on the site?*

*Are there opportunities for shared use of facilities, for example shared use of sports facilities or community buildings?*

*Where should facilities be located?*

*What type of retail provision is needed?*

*Is there any requirement for provision of office or workshop space?*

*Do you have any other comments about education, facilities and services?*

- Where will shops etc be situated?
- If any community hall is built it is important that the main floor area be joisted, not solid, for the benefit of the joints of those performing dance or other physical activities and the NHS.
- Medical – Falkland surgery is already over full – Provision must be made for additional doctor's surgery possibly a dental surgery too.
- A joisted floor would be essential in a community hall for physical activities (dancing) especially for elderly participants.
- Expand Falkland surgery. Minor injuries unit to be added?
- Additional playing fields at Park House School required.
- What about older people?
- Could we add a post office to the plan please?
- Falkland surgery is already extremely busy – appointments are a problem now. What provision will be made for further GP capacity?
- Good opportunity for synergy with Newbury College.
- In previous sites retail shops have failed – just newspapers and things forgotten.
- Need to make sure we have enough schools.
- Medical: 1) The Falkland surgery is overfull now. 2) What provision for a surgery for the proposed development? 3) We need more surgery capacity NOW.
- High speed broadband to reduce need to commute.
- Centralise additional sporting/recreational facilities at Park House as it is a sports college and is a central point to all local areas (including existing Wash Common residents).
- Falkland surgery is already working beyond capacity. There is no room for any expansion. Will a new surgery be provided?
- Also what development is planned for sewage/water? Both present systems are overloaded?!
- Park House needs major refurbishment to fit in with new modern development.
- A Community Hall is a MUST – (needed for the resident local toddler group)
- New/extra medical facilities please. We are already over crowded.
- NO SHOPS PLEASE! Otherwise Budgens will go bust.
- Scout/Guide/Brownie/Cubs facilities. Shared facilities for sport and clubs. Community shop.

- Concern that infrastructure buildings are in place e.g. schools, community buildings etc.
- Are there any facilities for young people?
- Is Falkland surgery willing to accept all these new patients?
- Extended sport and community access swimming pool/tennis courts? Teenager focused community facilities – skate park? Off road bike tracks?
- Provision for extending sport facilities? E.g. swimming pool, racquet sports, gym etc. We could be loosing Greenacres!!!
- Extension of gas and drainage networks.
- Provision of main drainage for houses in Monks Lane which are on septic tanks at present.
- Retail – There is a dearth of information on a shopping complex. This should be explained.
- Since when has the waste disposal facility been regarded as residential? Road access from near that to the development would take pressure off Monks Lane.
- Positive opportunity to boost Newbury College and re-integrate it into the fabric of the town.
- A small community centre with rooms that can be rented by the hour would be useful.
- Is the play area (age groups) going to be mandatory?
- On behalf of Glendale Church we would hope for multi-purpose premise with at least an auditorium for 300 seats and usual other facilities i.e. 6 or 7 off-rooms.
- Will 106 funding be reserved for Wash Common and Sandford communities who will be most impacted?
- Park House School will need more land for buildings etc if it is to cater for such a huge development.
- Are you sure that Park House has the willingness and/or facilities to increase capacity?
- What does ‘shared use of facilities’ mean? If there are community facilities aren’t they available to the community? i.e. Wash Common
- We need facilities for young people
- We need more schools
- We need more affordable homes for local people
- With the close proximity of the retail park a small store (Tesco metro) would be useful for walking access.
- Will there be easy access to hospitals?
- We shall need additional surgery and surgery parking in the area and more facilities at the West Berks hospital to avoid increased pressure on the RBH.

### **Display Board 12: Proposed Concept Plan**

- Are you sure this money isn’t going to waste?

### **Display Board 13: Next Steps**



- Residents have no say what so ever – the Council is only interested in planners and developers.

**General comments:**

- Please as well as going on web site – Please publish in Newbury Weekly News.

## Appendix 4 Public Consultation Feedback Form Responses

This appendix sets out the comments received to the questions asked on the Feedback Form and on the exhibition boards along with detailed responses from the Council.

<b>Landscape - What elements of the landscape are particularly important to you as a local resident?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
6	Retention of trees and hedging along Monks Lane important – need for green space at north end of development	The draft SPD recognises that the views into the site from Monks Lane are restricted by the existing screening provided by the trees and hedgerows, and will retain and enhance these existing landscape features through strategic landscaping.
2	Trees on boundary with Kendrick Road and Round End	Noted. Existing vegetation will be protected and enhanced in this location.
34	Importance of existing wooded areas including ancient woodland and wildlife corridors	The SPD sets out that all of the woodland at the site is designated as a Wildlife Heritage site (a local designation). These are features of particular ecological value. The draft SPD will state that all areas of woodland, including Ancient Woodland should be retained and protected, and that a buffer will be provided from all ancient woodland on the site. Access to the ancient woodlands will be carefully managed.
1	Some woodland will need to be used for amenity use – suggest the most northerly (Crook's Copse)	The SPD sets out that there will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes. However, one of the principles of both the policy and the draft SPD is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland rather than encourage its amenity usage.
1	Waterleaze Copse is unique, and public access should not be encouraged to this area. This will be the main wildlife reservoir and access route to the site. The current copse forms the upper flood bank of the river. It contains bats, water voles, certain	Managed access to the ancient woodlands will enable features of ecological value to be protected. These features are recognised within the SPD and will be taken into account when looking at access to the woodlands. The extensive County Park will be the

<b>Landscape - What elements of the landscape are particularly important to you as a local resident?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	mushrooms and fungi, sphagnum mosses, and Purple Toothwort amongst other wildlife and flowers. All of these could be disrupted very easily.	focus of informal recreational activity at the site.
2	Hedgerows	Hedgerows form part of the landscape strategy for the site. They are identified within the SPD as being of particular ecological value, to be taken into account in the design, layout and future management of the site. One of the proposed strategic objectives of the SPD seeks to retain all important hedgerows on the site, and to integrate them into the development.
9	Views from and into the site, including across Hampshire countryside and to Beacon Hill (as seen from the college) and views from the south, from Sandleford Priory and the A339	The draft SPD includes measures to ensure that views into the site, in particular those from Sandleford Priory and the A339 will be protected, including strategic planting. The proposed layout of the site has taken this into account. An example of this is the views into the site from Sandleford priory and the A339, which mean that built form, should be concentrated in the northern and western parts of the site with the retention of existing woodland. Land to the southeast of the site is visually prominent in views from the Priory and the A339 and should remain open in character. There is also potential for screen planting linking the separate copses along the south-eastern edge of the development which would screen potential views of any built form in the southern part of the site whilst being consistent with the vegetation pattern of the area.
10	Open fields and farmland, natural open space. Wish to retain natural beauty and tranquillity. Open spaces are a "green lung"	The policy and the draft SPD set out that a Country park will be provided on site which will provide a significant amount of public open space, thus opening up far more of the site than can be accessed at

<b>Landscape - What elements of the landscape are particularly important to you as a local resident?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		present. The development will have additional green links and spaces through the development areas to avoid large areas of urban development.
10	Concern that measures be taken to protect existing flora and fauna, particularly endangered species. Reported that bats roost in Gorse Covert. Dark skies are important for nocturnal wildlife and street lighting needs to be developed sensitively.	The ecological value of the site has been assessed and the opportunities for ecological enhancement explored. There are a number of key ecological features which need to be carefully considered in the design, layout and future management of the site. There will be a number of measures to enhance the ecology and biodiversity of the site, in particular with woodland management and the creation of the country park. Lighting will be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the site. A Strategic Ecological Enhancement Plan will accompany any planning application.
1	Preservation of the valleys which provide valuable wet/bogland where there are regular sightings of deer and other mammals. Belief that pedestrian routes along valleys would be a mistake.	Noted. The landscape character of the valley will be maintained and the views up and down the valley protected. Any pedestrian routes will follow the edge of the valley floor away from the wetland area.
8	Leave the area as it is – trees, woodland and open landscape, free from buildings and traffic noise and pollution.	The principle of developing the site has been established through the Core Strategy process. However, the development that is proposed to take place has been planned within the existing constraints of the site, and the strategic objectives for the site include the retention of trees and hedgerows and the provision of a new Country Park to improve public access at the site and secure biodiversity enhancements.
1	Consideration to be made for smaller development at Sandford and use other areas including empty buildings around the town	The principle of developing the site as a strategic allocation of this scale has been established through the Core Strategy process.

<b>Landscape - What elements of the landscape are particularly important to you as a local resident?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
4	The "Capability Brown" landscape (the Country Park) – should be recognised and respected – country park provides opportunity to restore the landscape.	The development of the site will respect the landscape character of the area. Protection of the historic landscape of Sandleford Priory and the surrounding historic parkland forms one of the masterplan components of the site. The current masterplan largely avoids development within a large part of the western parkland where it most closely relates to the Priory and registered park and garden.
1	Original park boundary shown further north on older maps and requested this become the general public access boundary, whilst the south remains wildlife refuge	Protection of the historic landscape of Sandleford Priory and the surrounding historic parkland forms one of the strategic objectives for the draft SPD. There are also development principles on the protection of designated heritage assets and their settings.
1	Country Park must retain the identity of the current landscape	The Country Park will respect and enhance the sensitive landscape character of the southern part of the site in perpetuity. This is a key principle of policy CS3 and the SPD, and is set out as a strategic objective within the SPD.
5	The footpath from Warren Road to St. Gabriel's School should remain as attractive as possible	There are currently views of the site available from this footpath, and new strategic landscaping means that the development can be largely screened in views.
6	Access to country walking	The policy and the draft SPD set out that a Country park will be provided on site which will provide a significant amount of public open space, thus opening up far more of the site than can be accessed at present. The development will include a network of green links which will make connections throughout the site between, for example, the wider urban area, the country park and the areas of ancient woodland.
1	Provision of footpaths for pedestrian and wheelchair use	There will be pedestrian access to the ancient woodland via a series of

<b>Landscape - What elements of the landscape are particularly important to you as a local resident?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	only, through all wooded areas	identified paths and routes. There will be no access for cycles within the woodland.
3	Undulating landscape	The site generally slopes downwards from north to south towards the River Enborne. The site is being designed to respect the landscape sensitivity of the site. The masterplan will have a clear landscape framework which will integrate the development within the landscape. The site's existing topography and landscape features can be used to contain the development in visual terms and also integrate the development in to the character of the area and add interest.
2	Flooding concerns - issue of additional surface water run-off towards River Enborne	There is a very small area of flood risk zones 2 and 3a adjacent to the northern park of the River Enborne on the southern boundary of the site. Surface water discharge from the site will not be increased and this will be dealt with by the provision of attenuation storage within the site drainage system. Development runoff will be strictly controlled to greenfield runoff rates and sustainable drainage techniques (SuDS) employed to ensure that downstream flood risk is not increased and wherever possible, reduced.
3	The River Enborne. Home to number of sensitive species including water voles that could easily be disrupted by human activity in the area	Buffer zones will be established for the entire length of watercourses within the site, with no development taking place within areas less than 10m from the watercourse.
1	Watership Down connection	Noted.

<b>Landscape - Are there other landscape features we have not identified?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>

1	Bluebell woods – particularly High Wood and beside River Enborne	The bluebell woods form part of the ancient woodlands. The SPD will set out that all of the woodland at the site is designated as a Wildlife Heritage site (a local designation). These are features of particular ecological value. The draft SPD will state that all areas of woodland, including Ancient Woodland should be retained and protected, and that a buffer will be provided from all ancient woodland on the site. Access to the ancient woodlands will be carefully managed.
1	Primrose banks on south edges of High Wood and Dirty Ground Copse	Noted.
1	Hedgerows either side of Monks lane	The draft SPD will recognise that the views into the site from Monks Lane are restricted by the existing screening provided by the trees and hedgerows, and will retain and enhance these existing landscape features.
1	Access to River Enborne (opportunity for riverside walk).	The River Enborne is recognised within the draft SPD as being a particular feature of ecological value. This would need to be carefully considered if a riverside walk were to be encouraged.
1	View onto St Gabriel's School	The draft SPD includes measures to ensure that views into the site, in particular those from Sandleford Priory and the A339 will be protected, including strategic planting. The built form should be concentrated in the northern and western parts of the site with the retention and enhancement of existing woodland. Land to the southeast of the site is visually prominent in views from the Priory and the A339 and is proposed to remain open in character. There is also potential for screen planting linking the separate copses along the south-eastern edge of the development which will screen potential views of any built form in the southern part of the site whilst being consistent with the vegetation pattern of the area

2	The Night sky	Street lighting at the site will be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the site
2	Scenic area of Newbury – the only approach now undisturbed	The draft SPD includes measures to ensure that views into the site, in particular those from Sandleford Priory and the A339 will be protected, including strategic planting. The proposed layout of the site has taken this into account. An example of this is the views into the site from Sandleford Priory and the A339, which mean that built form should be concentrated in the northern and western parts of the site with the retention of existing woodland. Land to the southeast of the site is visually prominent in views from the Priory and the A339 and should remain open in character. There is also potential for screen planting linking the separate copses along the south-eastern edge of the development which would screen potential views of any built form in the southern part of the site whilst being consistent with the vegetation pattern of the area.
1	The stream at the bottom of the valley.	The valley crossing and valley corridors are defined as character areas within the draft SPD which will enable their special characteristics to be considered and enhanced.
1	Kennel Cottage on Kendrick Road is a listed building	Noted.
2	Mature trees bordering the site and mature trees within Park House School boundary with Warren Road. Concerns associated with potential road widening. Would like TPOs on all mature trees.	Trees are identified within the draft SPD as particular features of ecological value. As most of the trees are of individual quality and also significant landscape value there is very limited scope for removal.
1	Opportunity to open access to River Enborne and create a riverside footpath along the boundary with Hampshire to Andover Road	The River Enborne is recognised within the draft SPD as being a particular feature of ecological value. This would need to be carefully considered if a riverside walk were to be encouraged.



1	Conflict between human safety and wildlife conservation, with regard to street lighting. If it is considered 'appropriate' to develop green fields for human habitation, the safety of the human occupants must be prioritised over wildlife. 'Bollard' lighting for example is NOT appropriate to create a sense of safety at human eye level.	Lighting will be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the site.
1	Street lights to be focused downwards and shields to prevent light pollution in the sky above. Would still like to retain good view of the stars.	Lighting will be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the site.
1	Grass verges with evergreen trees on all internal roads within the site to break up the monotony of the hard landscaping. All roads to be wide enough to accommodate parking on roads. Lay-bys to accommodate buses at bus stops to avoid road congestion. Bus shelters and seats at all bus stops.	Green links will be provided within the residential areas as part of the wider pedestrian and cycle network across the site. Further details are set out on each of the proposed character areas within the draft SPD.
1	Proper consideration should be given to the landscaping at the end of Kendrick Road adjacent to the listed building	New strategic landscaping including a strategic planting framework is proposed where necessary to screen views to the site from the wider area. In this particular area planting will be added where appropriate. Additionally the layout of the proposed development will avoid the situation of development in close proximity to the site boundary which could be intrusive in close proximity views into the site.
1	Prevention of fly tipping. Consideration to be given to access waste disposal centre from within Sandeford development	This is currently being explored.

<b>Country Park - What types of opportunities would you like to see at the County Park - for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>

<b>Country Park - What types of opportunities would you like to see at the County Park - for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
12	Leave as natural and undisturbed as possible, ideally left as mixture of grazing and arable land. Enhance the rural feeling rather than provide a countryside playground or visitor attraction. Children's play areas should be restricted to parts of the sites that are up for development. One comment that should have minimal walking and cycling routes with no facilities and that a footpath is enough to enjoy open space.	The Country Park is most suitable for informal recreation and will play a key role in protecting the landscape and historical significance of the southern part of the Sandlesford Park site. However, there may be scope for play areas on the edges of the Country Park.
1	Important that a suitable endowment is made to allow the woods to be properly maintained as opposed to the complete neglect they have endured other than for the shoot. Hopefully as part of this scheme pheasant shooting in the area will be phased out.	The landscape strategy will include a management plan for the woodlands.
26	Cycle routes – including access to Retail Park and Newbury College, to A339 from Warren Road.	The country park is currently proposed to provide a range of opportunities which includes cycle routes/trails. It is proposed that the Country Park will have a number of strategic green links for cyclists and pedestrians through the housing areas to ensure an accessible network of open spaces.
2	No bicycles or cycle tracks	Any cycle routes within the Country Park will be in the form of green links as part of the wider pedestrian and cycle network across and beyond the site, making connections, for example, between the wider urban area, the country park, the areas of ancient woodland and the school.
19	Managed habitat areas – comment that something that has to be expertly overseen	The management of the ecology on site will be included within a Strategic Ecological Enhancement Plan – setting out how key habitats will be conserved and managed. One of the principles of the development

<b>Country Park - What types of opportunities would you like to see at the County Park - for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		is that Sandleford Park will actively manage and promote ecology and biodiversity within the site.
16	Picnic areas	Picnic areas are currently proposed to be provided within the country park.
2	Picnic areas probably mean more concrete and more parking facilities and should not be encouraged	It is not currently proposed to have any parking facilities at the Country Park. Any feature (including picnic areas) that is provided at the Country Park will be in the form of informal open space based on a natural approach which respects the landscape character and can be accommodated within it.
3	Barbecue stations (anti vandal)	It is possible that barbecue stations could be provided within the Country park, however this would need to be carefully managed due to the risk of fire.
11	Educational facilities	Educational facilities (including educational trails) are currently proposed to be provided within the Country park. These will be of benefit to local schools as well as for residents and visitors.
1	No educational facilities	Educational facilities (including educational trails) are currently proposed to be provided within the Country park. These will be of benefit to local schools as well as for residents and visitors.
8	Children's play area	A Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) is required for the Sandleford site. This is a play area equipped mainly for older children but with opportunities for play for younger children. It could potentially be adjacent to the wider Country Park.
1	Adventure playground	A Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) is required for the Sandleford site. This is a play

<b>Country Park - What types of opportunities would you like to see at the Country Park - for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		area equipped mainly for older children but with opportunities for play for younger children. It could potentially form part of the wider country park. Locally Equipped Areas of Play (LEAPs), which are play areas equipped for children of early school age are also needed on the Sandleford site. There is potential for one of these to be provided on the edge of the Country Park site.
3	Fitness track – low visual impact than traditional playground	This could form part of the informal recreational provision at the Country Park.
1	Activities for teenagers - e.g. adventure cycle trail	If something of this nature was provided the key considerations would be the need for successful integration into the landscape and the need to protect the ecology.
1	Bird watching	This can be taken into consideration in the planning and design of the Country Park – for example a bird hide could be provided.
1	BMX track	This is unlikely to be provided due to the range of other recreational usages on site, but can be explored further if shown as a high priority during the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Pond/river dipping. Mention of example of Thatcham water park amenities which could be adapted.	Whilst this can be explored further, the River Enborne has high ecological value and the protection of this would be a key consideration.
1	Animal roaming, as at Greenham Common	It is possible that cattle (currently at Greenham Common) could graze at the Country Park.
1	Allotments	Allotments are proposed to be incorporated within the Country Park.
1	Reed beds for managing waste	This is an option that can potentially be explored further

<b>Country Park - What types of opportunities would you like to see at the County Park - for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		through the hydrology and drainage work for the site.
2	Access to river - A footpath along the length of the River Enborne suggested	The River Enborne is recognised within the draft SPD as being a particular feature of ecological value. This would need to be carefully considered if a riverside walk were to be encouraged. This can be explored further through the landscape strategy for the site.
1	Seating	Appropriately designed seating is likely to be provided within the Country Park.
2	Limited car parking. Issues relating to safe and secure car parking – Country Park will be too far from existing housing for easy foot access but car parking will be a magnet for anti-social gathering after dark unless managed and secured appropriately.	It is not currently proposed to have any car parking at the Country park. There is easy access from existing and new residential areas to the County park, and pedestrian and cycle linkages will be enhanced. However, this will be reconsidered if it emerges as an issue from the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Fence off the ancient woodland and restrict access.	The SPD will set out that there will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes. However, one of the principles of both the policy and the draft SPD is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland rather than encourage its amenity usage.
4	Easy access. Important that safe access to / from A339 available for pedestrians and cyclists. Local residents (Sandleford Lane and St. Gabriel's school pupils) should not feel obliged to get into cars / minibuses to get to and fro.	Noted. The development will include a network of green links for pedestrians and cyclists which make connections throughout and outside the site. This will include opportunities for enhanced linkages outside the Sandleford site.
1	Links with other open spaces - We need crossing point(s) and decent footpaths along (even better away	The development will include a network of green links which make connections throughout

<b>Country Park - What types of opportunities would you like to see at the County Park - for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	from) the main road to achieve this.	and outside the site. This will include opportunities for enhanced linkages outside the Sandford site and these opportunities are flagged up within the draft SPD.
5	Dog walking – off lead (with dog bins)	It is probable that controlled dog walking will be allowed at the County Park but that this will be limited to particular areas of the site.
1	Dog walking should be limited to preserve wildlife in the area.	It is probable that controlled dog walking will be allowed at the County Park but that this will be limited to particular areas of the site.
6	Walks – access to open country. Providing access to the countryside / ancient woodland to which now there is very restricted access is positive. Comments to leave natural rather than concrete paths.	The policy and the draft SPD set out that a Country park will be provided on site which will provide a significant amount of public open space, thus opening up far more of the site than can be accessed at present. The development will include a network of green links which will make connections throughout the site between, for example, the wider urban area, the country park and the areas of ancient woodland. These will be green links utilising natural materials where possible.
1	Maximise the country park and minimise the number of houses.	The principle and extent of the different uses on the site has been established through the Core Strategy process.
1	Trees	The SPD will set out that all of the woodland at the site is designated as a Wildlife Heritage site (a local designation). These are features of particular ecological value. The draft SPD states that all areas of woodland, including Ancient Woodland should be retained and protected, and that a buffer will be provided

<b>Country Park - What types of opportunities would you like to see at the County Park - for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		from all ancient woodland on the site. Access to the ancient woodlands will be carefully managed
3	Extension of playing fields/sports pitch. Open area for ball games. Cricket, football and golf mentioned by one respondent.	The Country Park is intended as a location for informal open space rather than sports pitches.
2	Shared facilities for proposed 2 primary schools. Opportunities for environmental education and outdoor/alternative learning.	The form of the primary schools to be provided on site is currently being explored through feasibility work. This will include looking at options for shared facilities.  Environmental educational facilities are currently proposed to be provided within the Country park. These will be of benefit to local schools as well as for residents and visitors.
2	Public Toilet	This will be explored further if it emerges through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Litter boxes	Appropriately designed litter boxes will be provided at the Country park.
1	Wooden sculptures – low key but create interest.	Opportunities for low key public art will be sought at the Sandeford site, particularly within the Country Park.
1	Go APE high wires	This is unlikely to be appropriate for this location and could have potentially negative ecological impacts. Instead the focus on recreation at the site will be on informal recreation.
1	Reference should be made to original design behind Capability Brown landscape. Picturesque means “in the manner of a picture” and careful consideration should be given to this.	Protection of the historic landscape of Sandeford priory and the surrounding historic parkland forms one of the masterplan components of the site.
1	Reference to older maps show the original park boundary to be further	Protection of the historic landscape of Sandeford priory

<b>Country Park - What types of opportunities would you like to see at the County Park - for example cycle routes, picnic areas, educational facilities, managed habitat areas?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	north than is shown on plans, and it is requested that this boundary become the general public access boundary, whilst the Southern parts remain a wildlife refuge.	and the surrounding historic parkland forms one of the strategic objectives for the SPD and is being further explored through development principles which require that a landscape, Visual and Heritage Impact Assessment will be agreed with the Council through the planning application process.
3	Negative comments including "We won't have any left if this development goes ahead". "You would be destroying the natural habitat to create another one?!?"	Noted. However, the principle of this development has been established through the Core Strategy process.

<b>Woodlands and Trees - Should there be public access to the woodlands and ancient woodlands?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
13	Limited access. Some areas should have public access but some should be protected for conservation of flora and fauna. One suggestion that other than Crooks Copse and woodland edging River Enborne, access should be discouraged through use of perimeter scrub planting.	The SPD will set out that there will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes. However, one of the principles of both the policy and the draft SPD is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland to protect its ecological value, rather than encourage its amenity usage.
1	A correction is requested to your map. The southern area of woodland (Waterleaze Copse) adjacent to the river Enborne should be marked as Ancient Woodland. Waterleaze Copse is unique, and public access should not be encouraged to this area. It would make sense to restore this woodland, in line with the historic parkland design as it was envisioned by the original landscape architect. This would also help buffer the river valley	The Waterleaze Copse area of Ancient Woodland has been added to the maps within the draft SPD.  The River Enborne is recognised within the draft SPD as being a particular feature of ecological value. This would need to be carefully considered if a riverside walk were to be encouraged. This can be explored further through the landscape strategy for the site.



<b>Woodlands and Trees - Should there be public access to the woodlands and ancient woodlands?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	from the noise and movement of the main park. The wood forms a wildlife corridor along the river valley. The Enborne river itself is an exceptionally clean waterway and carries a number of sensitive species including water voles that could easily be disrupted by human activity in the area, especially along the river banks where various animals make their home. Mass public access to this area will substantially disrupt wildlife.	
1	A riverside walk alongside or near the River Enborne would be a welcome feature.	The River Enborne is recognised within the draft SPD as being a particular feature of ecological value. This would need to be carefully considered if a riverside walk were to be encouraged. This can be explored further through the landscape strategy for the site.
3	Not through Ancient Woodland sites or they will be trampled	The SPD sets out that there will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes. However, one of the principles of both the policy and the draft SPD is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland to protect its ecological value, rather than encourage its amenity usage.
42	Yes, including a number of comments that woodlands would need to be managed. Comment that should be only for pedestrian access, including people with disabilities	The SPD sets out that there will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes. However, one of the principles of both the policy and the draft SPD is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland to protect its ecological value, rather than encourage its amenity usage.
2	Yes – as play area, could incorporate children’s adventure features e.g. high-level walkways through trees, bike trails.	There will be different types of play areas at Sandford Park, which could potentially be located within the Country Park. Anything that is provided will need to avoid negative ecological impacts.
2	There WILL be public access unless it is heavily fenced and	Managed access via identified paths and routes will help to ensure

<b>Woodlands and Trees - Should there be public access to the woodlands and ancient woodlands?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	defended. Children will enter to play and climb, foragers will enter to pick mushrooms and flowers and the anti-social will enter for whatever else!	appropriate access, as will the appointment of a warden.
1	Dogs on leads in woodland	It is probable that controlled dog walking will be allowed in the Woodlands but that this will be limited to particular areas of the site.
12	No –reasons given include for protection of fauna and flora, and to maintain feeling of being in countryside, issue of domestic animals disturbing wildlife, noise and light pollution.	The SPD will set out that there will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes. However, one of the principles of both the policy and the draft SPD is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland to protect its ecological value, rather than encourage its amenity usage.
1	Concern at how the potential to have isolated areas of woodland without green or wildlife corridors will impact wildlife and could result in these pockets of woodland within the site being deserted habitats	Green links will be included within the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Strategy. These will include connections between areas of ancient woodland, hedges, buffers and grassland which will link to form the green infrastructure and to avoid them becoming isolated.

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Are there any other open space or recreational facilities that should be provided on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
5	Sports facilities including football pitch. Suggestion for all weather multi-use small scale pitches for football/tennis/netball	There is no identified formal recreation provision (sports pitches) on the site in lieu of significant areas of informal open space. Instead shared facilities will be sought with surrounding usages.
1	Park House playing fields should be extended. Additional sporting facilities to be built on Park House	Discussions with Park House school about the potential of any shared usage are ongoing and

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Are there any other open space or recreational facilities that should be provided on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	site as DUAL USE facilities. Make Park House community hub	do not need to be finalised for the SPD process.
9	children's play area	A Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) is required for the Sandleford site. This is a play area equipped mainly for older children but with opportunities for play for younger children. It could potentially form part of the wider Country Park. Locally Equipped Areas of Play (LEAPs), which are play areas equipped for children of early school age are also needed on the Sandleford site. There is potential for one of these to be provided on the Country Park site. LAPs are areas of green space for young children (largely 4-6 year olds) to play games.
1	Recreational spaces should be restricted to built up areas with woodland areas allowed to thrive as wildlife refuges and open land still available for ground nesting birds.	There are proposed to be a range of public open spaces at Sandleford Park including the Country park and informal open space around the site. The principle is to provide an informal and natural approach to play and recreation. There will be managed access to the ancient woodland via a series of identified paths and routes. However, one of the principles of both the policy and the draft SPD is to conserve and enhance the ancient woodland rather than encourage its amenity usage. There will be further measures to protect and enhance the ecology and biodiversity on the site.
1	Bmx track	This is unlikely to be provided due to the range of other recreational usages on site, but can be explored further if shown as a high priority during the consultation on the draft SPD.
2	Bird watching – hide to watch wildlife	This can be taken into consideration in the planning

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Are there any other open space or recreational facilities that should be provided on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		and design of the Country Park.
2	Small pond or lake with an island for wildlife and as educational resource. Pond dipping	There are no proposals for this at present. Instead, the design of the Country park will maximise opportunities of existing natural materials and existing site features.
1	Picnic areas	Informal picnic areas are proposed to be included within the Country Park.
1	Animal roaming as at Greenham Common	It is possible that cattle (currently at Greenham Common) could graze at the Country park and this will be explored further.
1	Cycle routes	The Country Park will provide a range of opportunities including leisure trails, cycle routes, and picnic areas etc. It is proposed that the Country Park will have a number of strategic green links for cyclists and pedestrians through the housing areas to ensure an accessible network of open spaces.
5	Adventure playground. One suggestion for separate simple assault courses for children and adults. Suggestion for outdoor gym and climbing area in the woodlands	One of the types of play area to be provided on site is a Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play which is a play area equipped mainly for older children. The woodlands are features of particular ecological value, where access needs to be carefully managed and the focus is on ecological conservation and enhancement.
2	Allotments	Allotments are proposed to be incorporated within the Country Park.
1	Reed beds for managing waste	This is an option to be explored further through the SPD.
2	Trees along the whole length of Monks Lane. Planting of as many native English trees as possible, planned from outset.	There is already a tall hedgerow along the southern side of Monks Lane. The draft SPD will recognise that the views into the site from Monks Lane are

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Are there any other open space or recreational facilities that should be provided on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		restricted by the existing screening provided by the trees and hedgerows, and will retain and enhance these existing landscape features.
3	Public toilets	This issue will be explored further if it is raised as an issue through consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Paddling pools for children	There are no proposals for this at present. Instead, the design of the County park will maximise opportunities of exiting natural materials and existing site features
4	Facilities for older children - appropriate informal youth facilities. Sandleford is too far from other facilities for younger teenagers living on the new development to access on their own. Youth shelters, baseball hoops, skateboard ramps etc. will be needed - under good natural surveillance and not hidden away, BUT close enough to dwellings that users feel safe - and in case of accidents, BUT not so close to cause disturbance.	A Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) is required for the Sandleford site. This is a play area equipped mainly for older children but with opportunities for play for younger children. It could potentially form part of the wider country park. The focus on recreation at the Sandleford site is on informal recreation opportunities.
1	Only for residents	The Country park will also be a facility for residents of Newbury.
2	Do not want anything built! Not needed	The principle of development has been established through the Core Strategy process.
3	Open country for walking. Green space – for play and relaxation	The development will include a network of green links which will make connections throughout the site between, for example, the wider urban area, the country park and the areas of ancient woodland. There are proposed to be a range of public open spaces at Sandleford Park including the Country park and informal open space around the site. The principle is to provide an informal and natural

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Are there any other open space or recreational facilities that should be provided on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		approach to play and recreation.
2	Community Hall	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities. A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.
1	Youth club	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities. A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.
1	Scout hut	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities. A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.
1	Library	A permanent library is not proposed for the site – however there will be improvements to local library provision.
1	Shop	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities.
2	Community cafe	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities. A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Where should we provide food growing areas on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
4	Close to Monks Lane: would provide green breathing space and easy access. One suggestion for the narrow site between Crooks Copse and Monks Lane.	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Allotment provision and planting of fruit trees desirable	The current proposal is to provide growing areas for the local community which could include allotments, community orchards and bee hives. These are currently proposed to be incorporated within the country park area but this needs to be explored further through the SPD.
1	Allotments in the better soil areas	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	South facing, well-drained site screened from general view. Local allotment holders should be involved in allocating suitable provision	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
5	Not necessary. Hopefully houses should have adequate gardens. Density proposed means little room for growing food by individual householders. Reduce density.	The principle of the density on site has been established through the Core Strategy process and reflects the proportion of family sized homes to be provided on the site.

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Where should we provide food growing areas on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area.
5	On the edge of woodland/open spaces which are near to houses. - make them accessible and part of a recreational landscape.	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards, edible landscape features and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Food growing areas should blend in with the initial landscape design.	The design of any food growing areas will be considered through the Strategic landscaping and Green Infrastructure plan for the Sandleford Park site.
6	Near residential areas and schools. Near houses in order to encourage use and community by making them a part of everyday life,	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	On the edges of each housing area.	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	in a central area to maximise the number of growers	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments,



<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Where should we provide food growing areas on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
2	Between Area 1 & 2 and at the back of the Rugby club might be the best.	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	The strip of land between the college and Monks Lane on the north perimeter could be made available to allotments as could the area to the south of Newbury College and to the north and west of the recycling facility. If additional areas are required then the logical place would be to take a strip along the A339.	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Allotments/ community orchards in the middle of housing, like London squares but not fenced and not with notices saying no ball games.	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Ironically, the loss of Sandleford as potential food growing on a farm scale may be regretted as food supply is threatened in the future.	The principle of the Sandleford development has been established through the Core Strategy process.
1	Where as little of the open spaces are diminished as possible.	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Where should we provide food growing areas on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Provide food for insects, birds etc by planting wild flower areas, which look after themselves	The Country park will be mainly wild flower grassland which will add ecological value.
1	Towards A339	The current proposal is to incorporate community growing features such as allotments, community orchards and bee hives within the country park area. However, given that there have been a range of comments about the most appropriate location for these uses, this will need to be explored further through the consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Where are there food growing on other estates in Newbury, this is a ridiculous idea	Greenham Parish currently have no allotments. There needs to be sufficient provision made to ensure that there are sufficient food growing areas for the local community provided on the site. This will accord with the approach to sustainable development at the site.

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Should these food growing areas be in the form of community gardens or privately rented allotments?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
14	Both. A mixture of well organised allotments and community gardens/ orchard. Comment that should be community orchard in each of proposed development areas.	The current proposal is to provide growing areas for the local community which could include allotments, community orchards and bee hives. These are currently proposed to be incorporated within the country park area but this needs to be explored further through the SPD.
23	Privately rented allotments – some queries as to whether	The current proposal is to provide growing areas for the local community

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Should these food growing areas be in the form of community gardens or privately rented allotments?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	sufficient space and some concern regarding appearance.	which could include allotments, community orchards and bee hives. These are currently proposed to be incorporated within the country park area but this needs to be explored further through the SPD. Appropriate management would be required for the food growing areas from the outset. The mechanisms of this are currently being explored.
1	Community gardens and orchards.	The current proposal is to provide growing areas for the local community which could include allotments, community orchards and bee hives. These are currently proposed to be incorporated within the country park area but this needs to be explored further through the SPD.
1	Community gardens need money to keep nice - would this be available?	Appropriate management would be required for the food growing areas from the outset. The mechanisms of this are currently being explored but would require a legal agreement.
4	Either-	The current proposal is to provide growing areas for the local community which could include allotments, community orchards and bee hives. These are currently proposed to be incorporated within the country park area but this needs to be explored further through the SPD.
3	Neither - both would end up as eyesores. Not necessary	Appropriate management would be required for the food growing areas from the outset. The mechanisms of this are currently being explored but would require a legal agreement.
1	Community facilities rely on some form of 'community' to manage and resource them and on most new developments, this can take time to establish	Appropriate management would be required for the food growing areas from the outset. The mechanisms of this are currently being explored.
1	Food growing areas should be provided within the garden of each house and the plots made larger to accommodate this otherwise the Country Park will	It is currently proposed to provide growing areas within the Country park but this needs to be explored further through the SPD to establish whether this is the most appropriate location.

<b>Public Open Space and Recreation - Should these food growing areas be in the form of community gardens or privately rented allotments?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	become one big area devoted unsightly sheds, greenhouses, growing areas, etc.	

<b>Access and Movement - What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
30	Access only on to Monks Lane is inadequate, is restrictive and will intensify traffic problems and cause tremendous pressure on existing residents. Junction at college already congested and roads to retail park at full capacity. Potential to improve existing roundabouts limited. Options need to be reviewed.	The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through consultation, opportunities for an all vehicle access link through Warren Road on to the Andover Road (currently proposed as a sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses) is also being explored as is an all vehicle access onto the A339.
1	There is a need to review Monks Lane access points in the context of student safety and the already high volume of traffic movement at peak times. Vehicular access and pick-up and drop-off arrangements for Park House School need to be actively considered, potentially utilising the existing access point off Monks Lane to the Rugby Club.	The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane and sets out a range of infrastructure improvements which are necessary to deliver the development. However, in response to concerns raised through consultation, opportunities for an all vehicle access link through Warren Road on to the Andover Road (currently proposed as a sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses) is also being explored. Discussions with Park House school about the school's interrelationship with the Sandleford site are underway.
1	Need more vehicular accesses to reduce congestion	The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through

<b>Access and Movement - What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		consultation, opportunities for an all vehicle access link through Warren Road onto the Andover Road (currently proposed as a sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses) is also being explored as is an all vehicle access onto the A339.
5	Access only from Monks Lane. Comment that would be acceptable if this road was widened – one suggestion that possible dual carriageway	The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and a range of infrastructure improvements have been modelled which are necessary to deliver the development. These are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site which accompanies this SPD. However, in response to concerns raised through public consultation to date, other access options are currently being modelled, which are all vehicle accesses onto the Warren Road and onto the A339.
2	Access From Monks Lane is the least worst option. The Andover Road and A339 are not very suitable - certainly not for general vehicular traffic.	The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane and a range of infrastructure improvements have been modelled which are necessary to deliver the development. These are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site which accompanies this SPD. However, in response to concerns raised through public consultation to date, other access options are currently being modelled.
1	Access and car parks should be towards north of site, leaving south of site as park and wildlife reserve.	There are no accesses proposed to the south of the site at present. The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. The south of the site will be protected as a Country Park.
9	Andover Road and Monks Lane congested at peak periods. Huge load at school delivery/collection times. Comment that pedestrians are already discouraged from using Andover Road and Monk's Lane due to lack of provision and heavy traffic. The potential developers have not offered a solution to this problem.	The site has been modelled through the 4 phases of Transport Assessments (TA) which accompanied the Core Strategy as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. A range of infrastructure improvements have been modelled through the TA work which are necessary to deliver the Sandleford development. These are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site which accompanies this SPD.
2	The infrastructure is totally insufficient at the moment – local roads can not cope	The site has been modelled through the 4 phases of Transport Assessments (TA) which accompanied the Core Strategy as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. A range of infrastructure improvements have been modelled

<b>Access and Movement - What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		through the TA work which are necessary to deliver the Sandleford development. These are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site which accompanies this SPD.
1	There will be too much traffic for the roads into town – only Andover Road and Newtown Road.	The site has been modelled through the 4 phases of Transport Assessments (TA) which accompanied the Core Strategy as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. A range of infrastructure improvements have been modelled through the TA work which are necessary to deliver the Sandleford development. These are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site which accompanies this SPD.
12	Additional access off A339 required - would help slow traffic and reduce congestion. One suggestion may need two access roads to the east.	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. These are all vehicle accesses on to Warren Road and on to the A339.
2	Not from A339. Providing any direct access from the site to the A339 would be a mistake causing the residential area to be a rat run between the A339 and the A343. Access to the site directly from the A339 would create a new Pathway into Newbury which would spoil the southern access to the town as well as worsen the problems on the A339	There are no accesses proposed to the south of the site at present. The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled to assess their suitability and deliverability.
2	Suggestion for new access road to A339 to the south (north of the Swan roundabout) One suggestion that tunnel may be required.	There are no accesses proposed to the south of the site at present. The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. These are all vehicle accesses on to Warren Road and on to the A339.  The particular option mentioned in this comment is unlikely to be tested due to the landscape impact that it would cause and the fact that it is not close to the proposed areas of residential development.
2	Suggestion for access from the Swan	There are no accesses proposed to the south of the site at present. The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to

<b>Access and Movement - What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	roundabout. One suggestion for perimeter road around to access developments and one way system on Monks Lane. Another to compulsory purchase Sandford Place or part of land required for access onto roundabout.	Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. This particular option is unlikely to be tested due to the landscape impact that it would cause and the fact that it is not close to the proposed areas of residential development.
2	Suggestion for road off A339 opposite St Gabriel's,	There are no accesses proposed to the south of the site at present. The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. This particular option is unlikely to be tested due to the impacts that it would have on both the landscape and the historic environment.
2	Possible roundabout on A339 at entrance to recycling centre, as well as those proposed off Monks Lane	There are no accesses proposed to the south of the site at present. The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. These are all vehicle accesses on to Warren Road and onto the A339.
2	Suggestion for access via A339 between College and waste site	There are no accesses proposed to the south of the site at present. The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. These are all vehicle accesses on to Warren Road and onto the A339.
3	Suggestion that access from existing or amended roundabout by Newbury College with feeder lane for site and College.	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options and their implications for the wider highways network are currently being explored and modelled.
1	Possible solution to congestion at Monks Lane/Pinchington Lane roundabout could be to add a second lane to the downhill section from roundabout to the Swan roundabout. This would at least help clear the roundabout.	The traffic impacts of the Sandford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893</a> . Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandford. Where these result in specific

**Access and Movement - What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?**

Number of responses	Summary of Comments	Draft Council Response
	Otherwise, morning rush hour is likely to be completely gridlocked, with people trying to leave Sandford queuing to get out.	<p>infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a></p> <p>This suggestion has not been included within the IDP.</p>
1	Monks Lane and Andover Road	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled These are all vehicle accesses onto Warren Road and onto the A339. .
1	No access on to Andover Road	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. These are all vehicle accesses onto Warren Road and onto the A339.
11	Warren Road as bus access only. It is too narrow for buses and cars. It will be good to have frequent buses. Unsuitable as main access road. Safety concern with proximity of 2 schools. Belief that additional traffic will spoil a pleasant area of Newbury. Comment that it is difficult to see how Warren Road can be opened up to all vehicular access again without creating another link on to Monks Lane and another rat run. Suggestion for rising bollards in Warren Road to restrict to buses, taxis and emergency vehicles.	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. These are all vehicle accesses onto Warren Road and onto the A339.
3	Warren Road could be considered as alternative access - it would facilitate access to the A34.	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. These are all vehicle accesses onto Warren Road and onto the A339.



**Access and Movement - What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?**

Number of responses	Summary of Comments	Draft Council Response
2	The proposed bus link is a disaster waiting to happen. Currently Warren Road has cars parked on one side. Access for buses, cyclists and pedestrians is ludicrous.	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. A range of infrastructure improvements have been modelled through the TA work which are necessary to deliver the Sandleford development. These are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site which accompanies this SPD
1	The potential bus route should be a wide tree-lined boulevard, to give character to the area. It can include traffic calming measures	Noted. Traffic calming features will be in place on the bus route and a strong formal landscape character will be achieved through formal planting, street trees and hedgerows.
1	Would like to see dedicated cycle path from Warren Road through development to the country park	The development will include a network of green links which make connections throughout and outside the site. This will include opportunities for enhanced linkages outside the Sandleford site. A western sustainable transport link will be provided along Warren Road, giving access to the A343 Andover Road.
1	Provide a public footbridge to link to the other side of the A339 at the end of the existing right of way. Widen the footpath and put in barriers for safety of girls at St Gabriel's.	This is not a proposal that is being explored.
2	Kendrick Road. One response sees this as the only option for access to Andover Road.	This is not a proposal that is being explored.
1	Options are poor. Andover Road is inaccessible unless houses are demolished	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. This is not a proposal that is being explored.
1	Include electric car charging facilities in estate and in town	A requirement for electric car charging points can be included within the Travel Plan which is an appendix to the SPD.

<b>Access and Movement - What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	centre	
1	Would like to see a covenant restricting each household to 1 car – combined with shuttle buses to station and safe cycle routes to town centre.	There is no plan to restrict car ownership at present – instead the likely car ownership at the site has been taken into account through the 4 phases of Transport Assessments. Development of the site provides the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing bus services from this part of town to the town centre and wider area. The layout of the development will provide good pedestrian and cycle links outside of the site to existing services including those found in Newbury Town Centre.
1	There is a problem with access for the south west development and potential site infrastructure	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled – including making the proposed access onto the Warren Road an all vehicle access.
1	Double roundabout at Andover Road/Monks Lane will need 'improvement'.	This is included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site.
1	Direct routes to town centre should be made as favourable as possible for bike/bus.	Development of the site provides the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing bus services from this part of town to the town centre and wider area. The layout of the development will provide good pedestrian and improved cycle links outside of the site to existing services including those found in Newbury Town Centre.
1	There should be two car parking areas: Andover Road and Newtown Road	This is not currently proposed at the site.
1	Keep traffic away from existing residential roads and avoid rat-running	Measures set out within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan based on the Transport Assessments will assess this issue.
3	Questions regarding traffic surveys - Has there been a traffic count of vehicles on Monks Lane at busy times? Comment that there seems to be no recognition of the amount of traffic already using the routes close to the development and no	The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893</a> . Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the

**Access and Movement - What do you think are the options for providing road accesses to the site?**

Number of responses	Summary of Comments	Draft Council Response
	<p>clear plan as to how the hugely increased traffic flow will be managed. No indication of where the cars from the properties would be travelling to and from (e.g. where so many new residents will be working). Comments that it seems very unlikely that the forecast levels of foot and cycle use will be met, due to the distance and gradient from the town centre, and within site. Hope the Council will hold the developers to account when reviewing infrastructure plans and consult actively on outline plans.</p>	<p>Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a></p> <p>Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) does not make any assumptions about future bus, cycle and pedestrian movements. Therefore TA4 represents a worst case scenario and site specific public transport and modal shift will provide a reduction in car trips. However, modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this.</p>
3	<p>Very limited - do not feel this site is suitable for a large development. If proper sustainable pedestrian, cycle and public transport access cannot be found then development of the whole site is unsustainable.</p>	<p>the principle of developing the site has already been established through the Core Strategy process. The site is proposed to be delivered with good cycle and pedestrian links throughout the site and outside the site to existing services. Development of the site will also provide the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing bus services from this part of the town to the town centre and wider area.</p> <p>Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this.</p>

**Access and Movement - What are the important linkages within the site, and those outside the site to the wider area?**

Number of responses	Summary of Comments	Draft Council Response
5	<p>A direct connection to the A339 preferred - would</p>	<p>The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional</p>

<b>Access and Movement - What are the important linkages within the site, and those outside the site to the wider area?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	ease congestion and give access to major routes.	sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. This includes an all vehicle access onto the A339.
8	Important linkages are to town centre and station and the A34 and M4/A339/ A343	Agreed. The site has good accessibility.
1	Important linkages to Tesco and the Retail Park	Agreed. The layout of the development will provide strong linkages to the existing facilities outside of the site. This is set out within the draft SPD.
3	Safe routes to schools. Access to Park House key from within the site, including segregated cycle routes	It will be important to provide cycle and pedestrian access into Park House school from the site. Discussions are underway with Park House school.
1	Do not build linkage to Monks lane for cars, restrict access for buses, pedestrians and bikes...all cars should be permitted to drive south via A34 to reach town centre.	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. This has been modelled as deliverable with infrastructure improvements through the Transport Assessment work that has been carried out.  In response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled.
1	Monks Lane only for vehicles	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. This has been modelled as deliverable with infrastructure improvements through the Transport Assessment work that has been carried out. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled.
1	Monks Lane requires widening to allow traffic turning into site to wait without holding up other vehicles.	This is not currently proposed within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site although it is possible that the future detailed design of the junctions can accommodate this.
7	Access to either Monks Lane or the Andover Road is going to cause huge problems to the roundabouts at both ends of Monks	The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy.

<b>Access and Movement - What are the important linkages within the site, and those outside the site to the wider area?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	Lane. Junctions will need improving to take additional traffic. Junction near retail park is very congested and on Andover Road at beginning and end of school day. One suggestion that at Andover Road mini roundabouts the problem may be eased if a way can be found to expand the parade shops car park with direct access on to Andover Road enabling the creation of a one way route through the car park either running with entry on Essex Street and exit on Andover Road or the other way around. This needs to be achieved without spoiling the character of The Gun or The Bell pubs.	These are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893</a> . Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a>
1	Concern about traffic down Wendan Road which would form an obvious shortcut into town if the access road is along Monks Lane. Wendan Road already suffers from too much traffic. There MUST be some traffic calming measures introduced to prevent speeding and deter people from using the road as a cut through. Safety issues with 2 schools in close proximity.	Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a>  These will be taken forward in the planning application for the site.
1	If a new roundabout is to be provided along Monks Lane it would seem preferable that this should incorporate Rupert Road. This would allow a North South flow of traffic to counteract the East West flow and so may avert the need for traffic lights. The other access could then still be situated close to the	Adequate frontage exists along Monks Lane to enable accesses to be provided within highway land and the land controlled by the landowners and the Highway Authority. The detailed design of these junctions is under consideration.

<b>Access and Movement - What are the important linkages within the site, and those outside the site to the wider area?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	Rugby Club land and made a left turn only junction from the site	
1	Concerns about the potential of extra traffic along the A343/Andover Road seeking to go south onto the A34. Not only is there a need for an extra roundabout to handle traffic wanting to travel north, but both slip roads need to be extended to handle the increased volume in traffic. The short runs are already treacherous and are likely to be lethal if it becomes a major thoroughfare as envisaged in the Core Strategy. This work should be undertaken prior to the release of any significant volume of houses from Sandleford.	The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy.. Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a> . The Highways Agency have not objected to the Sandleford site and the impact onto the A34 – however, they will continue to be a key consultee in the development of the site.
1	The bypass was built due to a heavily congested A339 (old A34) and if this development goes ahead, as planned, we will be back to square one with traffic unable to move through Newbury. This is going to give a very bad image of Newbury as people remember the days when Newbury was choked up with traffic and they were stuck in queues for a very long time.	The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893</a> . Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a>
1	Suggestion for new eastern bypass from A339 - via Colthrop - dual carriageway - Henwick Farm - and join A339 north of Newbury above Vodafone roundabout.	This is not currently required to support the Sandleford development.
1	So little scope will be	The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in

<b>Access and Movement - What are the important linkages within the site, and those outside the site to the wider area?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	available, unless a massive change to the adjacent road structure is implemented	combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893</a> . Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a>
7	Current infrastructure problems including request that infrastructure comes first Comment that all roads into Newbury are busy at rush hour. Monks Lane and Andover Road are saturated at peak times. Concern about increased traffic and impact on local roads, including safety concerns.	The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893</a> . Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a>
2	Critical that the increase in traffic on local roads is properly addressed	The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893</a> . Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. This includes where appropriate, impacts on local roads.  Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a>
2	Must try to keep cars away from Andover Road & Monks Lane as much as possible.	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. However, in response to

<b>Access and Movement - What are the important linkages within the site, and those outside the site to the wider area?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled.
2	Warren Road for buses and cycles only. Free vehicle access along Warren Road would be highly dangerous - both at the Andover Road junction and for children at Park House School. Access & movement principles MUST comply with guidance in 'Safer Places - the planning system and crime prevention'.	The current proposal is 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane, with Warren Road providing an additional sustainable transport link onto the Andover Road for pedestrians, cyclists and buses. However, in response to concerns raised through the public consultation, other access options are currently being explored and modelled. This modelling would include work on the wider road infrastructure requirements of any other accesses.
1	Allow people to walk and cycle safely to the retail park.	Development of the site provides the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing pedestrian and cycle links outside of the site to existing services including those found at Newbury Retail Park.
5	Implement and improve cycle routes to town centre and to schools –Newtown Road route sometimes blocked. Andover Road cycle track is too narrow and dangerous. Cannot rely on shared pavement /cycle routes in that area due to the huge volume of secondary/primary/preschool traffic on the Warren Road/Andover Road/Monks Lane/Essex Street areas. Encouraging cycle use by proper provision of 'green routes' for cycling needs to recognise that cyclists and pedestrians will both be using the areas at the same peak times.	Development of the site provides the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing pedestrian and cycle links outside of the site to existing services including to the town centre and to schools.
1	Would be brilliant if routes to the south and east of the development could be considered - safe pedestrian and cycle routes into	Whilst bridges are not currently proposed across the major roads, the development will provide good pedestrian and cycle links within and outside of the site, linking into existing routes.



<b>Access and Movement - What are the important linkages within the site, and those outside the site to the wider area?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	Greenham Common and Newtown Common, such as bridges across the major roads, would create a fantastically large area of safe cycling and walking, all easily accessible from Newbury.	
	Newtown Road is NOT a pleasant walking road, therefore pathways within the site should run parallel to the road.	The east-west public footpath which traverses the site links with the Newtown Road.
5	Improved bus service would be good. Comments that if the bus is to replace car journeys for families it would really have to be at least as frequent as every 15mins. Bus services also need to be regular at peak times and in the evenings ( most Newbury buses stop after early evening) - but concern that appropriate frequency of bus services to encourage people out of their cars, will have adverse impact on Warren Road/Andover Road junction.	Development of the site will also provide the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing bus services from this part of the town to the town centre and wider area.  Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this.
1	As always with a new large development emphasis is about the site and not about its impact	A key part of the Core Strategy process was establishing the impact and delivery of the Sandleford Park site. The wider impact of the development in terms of the infrastructure requirements has been fully assessed in partnership with infrastructure providers and published in an infrastructure delivery plan, which is already publicly available but will be published again as an appendix to the draft SPD.
1	The site is very poorly provided with good natural linkages. Providing anything like the amount needed to integrate the site effectively with the rest of Newbury will have highly detrimental impacts on both landscape integrity, historic views and	Development of the site provides the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing pedestrian and cycle links outside of the site to existing services including to the town centre and to schools. Green links will be provided throughout the site, linking into the wider infrastructure outside the site. The development of the site will respect the landscape character of the area and with the country park and new strategic landscaping the development will be largely screened from views from

<b>Access and Movement - What are the important linkages within the site, and those outside the site to the wider area?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	road safety.	the wider area.
1	No amount of talk about bikes and buses will ensure the residents will use other forms of transport. It does not currently happen with the Wash Common housing that currently exists so why should the residents of Sandeford be expected to be any different?	Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) does not make any assumptions about future bus, cycle and foot movements use. Therefore TA4 represents a worst case scenario and site specific public transport will provide a reduction in car trips. However, modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this.
1	how are people/cars crossing the woodland strip	There will be access through the ancient woodlands via a series of identified paths and routes. These will integrate into the wider network of pedestrian linkages around the site.
1	Possibility of park/ride from Rugby Club should be considered	This is not being considered within the SPD.
1	Consider 'Boris bikes' within the site or within Newbury as a whole.	Whilst this is not an option for the draft SPD, it can be explored further through the Travel Plan for the site.

<b>Development Principles - What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
1	Very keen on the country park idea	Noted.
14	Against the proposed development. There are access challenges from the south. It is not adjacent any areas of job opportunities. A development to the north would be more appropriate as it would be closer to Vodafone, the areas biggest employer. Already too developed on this side of town. Confusion as to reasons for choice of Sandeford and SA scoring system. Ignoring the clearly expressed views of the electorate, local residents and environmental concerns. Abhorrent - both on the grounds of devastating our natural habitat and creating more traffic congestion to a town already suffering with regular gridlock on the roads.	The principle of the development has been established through the Core Strategy process. The purpose of the SPD is to guide future development on the site and to provide a framework for future planning applications. Public views on the detail of the development are therefore being sought as part of the SPD process.

<b>Development Principles - What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
2	Too many houses – Comments that 1000 would have been fine and concerns regarding traffic flow and infrastructure/ medical and educational provision. Danger of over-development.	The principle of the development has been established through the Core Strategy process and the site has been accepted as the location to provide a long term urban extension which will deliver up to 2000 homes over at least a 20 year period. The infrastructure requirements of the site have been established in partnership with service providers. These are set out within an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the SPD. Only 39% of the site is proposed for development and the rest is open space and woodland.
1	The Wash Common area should be reduced and the area around the rugby ground used. Why not make more use of the 'spaces' lining Monks Lane?	The site is proposed to be delivered to create two new neighbourhoods which respond individually to their surrounding character and context. It is currently being proposed that the northern part of the site will be higher density than the western part of the site to respond to adjoining patterns of development.
6	Concern over high densities – orange and blue area mentioned. Density will create problems.	The proposed densities have been established during the Core Strategy process. They are not high – but instead reflect the predominant mix of family sized homes which are proposed for the site.
3	Positive responses. Like the fact that the woodland will be retained, breaking up the estate which otherwise would probably be yet another nasty legoland clone estate.	Noted.
	Thames Valley Police request that community safety and designing against crime should be a major consideration in layout and design, in line with principles in NPPF. Parking arrangements and design can affect how successful the layout can be in this regard – reference to research by CABE and the Home Office.	Sandleford Park will be designed and laid out in accordance with best practice masterplanning principles to promote a legible and permeable place. The layout of buildings and spaces will take priority over streets and car parking so that the highways do not dominate the place.
1	The proposed segmentation of the site into three zones is sensible. Concerns that the southern end of the site is very remote from the major access areas, but cannot see how this can be eased as to direct all vehicular access along Warren Road is impractical and dangerous given the	In response to concerns raised through consultation, opportunities for an all vehicle access link through Warren Road on to the Andover Road (currently proposed as a sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses) is currently being explored as is an all

<b>Development Principles - What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	proximity of Park House School. Increasing traffic at this junction is not good given also the close proximity of Falkland School and St Joseph's church.	vehicle access onto the A339.
1	If access is from Monks Lane, traffic flow will be reduced if low density is at the south of the site	The higher densities at the site are currently proposed to be at the northern part of the site
1	Wrong. Monks Lane not wide enough to cater for more heavy traffic.	The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through consultation, opportunities for an all vehicle access link through Warren Road onto the Andover Road (currently proposed as a sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses) is also being explored.
2	Concern over vehicular access	The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through consultation, opportunities for an all vehicle access link through Warren Road onto the Andover Road (currently proposed as a sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses) is also being explored as is an additional all vehicle access onto the A339.
	Maximise use of the A339 to try to retain some semblance of a nice residential area for Monks Lane	The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments as deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses on to Monks Lane. However, in response to concerns raised through consultation, opportunities for an all vehicle access link through Warren Road onto the Andover Road (currently proposed as a sustainable transport link for pedestrians, cyclists and buses) is also being explored and some work is underway looking at the potential of providing an access onto the A339.
1	Community consultation is essential.	Community consultation forms a key part of the SPD preparation and a statement setting out what consultation has been carried out has been prepared

<b>Development Principles - What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		and published alongside the SPD.
6	Should be more mixed up. Don't see why housing density should be graded N-S. Good social mix needed to avoid less desirable areas. Social housing should be distributed evenly across the development and should be terraced or semi-detached houses (not flats).	The affordable housing will be pepper potted across the site in accordance with policy CS6 of the Core Strategy rather than concentrated in one place.
1	In principle agree - affordable houses on the Monks Lane area and lower density and maybe large properties on the other two.	The affordable housing will be pepper potted across the site in accordance with policy CS6 of the Core Strategy rather than concentrated in one place.
1	In keeping with the North to South decrease in housing density, a similar decrease in noise and activity to the South of the parkland site would aid wildlife retention as well as being sensitive to the needs of those living to the South of the site wishing to retain quiet and seclusion, especially as sound does carry across the valley.  The residents at Sandleford Place/ Sandleford Lodge, are especially vulnerable in this context, , therefore a substantial buffer in the south is requested to lessen the impact on those in this area. Noise and light disruption will be a serious sensitivity, as will public access and potentially trespass from the site onto surrounding areas.	The Country park in itself will provide a substantive buffer zone. However, these comments can be taken into account when looking at the detailed design of the Country Park through the Management Plan.
1	Are any flats planned?	A mix of dwelling sizes are planned for the site, including houses and apartments.
1	This amount of affordable housing is going to bring social issues/crime to the area	It is not accepted that affordable housing causes social issues and crime.  The affordable housing will be pepper potted across the development to ensure an integrated development.
1	Development will not 'fit' into the urban grain of south Newbury and will invariably grow into somewhat isolated enclaves.	The draft SPD aims to preserve and enhance the character of the area and respond to the wider area in both its townscape and landscape design.
1	Style wise - no narrow alleyways between housing - smaller groupings of houses in	The site will be structured to create 2 new neighbourhoods which respond

<b>Development Principles - What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	crescent or close form with plenty of trees & greenery to break up sites.	individually and sensitively to their surrounding character and context. Green links will be provided and public realm and open space will be designed as an integral part of the layout.
1	Each property will have 2-3 cars and not many people use garages, so the roads will become congested.	The layout of buildings and spaces will take priority over streets and car parking so that the highways do not dominate the place. Parking will be incorporated within the design of the street and in accordance with national and local parking standards.
1	The information given so far seems to be focussing on the country park and more pleasant aspects of the development. More effort needs to be put into looking at the transport/infrastructure side. The roads bounding the site all suffer from congestion at peak periods, this needs to be addressed before any building work is undertaken. At the moment it seems to be largely ignored.	An infrastructure delivery plan has been prepared in partnership with service providers. This sets out the infrastructure requirements for the Sandleford site and includes a range of highways improvements, based on the evidence from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments for the site. Sandleford specific infrastructure will be set out in an appendix to the SPD – however, this information is already publicly available.
1	Addressing the drainage / run off and local renewable energy seems good. Will this and grey water cycling to reduce the impact on the already over-extracted water resources in the area be mandated for the development? I believe our local MP has spoken out about the effect on the Kennet River of the present extraction rates.	There are opportunities for on-site renewable energy generation in accordance with policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and a range of solutions will be incorporated on site to provide a sustainable form of development. The design of buildings within the development will provide grey water recycling as a key part of the approach to meeting sustainability requirements for the site.
1	Very little in terms of design criteria for sustainable housing. Any developer will take the path of least resistance and Sandleford has the potential to end up like the soul-less new developments to the north west of Thatcham station. Developments must be innovative and be a role model for sustainable housing in the future. Made with renewable materials, lots of glass for passive solar energy gain, energy producing features and imaginative contemporary design. Please make this a criteria for developers, before we have a	There are opportunities for on-site renewable energy generation in accordance with policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and a range of solutions will be incorporated on site to provide a sustainable form of development.

<b>Development Principles - What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	plethora of sandstone lintels and mock Georgian frontages. We know lots about sustainable architecture and vernacular materials these days, so please ensure that the developments in our local area are something of which we can be proud rather than curse.	
1	Maximising (i.e. increasing dramatically) the use of the remaining green space and paying huge amount of attention to traffic alleviation measures will make it as successful as possible.	The policy and the draft SPD set out that a Country park will be provided on site which will provide a significant amount of public open space, thus opening up far more of the site than can be accessed at present. The development will include a network of green links which will make connections throughout the site between, for example, the wider urban area, the country park and the areas of ancient woodland.
1	The interface between areas designated for development and ancient woodland needs to be given very careful consideration to minimise encroachment on these areas either as play areas or from intrusive lighting.	A 15m buffer will be provided from all ancient woodland on the site. Development of roads or buildings will not be allowed in the buffer zones. Residential properties will either front or side onto areas of ancient woodland and will be set back from the buffer zones to ensure that they receive sufficient light and do not put pressure to lop or fell the existing trees.
1	Unclear on phasing - do the 3 areas imply a progression over time? Where do the 1st and 2nd batches of 1000 houses actually go? Within a division of 3 geographic areas?	There is not yet a phasing agreement in place for the site. Phasing will partly depend, for example, on final decisions about the location of accesses.
1	Too much 'potential' - how will it end up?	Now that the principle of development has been established, this is the time to fully explore the potential and publish a draft SPD for a formal period of public consultation.
1	The public consultation we consider to be excellent and transparent so far. We hope this trend will continue into the future into 2026.	Noted.
2	Doubts as to whether public comments taken on board and transparency of process. Listening to what people have to say is one thing, actually using the	Community consultation forms a key part of the SPD preparation and a statement setting out what consultation has been carried out has been prepared

<b>Development Principles - What do you think about the proposed approach to development on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of Responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	information as part of the plan is another. Doubt if any comments will have the slightest affect on any planning or development considerations	and published alongside the SPD.
1	Not impressed	Noted.
1	The whole development should be moved closer to Wash Water & away from Monks Lane to lessen/avoid traffic congestion.	The site has been planned to respect the landscape sensitivity of the wider site. This means that the built form should be concentrated in the northern and western parts of the site with the retention of existing woodland. Land to the southeast of the site is visually prominent in views from the Priory and the A339 and is proposed to remain open in character.

<b>Development Principles - Should each of the three areas have its own distinct character in terms of design? If so, what should the look and feel of these areas be?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
1	The entire site should be developed with traditional style housing without the 'hotch potch' effect that architects now seem to love. I do not want Newbury to be another Swindon with new estates deliberately designed to have almost every house mismatching the next door house. Another Conifer Crest type development would be fine	The draft SPD seeks to preserve and enhance the character of the area in both its townscape and landscape design by sensitive responses to its context across the site.
8	Importance of design. Want to see an attractive design which adds value to Newbury and is somewhere people want to live, we don't want to see the opportunity thrown away as Vodafone did with their HQ building, looking like a mock up of Stalag Luft 3 and a horrible plastic tent stuck on the side. Important to work with qualified architects and urban planners, involve the community and RIBA design panel. It is your chance to make it an innovative scheme not only in terms of sustainability but also in terms of contemporary design!!! Please do not just look at pattern books	<p>The SPD will set out the Council's expectations on urban design via a set of urban design principles to deliver a high quality environment within the site.</p> <p>The masterplan will preserve and enhance the character of the area in both its townscape and landscape design by sensitive responses to its context across the site.</p> <p>A design competition is an option to be further considered.</p>



<b>Development Principles - Should each of the three areas have its own distinct character in terms of design? If so, what should the look and feel of these areas be?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	of houses. Why don't you organise a design competition! There are a lot of brilliant schemes similar to this one in Europe and particularly Scandinavian countries. I think this is an opportunity for Newbury to lead the way!	
1	However 'distinctive' the design of dwellings and community buildings are, cheap construction, poorly located parking, inappropriate permeability and poorly managed / maintained open space will quickly degrade the character and amenity.	Key urban design principles to be included within the draft SPD include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The masterplan will preserve and enhance the character of the area in both its townscape and landscape design by sensitive responses to its context across the site.</li> <li>• The development will create a series of spaces and streets which overlook and provide a sense of enclosure to clearly define public and private areas.</li> <li>• Public realm and open space will be designed as an integral part of the layout and be accessible to all areas of the community.</li> <li>• Parking will be designed to ensure that it is not obtrusive and allow for active frontages to the street. Parking should be incorporated within the design of the street and large surface car parks will be avoided.</li> </ul>
3	Negative comments on wood cladding. Preference for brick.	Noted.
7	Should be mixture of styles and in each of three areas, to avoid appearance of a cloned estate and to attract a diverse array of householders which helps to foster vibrant community.	The site is proposed to be delivered to create two main new neighbourhoods which respond to their surrounding character and context. The detailed design and layout of buildings and spaces will be determined by the character areas which will be defined within the design principles to be set out in the SPD. Sandford Park is proposed to be a place with variety and choice.
1	Only if this reflects a design style rather than a reflection of the cost of housing in each area.	The housing will be tenure blind.
2	Design suggestions: Depart from	Noted. The site is proposed to be delivered

<b>Development Principles - Should each of the three areas have its own distinct character in terms of design? If so, what should the look and feel of these areas be?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	<p>conventional square boxes in a line down the street, set some back and some forward. Architectural features to include some curved features, i.e. curved window lintles. Also architecture harking back to Roman/ Tudor/ Victorian features. Make good use of different building materials i.e. flint, brick (red/white), pebble dash, hanging tiles, close boarding. Please try to avoid mistakes of past housing developments (i.e. Lower Earley, near Reading).</p> <p>Suggestion for cottage style housing, Edwardian, Victorian, local brick colour, knapped flint.</p>	<p>to create two main new neighbourhoods which respond individually to their surrounding character and context. The detailed design and layout of buildings and spaces will be determined by the character areas which will be defined within the design principles to be set out in the SPD.</p>
1	<p>Design should be dictated by minimising the energy requirements of these new homes, with high level of insulation minimising the requirement for heat and where possible given south facing exposures to maximise light. Again thought should be given to maximise south/south easterly roof areas for both solar thermal and solar PV. Other renewable energy sources should also be considered where these are not detrimental to the surrounding countryside. It would be nice to have a residential area that avoids the pastiche nod to the past as in Poundbury but are forward looking houses that put sustainability to the forefront but also avoiding the monolithic developments of the 60s and 70s.</p>	<p>There are opportunities for on-site renewable energy generation embedded within the built form which can achieve the required targets. It is proposed that a range of renewable energy solutions will be incorporated on site to help provide a sustainable form of development. These will have implications for the type of design to be found on site.</p>
4	<p>Density concerns. Comments include no high rise flats, room for trees etc.</p>	<p>No high rise flats are proposed to be provided on the site. The density of the site is proposed to be between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare which reflects the predominant mix of family sized homes on the site. The trees on the site are being maintained and there will be additional strategic planting.</p>
14	<p>Yes, distinct character to each area. Different house design, by zoning houses, e.g. detached, affordable, etc. Agree with idea that higher density housing be concentrated in the north of</p>	<p>The site is proposed to be delivered to create two new neighbourhoods which respond individually to their surrounding character and context. It is currently being proposed that the northern part of the site</p>

<b>Development Principles - Should each of the three areas have its own distinct character in terms of design? If so, what should the look and feel of these areas be?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	the site. Residents often prefer to live in an area where all of the units of accommodation are similar. Like idea of progressive densities, lower at western end in keeping (in principle) with Warren Road/Round End/Kendrick Road.	will be higher density than the western part of the site to respond to adjoining patterns of development.
1	Careful consideration should be given to the siting of private purchased and low cost housing in all 3 of the areas. It doesn't always work well when they are combined.	The Council's policy is to appropriately integrate the affordable units within the development to create mixed tenure schemes. Design will also be tenure blind. This helps the creation of mixed inclusive communities.
6	Affordable must be pepper potted and built to same design and specification as surrounding housing.. Resist watering this down in Area 3. No "posh" and "affordable" clusters please - we don't want another Pidgeons Farm style development or ghetto.	The Council's policy is to appropriately integrate the affordable units within the development to create mixed tenure schemes. Design will also be tenure blind. This helps the creation of mixed inclusive communities.
1	Housing must be kept separate from open space.	There will be green links between the housing and the open space
5	Hopefully it will blend in with the area – in sympathy with natural beauty.	The draft SPD seeks to preserve and enhance the character of the area in both its townscape and landscape design by sensitive responses to its context across the site.
1	Area 3 should not go ahead at all - or should be exchanged for the woodland between area 2 and 3 to minimise the affect on Wash Common area.	This area is currently proposed to be designed to medium/lower density which responds to the pattern of development to the west of the site. All ancient woodland on site is proposed to be protected and this is a key principle of the development.
1	Area 3 may be suitable for lower density housing - furthest from access to Monks Lane and in keeping with that part of Wash Common.	This area is currently proposed to be designed to medium/lower density which responds to the pattern of development to the west of the site.
1	Request for substantial buffer in the south to lessen impact on residents at Sandeford Place/Sandeford Lodge. Noise, light disruption and public access could have serious impact.	The Country park to the south of the site will provide a substantial buffer for these residents.
1	There is an argument the most northerly and southerly sites should be higher density housing with the middle site given the least density to maximise the	This is being considered as part of the more detailed design work. The detailed design and layout of buildings will be determined by character areas which are set out in the

<b>Development Principles - Should each of the three areas have its own distinct character in terms of design? If so, what should the look and feel of these areas be?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	amount of green space in the central area.	draft SPD's design principles. Sandleford north is likely to be higher/medium density which responds to the pattern of development to the north of the site.
2	Please keep it as low lying and as natural in its look and style as possible. For once, consider the local people around the area as well as those of us who come into the area for schooling etc	The masterplan will preserve and enhance the character of the area in both its townscape and landscape design by sensitive responses to its context across the site.

<b>Education, facilities and services - What community facilities would you like to see on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
19	Community/ village hall – comments that the main floor should be joisted and so suitable for dance and other physical activities. (Take advice from the NHS). Suggestion that attached to school. One suggestion that hall for each of 3 separate sites with kitchen and bar facilities. Another comment that should be built to minimise its energy requirement	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities. A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.
1	A separate building and complex for Glendale Church which could be used for the community too.	Noted.
18	Schools - important in terms of not over-stretching the current primary schools and also in terms of reducing congestion on Monks Lane at peak times. Required early in development. Possibility of using for community activities. Need for substantial refurbishment of Park House School	The site is proposed to be delivered with 2 primary schools on site (4 forms of entry in total) and the extension of Park House school. Discussions have taken place with Park House School who have confirmed that they can accommodate the increase in secondary school numbers. This may require some re-modelling of the existing accommodation.
1	Concern is that education funding is enhanced to ensure good education is provided in the new primary school and that the education of those at the current Park House school is enhanced, not damaged, as the demands on current education sites grows.	This is outside the scope of the SPD as it isn't related to land use planning.

<b>Education, facilities and services - What community facilities would you like to see on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
5	<p>Nursery school/ playschool/ mother and baby hall.</p> <p>Victoria Park Nursery School &amp; Children's Centre has staff that support other Early Years providers across the authority, and would be keen to have input into any proposed new Early Years provision. They would also be keen to explore the possibility of space within any such provision that could be used for training early years staff</p>	<p>Early years provision will be made at the site. Community provision will also be made with a community hall providing accommodation for a range of community uses.</p>
5	<p>Sports and play areas –suggestion for a football pitch or a large village green in the middle.</p>	<p>A Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play (NEAP) is required for the Sandleford site. This is a play area equipped mainly for older children but with opportunities for play for younger children. It could potentially form part of the wider country park. Locally Equipped Areas of Play, which are play areas equipped for children of early school age are also needed on the Sandleford site. There is potential for one of these to be provided on the Country park site. The emphasis on recreation is for informal rather than formal recreation.</p>
3	<p>Sports facilities-sports centre/gym/indoor swimming pool – question whether how viable pool would be. One comment that to reduce car journeys and enhance currently inadequate facilities available to young people in South Newbury, the following facilities should be provided as part of the plan: swimming pool, multi purpose activity centre/hall, Skateboard / BMX track, Mountain biking course. Tennis courts also suggested. Other sporting facilities such as a running track and outside gym area could be provided in conjunction with the Rugby Club as community facilities with direct access from Sandleford</p>	<p>There is no identified formal recreation provision (sports pitches) on the site in lieu of significant areas of informal open space. Instead shared facilities will be sought with surrounding usages.</p>
1	<p>Recycling services</p>	<p>Recycling facilities will be provided on site as part of the local centre.</p>
1	<p>Regular bus route along Monks Lane</p>	<p>Bus service 3A currently runs along Monks Lane, and there are other bus routes close to the site. Development of the site would also provide the opportunity to enhance</p>

<b>Education, facilities and services - What community facilities would you like to see on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		and extend the existing bus services from this part of the town to the town centre and wider area.
16	Health Care. Extra Doctor's surgery/chemist – will Falkland surgery have capacity to expand?. Will the Community Hospital need expansion with all the houses plus the racecourse development and others?	Berkshire Shared Services have been fully engaged in the early planning for the Sandleford site. They have indicated that expansion of some town centre practices will require expansion and that Falkland surgery will need to make internal changes to create additional clinical space.
1	No more than already proposed	Noted.
4	Some retail – so residents don't have to use cars to get all shopping.	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities.
1	"Estate shops" very negative. People will use nearby shops like Budgens or Tesco.	To help to ensure a sustainable development, there is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities
2	Social facilities for children and elderly	A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.
3	Dental surgery	No requirement for this has currently been identified.
1	Possibly a vet	No requirement for this has currently been identified
3	Scouts, brownies	A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses including scouts and brownies.
1	Post office	A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.
1	Parks	A substantive Country Park is being provided on the site. There will be additional play areas suitable for different age groups as well as other areas of informal open space and planting.
1	Newbury College	Links with Newbury College are currently being explored.
2	None - leave the landscape alone. None, apart from country park	Some additional community facilities will be provided on site to help to form a sustainable development.

<b>Education, facilities and services - What community facilities would you like to see on the site?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
1	play facilities	A substantive Country Park is being provided on the site which will provide a range of opportunities for recreation. There will be additional play areas suitable for different age groups as well as other areas of informal open space and planting.
2	library	A library is unlikely to be provided on the site. Developer contributions will be sought to improve existing library facilities.
1	Due to the distance from the town, there will need to be some 'on site' access for residents to housing association and council contact and matters such as neighbourhood police coverage and facilities will need to be negotiated with Thames Valley Police.	Noted.  Thames Valley Police have been involved in the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site.
1	Toilets	This is an issue which may need to be explored further through consultation on the draft SPD.
1	Cinema	No requirement for this has currently been identified.
1	Pub	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities.
1	Care home	The requirement for this is currently being explored.
1	All the facilities one would expect from a small town	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities
1	Good cycle routes linking through development to Tesco Greenacre Leisure and Budgens	Cycle and pedestrian access will be promoted both through the site and beyond it, linking the site with existing facilities.
1	All of these questions should be directed to prospective residents and or based on existing community experiences, social needs and problems, especially vandalism	Noted. Community consultation is an important part of the SPD preparation process

**Education, facilities and services - Are there opportunities for shared use of facilities, for example shared use of sports facilities or community buildings?**

Number of responses	Summary of Comments	Draft Council Response
4	Yes	Noted.
1	Not for the number of people you are planning for.	Comment noted. However, there are considered to be good opportunities for sharing facilities with neighbouring uses such as Newbury College, the Rugby Club and Park House school.
9	<p>Yes, with Park House. School halls should be available for community use out of hours. School (including Park House) sports facilities should be made available during all school holidays - free or for very modest charge.</p> <p>There is an outstanding opportunity to focus sports and community education facilities in the context of Park House School's role as a Specialist Sports College which already provides a wide range of community programmes and the Department for Culture Media and Sport's new youth sport strategy – 'Creating a Sporting Habit for Life'. This outlines investment totalling at least £1billion aimed at raising the proportion of 14-25 year olds who play sport through the establishment of a 'lasting network of schools and sports clubs in their local communities.' National Governing Bodies of sports are required to work with local partner schools to create new satellite clubs in 'school settings'.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to locate a Community Learning Centre (Library/Internet facilities) on the Park House site to provide a focus for both curricular and adult/community learning.</p> <p>The school would welcome opportunities to explore the potential for contiguous location of primary provision with existing secondary provision at Park House to maximise efficiencies, cross-phase learning opportunities and offset potential health and safety issues with vehicular movement during drop off and pick up times</p>	Noted. Discussions with Park House school on these issues are underway.
1	Shared facilities can help considerably with the social 'glue' of new communities. However, these must be well managed	Noted.



<b>Education, facilities and services - Are there opportunities for shared use of facilities, for example shared use of sports facilities or community buildings?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	(and the cost and complexity well understood) as schools and colleges which allow public / community access must also cover the issues of children's safety, security of buildings and assets such as computers etc.	
3	<p>Shared use of rugby club may be possible.</p> <p>Urgent consideration should be given to how the Rugby Club could become a general sports facility with a possible amalgamation with the Football Club to allow the development of Faraday Rd for residential housing, and with the potential to put both clubs on a sound financial footing. The club could provide a full range of sports including an expanded gym along the lines of the facility at Ealing Rugby club(Trailfinder being sponsors at that club - <a href="http://www.tfsc.co.uk/">http://www.tfsc.co.uk/</a>). Providing a local all round sports facility would reduce the need for locals to travel afield to gain access to gym clubs etc and put our local sports clubs on a much more secure fitting.</p>	Noted.
1	Must be school places. All local schools full.	The site is proposed to be delivered with early years provision, 2 primary schools on site (4 forms of entry in total) and the extension of Park House school. Discussions have taken place with Park House School who have confirmed that they can accommodate the increase in secondary school numbers. This will require some re-modelling of the existing accommodation.
1	This needs to be a 'green' development, showcasing what can be done. Newbury is an affluent area within the Thames Valley the 4th most affluent area in Europe. There should be a biomass District Heating scheme, ground source heat pumps for the housing, and PV. This must in some way make up for the significant carbon footprint which will result from the amount of surface transport which this development will generate.	There are opportunities for on-site renewable energy generation in accordance with policy CS15 of the Core Strategy and a range of solutions will be incorporated on site to provide a sustainable form of development.
3	A swimming facility (suggestion that added to the Rugby club gym?) If Greenacre	This is outside the scope of this SPD but could be explored further through other

<b>Education, facilities and services - Are there opportunities for shared use of facilities, for example shared use of sports facilities or community buildings?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	Sports Club is not to be adequately replaced for its current members, a first class sports centre, particularly a swimming pool, would be welcomed..	planning documents such as the Local Plan.
3	Gym / sports facilities with college and / or schools	Noted.
1	A church	There is potential for a church group to use the proposed community building.
8	Community centre, centre designed to have multiple uses e.g. hall use for sports / arts activities/ youth club./ social services or just local meetings	Noted. A community hall could provide accommodation for a range of community uses.
1	Facilities similar to the New Greenham Arts auditorium	Noted.
2	This would of course cause more traffic	Sharing facilities with neighbouring uses should not result in additional traffic due to the proximity of these uses to the site.
1	What does this mean & are there plans for private clubs?	This means that there are considered to be good opportunities for sharing facilities such as sport and community facilities with neighbouring uses such as Newbury College, the Rugby Club and Park House school.
1	Do we need yet more sporty things!!	Yes, there will be additional requirements resulting from the development.
1	Does this happen currently I'm not aware that it does	Yes.

<b>Education, facilities and services - Where should facilities be located?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
12	As central as possible within proposed housing areas	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling.
3	At Newbury Rugby club. Consideration should be given to how the Rugby Club could be developed to provide a wider range of sports facilities whilst retaining its	Noted. Discussions with the Rugby Club will continue to take place.

<b>Education, facilities and services - Where should facilities be located?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	core activity of rugby provision	
1	Area 2	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling.
1	Nearer the town for general use	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling. Additionally the layout of the development should provide strong linkages to the existing facilities outside of the site.
2	As close to the existing ones as possible	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling. Additionally the layout of the development should provide strong linkages to the existing facilities outside of the site.
4	Area 1 - School, Rugby Club and College are already there. If this is first stage planned to be completed.	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling. Additionally the layout of the development should provide strong linkages to the existing facilities outside of the site.
	Park House School believes facilities should be located there due to the school's role as a Specialist Sports College, and its educational status .	Noted. Discussions with Park House school are underway.
1	Somewhere in the housing development.	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling. Additionally the layout of the development should provide strong linkages to the existing facilities outside of the site.
2	As close as possible to the road access points, to minimise traffic within the site	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling. Additionally the layout of the

<b>Education, facilities and services - Where should facilities be located?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		development should provide strong linkages to the existing facilities outside of the site.
1	Provide community hub at Park House for 3 areas plus Wash Common	Noted. Discussions with Park House school are underway.
1	Planned primary school(s) need to be located away from too many properties and would suggest at one end of the development.	The primary schools will need to be located where they are accessible to the new residents in the area.
1	Need for safe access, movement and parking.	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling.
1	In the Crook's Copse area.	Noted
1	Next to the dump does not seem the nicest place to put the facilities. A bigger issue to having the school there is that it is actually not next to any of the housing areas. In fact it is a long way from Area 3. It should be closer to the housing areas to be more convenient to reach. Reducing Area 1 on its South West edge and placing the infrastructure there would be more central.	Noted. The location of any new services and facilities needs to be highly accessible by a range of transport modes, in particular public transport, pedestrian and cycling. The primary schools will need to be located where they are accessible to the new residents in the area.
1	So as not to encroach on further green space	Noted.
1	The primary school should be located in an area that enjoys an outlook on to the surrounding countryside and from where trips could be easily made to the park for nature studies and other activities	Noted. The primary schools will need to be located where they are accessible to the new residents in the area
1	The tennis courts should be somewhere on South Sandleford perhaps south of Warren Road to encourage use by the whole of Wash Common,	There are not currently any proposals for tennis courts – but instead an emphasis on informal open space on the site.

<b>Education, facilities and services - What type of retail provision is needed?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
24	One local shop. General store/ newsagent and post office. Despite the view that	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will

<b>Education, facilities and services - What type of retail provision is needed?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
	proximity to Tesco and the retail park is 'accessible', these are too far to walk with large items or a weekly shop and too far to consider nipping over for daily needs like milk and newspapers etc.	include a limited number of shops, employment space and community facilities. It is likely that the shops will cater for some day to day 'top up' shopping needs.
4	Small individual shops – local produce stores rather than standard convenience stores. More specialist provision such as a butchers, bakers and greengrocers (or a farm shop) which would encourage cross shopping between Sandleford and Wash Common and two way pedestrian traffic between the two areas	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops. The scope of these will depend on factors such as retail interest etc.
3	A small supermarket would be a good idea to reduce car journeys to Tesco, M&S & Budgens	It is unlikely that a supermarket can be provided, instead the focus of the local centre is likely to be on smaller shops for 'top up' shopping purposes.
5	Pub/ restaurant.	This could potentially be provided within the proposed local centre, dependent on business interest..
4	Coffee shop	This could potentially be provided within the proposed local centre, dependent on retailer interest.
10	Not felt necessary. We have adequate retail park and shops on Essex Street. In order to integrate Sandleford with Wash Common the development should avoid replicating what is already provided in the Monument Parade	A local centre is proposed for the site to deliver day-to-day shopping needs as assist in the creation of a sustainable community.
2	Bank	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops. The scope of these will depend on factors such as interest from retailers and service providers.
4	chemist	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops. The scope of these will depend on factors such as interest from retailers and service providers.
1	More on-site shops to save residents some travel - on-site.	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site to deliver day-to-day shopping needs to help the creation of a sustainable community.
1	hairdressers	There is proposed to be a new small

<b>Education, facilities and services - What type of retail provision is needed?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops. The scope of these will depend on factors such as interest from retailers and service providers.
1	I think the extra people will make the existing local shops more viable which is good, as there are many older people in the area with limited transport / mobility who depend on these shops. More people will help in a difficult retail environment.	Noted.
1	Library	This is not proposed at present, instead improvements to library facilities at, for example, Wash Water Library will be sought via developer contributions.
1	Travel Agent	There is proposed to be a new small local centre within the site which will include a limited number of shops. The scope of these will depend on factors such as interest from retailers and service providers
1	a filling station	This is unlikely due to space requirements and the proximity of other filling stations.
1	Free bus to parkway!	The development of the site provides the opportunity to enhance and extend the existing bus services from this part of town to the town centre and wider area. There are not proposed free buses, however.
1	As much as possible to minimise traffic from this site into Newbury town centre	The site is close enough to local and town centre services to facilitate the use of pedestrian and cycle links. Bus services will also be improved.

<b>Education, facilities and services - Is there any requirement for provision of office or workshop space?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
34	No. Comments that plenty in Newbury, including empty office space. And need to rejuvenate our town centre. Comment that would mean even more traffic	There is potential to provide some employment space at the Local Centre. Employment provision at the site will assist in the creation of a

<b>Education, facilities and services - Is there any requirement for provision of office or workshop space?</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Draft Council Response</b>
		sustainable community.
1	Suggestion for extension to Newbury College – for hire to residents	This is outside the scope of the SPD.
2	Possibly small-scale office rental space for people working from home	There is potential to provide some employment space and this would be located at the Local Centre.
1	If this is provided would it compromise the spaces left for housing?	No. The number of houses takes into account the other requirements of the site.
3	Home working only. As more people work from home, it would be hoped that some dwellings would include home office / workshop / studio potential but formal workplace buildings would be difficult to locate appropriately on a residential development and could lead to problems. Comment that fast broadband in all homes (included in cost of purchase) is essential to encourage home working to mitigate access issues and prevent the creation of a dormitory estate.	Noted. The option of providing some live work units on the site will be explored further.
3	Yes. The site should also provide jobs for those moving there. Comment that would minimise the traffic from this site into Newbury town centre. Comment that if some multi use sites can be provided whereby a local business can locate or start but without having to designate the space at the outset this would be a good thing perhaps in the same area as the shops. I understand there is to be a small business park in any case adjacent to the recycling centre.	There is potential to provide some employment space and this could potentially be located at the Local Centre. Employment provision at the site will assist in the creation of a sustainable community.

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
2	Newbury has the opportunity to build something special from scratch but please can we keep away from 'architect driven ego schemes' and	The purpose of the SPD is to guide the design of the site and the Council are committed to the delivery of a high quality, sustainable development. Applicants for planning permission will need to demonstrate how they have incorporated high standards of design and how these will be delivered.

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	just have down to earth, practical housing of traditional style that will still be around and cherished in 100 years time.	
1	Can planners specify that no bedroom is less than 6sqm in size	The detailed specification of house types and room sizes is detail that will be determined at the application stage. The Council have identified that there will be a high proportion of family homes on the site.
4	Sufficient car parking spaces for each house. Need for homes to have garages & adequate parking bearing in mind most families have 2 cars and often several visitors cars to accommodate	The Council recognise concerns relating to parking. The level of residential parking will be set to reflect national policy and up to date local standards whilst also taking into account such factors as the location and mix of dwellings and local levels of car ownership.
1	The green travel plan needs to show imagination and vision and needs to have significant amounts of money put into it to make it work. If you charge £1.80 to go into Newbury on the bus then people will still use their cars. It would make sense to have a Boris bikes system using electric bikes; the Andover Rd is too steep for most casual cyclists.	The required elements of the Travel Plan are set out in the SPD. These will include subsidy of the bus service, discount vouchers to purchase bikes, secure cycle storage, car club and measure to promote sustainable travel to school.
1	Concerned at the long term cost of maintaining the large amount of open space and preserving the woodlands	A management plan will be put in place to maintain the open space and managed access to the woodland areas.
2	I would love to see some reference to the farmers who tenant farmed Sandleford for 3 generations in the road naming: " Butler"	Local names and references will be considered at the later stage of street naming.



<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
1	I am in favour of development, but Park House School needs a complete rebuild	The implications of the scheme are being discussed on an ongoing basis with Park House School. These discussions include future accommodation requirements.
12	<p>Negative comments against development in principle including:</p> <p>This development will add to the loss of character and historic land use that is creeping in. Providing Schools, retail, recreation will bring even more people into the area - roads will be horrendous! Where will our local green and pleasant land be?</p> <p>The infrastructure in this area is totally unsuitable for such a development and improvement of the infrastructure must be a top priority if this project is to go ahead. We are already witnessing the total inadequacy of the A339.</p> <p>Is this site a greenfield site? If so, why has it been chosen?</p> <p>The Council makes the decisions and the developer is then not really interested in comments, questions, disagreements and even agreements from locals which is both sad and rude - but then they probably don't live here!</p> <p>There seems to be a drive to get Newbury to</p>	<p>Comments are all noted but the principle of development and the merits of alternative locations have been assessed and examined through the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>Evidence shows that there are not sufficient brownfield sites to deliver the housing required to meet the needs of the local population. A large scale urban extension has the advantage that it can deliver the infrastructure and community facilities that are needed for a sustainable development.</p> <p>Infrastructure provision has been assessed through the IDP which was prepared to support the delivery of the homes allocated through the West Berkshire Core Strategy. The specific infrastructure requirements for Sandford Park were assessed as part of this work and are set out as an appendix to the draft SPD.</p>

Any other comments		
Number of responses	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	<p>become Reading, god forbid! Existing issues with access to GP, dentist, traffic chaos due to poor council planning - Council should be supporting local community not wrecking locals' lives.</p> <p>The development will radically change the Wash Common area which is possibly the worst approach to the town centre. It has been said that it would be possible to create 2000 homes in a number of small scale sites in the locality but this has been rejected presumably to save money. I really fear that this development will be the thin end of the wedge and once it is completed, it will be allowed to grow over the following years, eating more open areas. Will crush the idea of a "market town" quality of the town and Newbury will become like Swindon, Basingstoke and Reading.</p> <p>We have A34-M4 perfectly linked for commuter traffic but if we keep on developing SOUTH the movement of people just at busy peak times will become impossible, schools and doctors are already over subscribed.</p>	

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	<p>This consultation appears to be an attempt to pretty up the surface of the development rather than tackle the core issues of sustainability and transport. Planting a few vegetables will not compensate for destroying the environment and clogging up local residential areas with unsupportable levels of car use.</p>	
20	<p>Concern regarding transport infrastructure and particularly effect on the existing roads, including A339, especially after additional traffic from Newbury Racecourse development. Monks Lane will become very busy and the roundabouts at either end of the lane need major revision. Need to rethink access, with other options considered including access from A339 and Andover Road. One suggestion that Eastern bypass required. Wendan Road (and Rupert Road/Chandos Road) need protecting to prevent increase of cut-through traffic.</p> <p>It is naive to assume people will use bikes and buses.</p> <p>Access issues particularly relevant bearing in mind that the Planning</p>	<p>The site has been modelled through the Transport Assessments and a range of infrastructure improvements have been modelled which are necessary to deliver the development. In response to concerns raised through public consultation other access options are currently being investigated.</p> <p>The Council are committed to a review of the evidence for the housing requirement. If this review indicates that housing numbers need to be revised, then the Council will need to review the housing distribution. It would not mean additional development on the Sandford Park site.</p>

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	Inspector's view regarding the Core Strategy was that the Council should have detailed 16,000 houses in the Core Strategy, not 10,500 - where else would a further 5,500 or a proportion of them be built?	
1	I don't believe that Planners should be too concerned about creating extra vehicular access to the site as this will only encourage commuter as opposed to local occupants. If the site is difficult for commuters then this should help with traffic management from the area and encourage the use of alternative means of transport.	The Council believes that the site should be well-connected and permeable. Many of the local occupants of the area need to commute to their place of work. The Travel Plan will include measures to promote sustainable travel.
4	Concern over number of homes. With community facilities taking up space 2,000 homes may be too high. Consideration should be given to reducing the number houses in order to reduce the traffic impact and create a quality development. Wash Common only has approx 1200 households. This development is going to change the entire area totally. The only way of not ruining what is already here is to reduce the number of properties planned in order to retain some of the feel of the area, south of Newbury.	The policy in the Core Strategy is for up to 2,000 homes on the site. The traffic impact has been tested through the Transport Assessments and further modelling will take place as work progresses on the detailed planning application.
1	Do not let the greedy	The infrastructure requirements are set out in the

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	developers build and run, as they normally do around here. Make sure they provide the homes with the infrastructure they need and take the advice of the police bodies regarding anti social behaviour.	Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Core Strategy policy on Design Principles states that development proposals will be expected to create safe environments, addressing crime prevention and community safety,
1	It would be helpful to know the timescale of the development	The phasing of the first 1000 dwellings is due to progress at a rate of approximately 100 dwellings a year. It is anticipated that the first housing completions will be in 2016/17.
1	Regarding southern open area, would like to see written agreement that the area would be vested in suitable trustees for public benefit in perpetuity and would not be developed.	Safeguards will be built into the Management Plan for the county park.
2	Protect river from flash flooding and contaminated run-off. Consideration ought to be given to sewerage being directed to the Kennet rather than the Enborne. An increase in effluent reaching the Enborne will disrupt the delicate ecosystem. Regarding surface water, even with SUDS, it is important that not only is peak water flow contained to existing levels, but also that run off is filtered to prevent contaminants reaching the river. At issue will be fertilisers and pesticides used in gardens, run off from roads containing rubber / fuel and oil residues.	There is a very small area of flood risk zones 2 and 3a adjacent to the northern park of the River Enborne on the southern boundary of the site. Surface water discharge from the site will not be increased and this will be dealt with by the provision of attenuation storage within the site drainage system. Development runoff will be strictly controlled to greenfield runoff rates and sustainable drainage techniques (SUDS) employed to ensure that downstream flood risk is not increased and wherever possible, reduced.

**Any other comments**

<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
5	<p>If this development is absolutely necessary local residents already in situ must be considered. Effort should be made to minimise the affect on the areas around the development - even if compromises have to be made to the development itself.</p> <p>We need St John's to be a safe place to walk our children to school and not just an in-between spot for traffic to whizz down. We'd like good access to the park in a way that promotes cycling, walking there. Link the area with the new developments on the other side of the A339 by easy foot and cycle access to encourage people to leave the car at home to visit the retail park.</p>	<p>The Council recognise the importance of linkages with the existing residential areas and of measures to promote sustainable means of transport and for traffic calming. These are reflected within the draft SPD.</p>
1	<p>The triangle of land sold to Skilldraw Ltd to permit road access - I was informed by one of your planning staff present that Sport England have not objected to this. But I hold an e-mail from Sport England that specifies that IF any sport-designated land is sold - then that land REMAINS a sport designated land for at least 5 years after the sale and thus CANNOT be developed. This is a big hurdle if Newbury Rugby Club try to sell more land for</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Council has consulted and will continue to consult with Sport England at every stage in the development of the proposals.</p>

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	development.	
2	The notion of reducing the current A339 dualling through Newbury to a single carriageway is laughably misguided and will cause total gridlock through the town and increase in accidents.	The Council do not intend to propose this in the SPD.
2	Important that existing footpath (Public Right of Way) is as far as possible in a landscape buffer between sections of development, and not between the fences or peoples gardens. Question of what will happen to route if Warren Road becomes a bus route or approach road	The existing public right of way will be maintained and form an important part of the green infrastructure of the site. The options for any potential accesses at Warren Road are currently being explored.
1	Important that the number of road crossing points is minimised, and that they are traffic calmed, etc.	Road safety will be a crucial consideration in the design.
6	Concern over Warren Road entrance and safety of school pupils. Both Park House and Falkland pupils use this as a drop off point and additional traffic would be extremely dangerous. Also 2 churches and nursery in vicinity. If to be a bus route, no parking should be allowed. Double yellow lines do not work!! Sunley Close should be made residents' parking only to prevent parking problems. Concern about impact of extra cars on Andover Road & Monks	<p>The options for Warren Road are currently being explored and any proposals will consider pupil access to Park House School. Ongoing discussions are taking place with Park House School.</p> <p>All the housing on the Sandleford Park site will be within easy walking distance of the school.</p> <p>Resident parking on streets beyond the development is not an issue that can be addressed in the SPD.</p>

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	<p>Lane during school run.</p> <p>Questions asked: If a route was to be formulated from Andover Road/Warren Road who would be entitled to use this link route? What will happen to the existing houses along Warren Road- will they not be blighted? Will they be subject to compulsory purchase orders?</p>	
2	<p>There are quite a few houses (c.30-42 Monks Lane) that have septic tank drainage that could now (if this development happens) have proper mains drainage.</p>	<p>Opportunities to improve infrastructure and services to surrounding properties can be considered in drawing up more detailed implementation schemes in conjunction with service providers.</p>
3	<p>Cycle routes: It is already dangerous to cycle into Newbury on the Andover Road from the Gun Pub. Something needs to be done to make it safer. Need realistic approach to cycling access to the town centre. Suggestion of "Boris Bikes" preferably with electric motors that can assist with the climb up the hill. This could be a Newbury wide scheme but launched on the back of the Sandleford and Racecourse developments with a pool of bikes available to registered users.</p> <p>Monks Lane cycle path is in fact a pavement adjacent to hawthorn and</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Site Travel Plan for Sandleford includes a cycle improvement fund to help improve the local cycle network.</p>



<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	<p>other mixed use hedging that is not conducive to bicycles. Moreover this pavement is jammed when Park House closes at 3:30pm, making the pavement inaccessible to bikes or other users. To accommodate the expansion of Park House more land needs to be made available to the school with access direct from the south which does not incorporate Warren Road(which in itself will be treacherous if pedestrians and buses are being asked to share this narrow route). Provision needs to be made for a proper cycle route along Monks Lane that provides a safe route into town both along the Andover Road and along side the A339.</p>	
5	<p>Sustainable transport. Regular bus service vital to reduce car impact BUT it must be regular i.e. evening and Sundays! Bus service to Newbury Station early morning 6 am-9am and 3 pm - 8pm for commuters and school kids.</p>	<p>The Site Travel Plan includes proposals for bus subsidy and increased frequency.</p>
1	<p>Access to area 3 not shown. Kendrick Road not appropriate or suitable. Proximity to woodland to east might make it unviable for development - a mercy.</p>	<p>The exhibition boards are illustrative and were not intended to show all road accesses.</p>
1	<p>Whilst the information</p>	<p>It is incorrect that the implications for the existing road</p>

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	<p>provided on the development was helpful, to be told that the implications for the existing road network still need to be 'worked out' was not.</p>	<p>network still need to be worked out. The traffic impacts of the Sandford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893</a>. Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandford. This includes where appropriate, impacts on local roads.</p> <p>Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</a></p> <p>Sandford specific infrastructure is set out in an Appendix to the draft SPD.</p>
4	<p>Comments on facilities and services. Will the Doctor's surgery, the recycling facility, and all other public services be able to cope. Suggestion that additional doctor's surgery will be required? Concern expressed that health provision missing from this form. Why? Would like it made clear just what responsibilities the developers have &amp; what is going to be left to the tax payer to fund.</p> <p>Need for community facility and a church premises separate but able to operate together. Is such a provision mandatory - i.e. for a religious provision?</p>	<p>Berkshire Shared Services have been fully engaged in the early planning for the Sandford site. They have indicated that expansion of some town centre practices will require expansion and that Falkland surgery will need to make internal changes to create additional clinical space.</p> <p>Developer contributions will be required from the development towards local infrastructure, services and amenities.</p> <p>Provision for church premises is not mandatory. However, this is currently proposed to be included within the community provision on site.</p>
1	Positive comments -	Noted.

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	Agreement with plans and particularly idea of country park	
1	The development should be built in character with the surrounding rural area. Maintain the small country style image of a market town with surrounding rural/village style amenities.	The development will need to make efficient use of land but will be designed to respond to the character of the surrounding area
1	Will there be enough vacancies in the area for all these additional people requiring a job!	Most of the occupants will not be additional people but local people who already have a job. Evidence indicates that additional housing is required in the area to support economic growth.
1	Crime prevention issues. All the new dwellings will meet at least CfSH level 4 - and as such will include relevant security to meet 'Part 2 of Secured by Design'. There was little understanding from the conversations I had that layout, external issues such as garden fencing, avoiding excessive or inappropriate permeability (to the rear or side of dwellings for instance), parking vehicles 'in curtilage' rather than hidden away in remote rear parking courts, adequate, appropriate levels of street lighting for human safety etc. will be vital to creating the 'quality' environment that that is aspired to for Sandleford. With the coalition proposals to reduce what are perceived as burdensome constraints of building regulations and planning guidance still further in	<p>Crime prevention issues will be important considerations in the design of the development. Core Strategy Policy CS14 states that development proposals will be expected to create safe environments, addressing crime prevention and community safety. The explanatory text states that developments should incorporate "Secured by Design" principles.</p> <p>This is also set out as a principle of the SPD and will need to be detailed within the Design and Access statement which will form part of any future planning application.</p>

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	<p>the months ahead, it will be VITAL for WBC to ensure that adequate local requirements are enshrined in the SPD to ensure that these are delivered from the start right through to the final completion of Sandleford, whatever changes are made to national policy and guidance in the many years the scheme will take to complete.</p> <p>Crime prevention and community safety issues MUST have relevant Thames Valley Police crime prevention design input as these matters rarely feature in the budgeting and scoping of most developers specifications and the community are left to pay the cost in financial and victim terms</p>	
3	<p>It will be important to see the type and size of housing that will be built. Suggestion for a managed housing in quiet area exclusively for over age 55 residents, i.e. Cognatum, McCarthy and Stone, etc. with resident warden/secretary.</p>	<p>The housing mix will need to include a variety of types and sizes of homes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community as set out in Core Strategy Policy CS4. This could include provision for specialist accommodation for the over 55s as the provision needs to reflect evidence on housing need and demand.</p>
2	<p>Please keep the hedge and trees between Monks Lane and the site and gardens backing on to Monks Lane.</p>	<p>The draft SPD will recognise that the views into the site from Monks Lane are restricted by the existing screening provided by the trees and hedgerows, and will retain and enhance these existing landscape features.</p>
2	<p>Please provide a footpath</p>	<p>Suggestions noted. Linkages to surrounding areas will be</p>

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	/ cycle path along A339 opposite St. Gabriel's, on west side of road, so that the eastern end of the footpath between Park House / St. Gabriel's links to Monks Lane, the retail park, etc. Currently the footpath ends on a dangerous road. Enable pedestrians/cyclists to safely access down to the Swan roundabout. At the moment it entails two dangerous crossings.	important components of the design and are set out as key principles of the draft SPD.
1	A means of direct pedestrian access to Greenham Common. This was part of the original sales pitch, and seems to have been forgotten. Bicycle access will not do.	Noted. Linkages to surrounding areas, including linked green infrastructure will be important components of the design.
1	Visible fire hydrants.	Noted
1	Police station would be very desirable	A police station is unlikely to be required
1	Will the results of the feedback forms be made public and hopefully will our comments be acted upon if practicable.	Yes – this summary sets out how it is proposed to act upon the comments expressed.
2	Minimise light pollution. Can the lighting on the site be of a sympathetic design and not tall standards - extra light will destroy the wildlife habitat.	Lighting will be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the site.
1	Park House School would welcome opportunities to engage students as part of the planning process, with links to curriculum projects. Park House School would	Noted. Discussions are ongoing with Park House School.

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	welcome further discussions with planners and developers to optimise opportunities to develop community and learning facilities within the existing site envelope	
2	If Park House extends - more traffic etc - they must provide their own parking on site. Need to consider access arrangements for Park House.	Noted – this will be considered in the design. The future accommodation requirements of Park House School are subject to ongoing discussions.
1	We feel strongly that there should be a buffer zone of between 100-200 metres at least, between the existing properties in Warren Road, Round End and Kendrick Road- and not encroaching to the existing boundaries.	It is not considered that incorporation of a buffer of up to 200 metres would be sustainable. Whilst existing wooded areas and hedgerows will be retained and enhanced by additional strategic landscaping at the site, the objective is to utilise land effectively and to deliver a development which is integrated into the existing urban form and which will form part of the wider community.
	There has been no demographic modelling of this proposal, so it is unclear of the traffic impact of a large percentage of family homes over time. For example any household with children over 8 years old moving in 2016 will increase the number of cars by the end of the 1st development period in 2026, will that influence/limit the extension of development beyond then?	Traffic modelling in the Transport Assessments has made assumptions about the anticipated population and levels of car use.
1	Sustainability. In 2007, Sustainable Newbury, a sub-committee of	Opportunities for sustainable energy generation will be explored through the SPD and via detailed background work on this issue and more detailed design.

**Any other comments**

<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	<p>Newbury Town Council, fulfilling its Local Agenda commitments, investigated a number of sites within Newbury Parish, for wind turbines (two 1.3MW). It was concluded that the only suitable location is on the windy ridge along Monk's Lane, adjacent to the College and Rugby Club.</p> <p>The general consensus from a public meeting and questionnaires sent to all local residents, was, for many spurious reasons, such as noise, vibration, flicker etc: and most predominant potential drop in property values, it was marginally dismissed. However, the site still remains with the best for wind power generation in Newbury Parish, with a potential of supplying all the electrical power for the whole development.</p> <p>The Sandleford Park Masterplan will destroy any future siting of large wind turbines, with housing covering the whole site.</p> <p>I would like to know what provisions for sustainable energy generation (wind, solar etc :) are going to be provided?</p> <p>There is still a lot of potential for smaller wind</p>	<p>Development will need to conform to policies within the Core Strategy (specifically policy CS15) and any national requirements.</p>

<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	<p>turbines being incorporated.</p> <p>Will there be provision for self-build and prototype, zero carbon footprint houses, as required by central Government?</p>	
1	<p>Future consultation with local residents needs to be communicated well - the publicity and mail shots funded by the developers should continue to update residents. It speaks volumes that they only funded the community mail shot after the core strategy was approved, and there was no similar communication during the consultation last year. This does not inspire confidence in the transparency of the planning process.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council has sought to engage the community throughout the Core Strategy process and particularly at the Options stage in the summer of 2009. The details are set out in the Core Strategy Statement of Consultation.</p>
1	<p>The opportunity should be taken to re-align the political boundaries and recognise that the A339 represents a natural boundary between Greenham and a new parish of Wash Common which should encompass Monks Lane(north and south) and Essex Street(north and south) and any dead end roads that lead into either. This would be an opportunity to help cement Sandleford firmly into the community as opposed to being a standalone development. It would</p>	<p>These are issues outside the scope of the SPD.</p>



<b>Any other comments</b>		
<b>Number of responses</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
	also relieve the pressure on Greenham that has to also absorb the racecourse development	
1	The area opposite the college mini roundabout looks very untidy. The old building with the green roofs very unusual and could look really stylish and beautiful if renovated. Parking outside the houses at the college end of Monks Lane looks unsightly. Often cars are parked on the grass here etc	These are issues outside the scope of the SPD
1	Wildlife access to site. Wildlife access will have to be from the south, and care must be taken not to prevent this, else the park will become shut off to wildlife. Public activity in this area could very easily dissuade wildlife from transiting into the park, severely limiting the deer and other wildlife.	There will be a number of measures to enhance the ecology and biodiversity of the site, in particular with woodland management and the creation of the country park
1	Since the site includes areas of Civil War battleground, full archaeological study will be essential prior to building.	The SPD covers issues of archaeology and heritage assets. The site and surrounding areas have been the subject of a number of archaeological assessments over the years, none of which has identified significant archaeological remains or features. However, further archaeological investigation including trial trenches will be carried out before any development takes place.
1	Development must be undertaken in such a way as it does not intrude upon views from the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, particularly the North Hampshire Downs; Beacon Hill, the ancient	The draft SPD includes measures to ensure that views into and from the site will be protected, including proposals for strategic planting.  Lighting will be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological and visual impact.

Any other comments		
Number of responses	Summary of Comments	Council Response
	<p>hill fort at Ladle Hill, Walbury Hill, the Watership Down scarp and the Kingsclere Downs. All of these form an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, traversed by Wayfarer's Walk, a long distance path.</p> <p>This is particularly a concern at dusk when street lighting may make the development visible at great distance; whereas Newbury's current housing is hidden.</p>	



## Appendix 5: Sandleford Park Draft Supplementary Planning Document – Consultation Responses

The following table sets out the consultation responses received on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Sandleford Park Site. The consultation period ran from 22 March to 3 May 2013.

The comments received have been placed directly into tables and a Council Response has been provided.

### Sections A - D

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
<b>Section A: Introduction</b>			
Michael Ikin	Allied Domecq	<p>We believe that the Sandleford project is an over development of Newbury.</p> <p>We already have traffic problems on Burysbank Road at the Retail Park, with queues at peak rush hour times, and at weekends, not to mention public holidays such as Easter etc.</p> <p>We do not have enough local services for more housing and given the development of the race course area the traffic onto the local roads would only be adding to the problems</p> <p>Parking at recreations spots is often full, i.e. Greenham Common and parking is an issue in general at both the Retail Park&amp; Greenham location at the weekends.</p> <p>Regardless of Government guidelines for building of homes we do not want this it would spoil the look of this beautiful valley.</p>	<p>The principle of development of the site has been established through the Core Strategy process and the site has been accepted as the location to provide a long term urban extension which will deliver up to 2000 homes over at least a 20 year period.</p> <p>The allocation has been informed by 4 phases of Transport Assessment work, which has fed into the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site. The broader infrastructure requirements of the site have been established in partnership with service providers.</p> <p>Development on the site will respond to the landscape character of the area, meaning that residential development will take place to the north and to the west of the site.</p> <p>The development will be designed with significant green infrastructure, taking account of the site's location, topography and landscape importance. The formation of country parkland in</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>The plan has too many houses and is far too big of a development for Newbury.</p> <p>We believe these are some of the key issue as to why the Sandleford Park Plans in its current form should be rejected.</p>	<p>the southern part of the site will protect that sensitive landscape area in perpetuity.</p>
Cllr Tony Vickers		<p>Section A – Introduction</p> <p>The idea that a landowner can be highly influential in the framing of policy for a strategic site that is on land which they own makes us extremely uncomfortable. Whilst we acknowledge that Members (on the Planning Task Group) have also had some influence, key aspects of the draft DPD are clearly dictated by the extent of ownership by a syndicate whose members appear to be largely non-resident and whose motives one would expect to be entirely driven by personal financial considerations. It is far too close to a monopolistic relationship that underpins this document. However we are told this is the way planning policy works and so we have to accept it.</p> <p>Our detailed comments try to ensure that when ownership transfers from landowner to developer(s) there is flexibility in any policies in this SPD that are currently seemingly dictated by the boundaries of land within the current landowner's control. We expect the Master Plan to apply to any major development proposal that the Council may need to determine involving land wholly or partly within the area defined by this Master Plan.</p>	<p>It is correct that the SPD has been prepared in cooperation with the agent promoting the Sandleford development on behalf of the Sandleford landowners. However, it is a Council document which expands on policy CS3 of the adopted Core Strategy which is a Council document, independently examined through the Core Strategy process. Given that Sandleford Park has now been allocated through an adopted Development Plan it is entirely reasonable to work alongside the landowner in ensuring that a deliverable scheme is brought forward for the site. This is a usual approach, necessary to ensure that we have the relevant information to inform the preparation of the SPD. The SPD has to reflect the site boundary; however, there have been wide ranging discussions with neighbours to the site to ensure a coordinated approach to the future development of southern Newbury.</p> <p>The SPD, once adopted, will form a material consideration to be taken into account in any future planning application for the site.</p>
<b>Section B: Vision and Strategic Objectives</b>			

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
John Gardner		<p>Section B: Vision</p> <p>Item 2: Andover Road; Monks Lane; Newtown Road and the A339 are already at capacity for vehicles and dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. There is NO MENTION in the SPD on how these roads will cope with the new traffic. The statement in item 2 is useless; whether or not the development has 2 or 4 exits onto the existing highway system will not solve the district transport problems that the development will cause. To say that the development is sustainable is a lie as anyone who walks, rides or drives, on the roads mentioned above, will know.</p>	<p>The information about the necessary improvements to the highways network is set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the site which forms Appendix 3 to the SPD. This sets out a number of improvements to the local road, public transport, cycling and water infrastructure network. A detailed Transport Assessment will need to accompany any future planning application.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p>
Richard Page		<p>-An all vehicle access link through Warren Road-</p> <p>The junction where Warren Road meets the Andover Road / A343 is opposite a primary school and along side a secondary school. On weekdays between 3:00 and 3:30, this area is extremely congested. Putting in this junction will cause an obstruction to one of the major routes into Newbury and a hazard to the 1600 children who pass through this area by foot, bike or car in this period every day.</p> <p>If this link is required for all vehicles, the sustainability of this site is not as high as stated in the Core Strategy and brings the selection of this site, on the ground of its sustainability, into question.</p>	<p>The site has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport assessment work which was carried out to support the allocation of the site with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to evaluate the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highways network.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the issues being raised and they will be required to be addressed through a future planning application.</p>
Cllr Tony Vickers		<p>Section B: Vision and Strategic Objectives</p> <p>It is not clear what (in the 2nd paragraph of the Vision) are</p>	<p>It is not unrealistic to expect a proportion of Sandfield Park residents to walk/cycle to Newbury's main employment areas, even where there is a hill in between. The adopted Core</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>"mostly within walking and cycling distance". It seems extremely unlikely that most jobs will be, given the gradient of the hill separating Sandford from Newbury's main employment areas. The consequence is that car use during peak hours will be high, unless there is an exceptionally good bus service. Otherwise the Vision is admirable but not entirely realisable through the policies set out here.</p> <p>We particularly support additional access points being explored.</p>	<p>Strategy requires improvements to local infrastructure including an improved / new bus service linking Sandford Park and Newbury Town Centre and improved pedestrian/cycle crossing links at Monks Lane and Newtown Road (College roundabout and other crossing points).</p> <p>The vision of the SPD has been amended to read 'many of which are within walking and cycling distance.'</p> <p>Support for exploration of additional access points noted.</p>
Derek People	Park House School	<p>Vision and Strategic Objectives</p> <p>In relation to the Vision and Strategic Objectives detailed on pages 6-7 of the Draft Supplementary Planning Document (March 2013) Park House School strongly recommends the provision of an all through school and/or the co-location of primary provision on the Park House School site (subject to the required adjustments to existing secondary age accommodation) for the following reasons:</p> <p>The promotion of effective learning and student achievement through enhanced curriculum planning and transition arrangements (Strategic Objective 10)</p> <p>Increased efficiencies through the shared use of facilities and staff (Strategic Objectives 13 and 14)</p> <p>Positive impacts on vehicular movement in relation to access</p>	<p>Comments noted. The exact location and format of the facilities will be considered as part of any future planning application. Background feasibility work to inform this is underway, including partnership working with surrounding uses in southern Newbury.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>points through the rationalisation of provision (Strategic Objective 2), additionally addressing key health and safety and environmental issues in relation to pupil movement to and from school as reflected in Appendix 2 -Site Travel Plan Requirements (pages 82-83)</p> <p>Maximisation of site capacity to ensure the desired delivery of balance between built and natural environments within the overall development (Strategic Objectives 3, 4, 5, 6, 12 and 14)</p>	
Rachel Page		<p>Section B Strategic Objectives</p> <p>2- Consideration of Warren Road as an all vehicle access.</p> <p>In my previous submission during core strategy consultation, I raised concerns about the use of Warren Road as a bus route, due to safety of pedestrians and cyclists in the local area, particularly due to the large numbers of school children of all ages crossing at this point.</p> <p>I am therefore even more concerned to see this expanded to an all vehicle access – as there is so little space around this junction to expand foot paths and crossing points to make it safe for the unaccompanied school children.</p> <p>Especially as we were assured during the core strategy consultation and the inspectors review that the Sandleford development was viable with only the Monks Lane access routes, and therefore it feels that the Wash Common community were misled about the potential impact of the</p>	<p>The site has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport assessment work which was carried out to support the allocation of the site through the Core Strategy process with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>In terms of affordable housing, Pages 46/47 of the SPD state that “Affordable housing will be delivered throughout the site in accordance with the provisions set out in Core Strategy policy CS6 providing at least 40% affordable housing... ..Pepper-</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>development on the Andover Road traffic.</p> <p>Affordable housing:</p> <p>No mention of minimum % of affordable housing is stated within the strategic objectives or other sections. I have only found a comment that up to 40% will be affordable, how will the council ensure this is not watered down as has happened on other new developments following challenges by the developers.</p> <p>Also, how will the various areas be divided up among developers, and will each area have a quota of affordable housing to ensure pepper potting?</p>	<p>potting of the affordable housing is essential to ensure a sustainable tenure blind community”.</p> <p>To provide additional clarity on the requirements, changes have been made to the Strategic Objectives of the SPD to reflect the percentage of affordable housing that is proposed for the site (from policy CS6 of the Core Strategy)</p> <p>In terms of the levels of provision, these are subject to the economics of provision – if there was a proposal below the levels set out in policy CS6 then this would need to be fully justified by any applicant through clear evidence set out in a viability assessment.</p> <p>In terms of division, the site has not yet been sold to developers, however, in terms of the policy requirement; the affordable units will need to be integrated into the development as a whole.</p>
Tony Hammond		<p>The most worrying thing about this document is that there are many pages concerning landscaping and environmental issues but very little additional details about the core scope of the actual housing and facilities. There are several items on the potential “character” of area design within the neighbourhoods, but nothing on the actual distribution and number of houses other than high-level density figures. Reducing the number of Neighbourhoods from 3 to 2 does little to clarify the distribution.</p> <p>The “community facilities” are described in a page and gloss over the issue of a significant increase in potential school</p>	<p>The SPD is intended to form a framework for the future development of the allocated site. It is considered that, together with Core Strategy CS3, an appropriate level of detail is provided on housing/facilities provision to guide future planning applications, without being overly prescriptive. The urban design principles and subdivision of the site into neighbourhoods and character areas will guide the more detailed design work, including numbers and layout of housing.</p> <p>Discussions and feasibility work is ongoing regarding the provision of education on the site and with Falkland Surgery regarding health provision.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>numbers and where to locate them, contain a vague statement regarding health provision and does not explain the significant relocation of the local centre from Neighbourhood A to B.</p> <p>The absence of any suggested phasing for building on the site is also a concern, particularly relating to the local centre in Neighbourhood B – as geographically this would appear to be an area not in the first phase of work although it's supposed to contain the critical local facilities.</p> <p>Then there's the "mission creep" with suggestion of new access points and shared facilities outside the development area, which calls into question the sustainability of the site that was the original selling point for the development and suggests that the original agreed proposal is not, after all, deliverable.</p>	<p>The Draft SPD showed a potential location for the Local Centre. It is important that this facility is located in an accessible location, linked to the main access routes and preferably close to the Country parkland. The proposed location has been moved further to the east within neighbourhood Sandford B in the final SPD.</p> <p>Phasing is a matter for the planning application. The timing of facilities generally relates to the numbers of houses on the site (as in the implementation plan for the Racecourse site). However, if there's a particular requirement for facilities (such as primary provision) then this will need to be agreed as part of the pre-application process.</p> <p>The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>The shared use of facilities was also supported in the earlier consultation and can enable more efficient use of facilities and help to foster a sense of community. The wording of the final SPD now reflects this more fully.</p>
<b>Section D: The Site Context</b>			

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Cllr Tony Vickers		<p>Section D: The Site Context</p> <p>Monks Lane Access. If there are to be two access points onto Monks Lane, it might be better to use one or both of the existing access roads that serve the Rugby Club and Newbury College, rather than create two new ones in addition as shown. This is because [a] they are positioned far from where most journeys are headed - A339 or A343 (see paragraphs 68-9) - and will therefore encourage rat-running via residential roads for traffic heading to Newbury (via Rupert / Wendan Roads, the preferred route for pedestrians using the one crossing point on Monks Lane) and [b] they will break up the excellent off-road cycleway (referred to in paragraph 74) and make a total of four interruptions / crossings by vehicles for cyclists and pedestrians using this existing E-W route.</p> <p>This should be acknowledged in the 'context' section. Just because Sandleford Park is now in the Core Strategy does not mean the Council can gloss over the 'contextual' issues that remain to be addressed.</p> <p>Distance of site from Newbury. In paragraph 73, it is said that the railway station is about 1800m from the site and that 2000m is the "recommended maximum walking distance". This ignores the fact that by the most direct route to the station it is 1800m to the northern boundary of the site, making it well over 2000m from almost all new dwellings. It cannot therefore be claimed, as the document does by implication here, that the development is in any sense 'sustainable' in terms of walkability to main employment</p>	<p>The principle of two additional access points off Monks Lane accords with Policy CS3 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>The site has been identified as a sustainable location for up to 2,000 dwellings in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Appendix D of the Core Strategy (reproduced at Appendix 3 of the SPD) sets out a number of improvements to the local road, public transport, cycling and walking infrastructure network that are required to deliver the Strategy, including those specific to the Sandleford Park Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>It is not unrealistic to expect a proportion of Sandleford Park residents to walk/cycle to Newbury's main employment areas, even where there is a hill in between. The adopted Core Strategy requires improvements to local infrastructure including an improved / new bus service linking Sandleford Park and Newbury Town Centre and improved pedestrian/cycle crossing links at Monks Lane and Newtown Road (College roundabout and other crossing points).</p> <p>Public footpath. Consultation has shown the public footpath to be a significant feature which it is proposed is retained. There will be additional footpath links through the Country Park to the</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>areas or rail station. To be 'sustainable' in terms of transport, there will need to be a bus service at all times (including meeting late evening trains from London) of no more than 15 minute frequency: if people have to consult a timetable before setting off for the bus, they are unlikely to regularly use one.</p> <p>Cycle Access. The “cycle path” running up Newtown Road is next to useless for residents of this site (para 74). It is a narrow footway for most of its length – especially where there is currently no footway on the west side of the road. Were there – amazingly – to be a significant number of people prepared to bike regularly along this route, it would be hazardous to pedestrians. But it does not follow a desire line to/from the site: that would be the Rupert Road / Wendan Road route, which is a good rat-run for cars.</p> <p>Mention of National Cycle Route 4 is even less relevant here: the national cycle network is mainly a recreational facility and is very unlikely to play any part in reducing peak hour car use.</p> <p>Public footpath. It is misleading to imply (para 75) that the public footpath towards Sandford Priors via the A339 is of any significance, because where it emerges on the main road there is no footway – and no means of safe crossing. The priory is now a private girls school and there is no possibility of the continuation of the path becoming a public right of way of any kind unless the use of the Priory changes.</p> <p>It is far more important that this development is served by a</p>	<p>south of the site. In A2 of the Access and Movement principles, the draft SPD includes Greenham Common in the list of destinations to which there are important connections to promote and enable.</p> <p>The development provides an opportunity to improve the link from the public right of way across the site east to Greenham Common. This would need to look at ways of overcoming the barrier of the A339 and improving the route south from the entrance to St Gabriel's School. This improved link to Greenham Common should be considered in the context of walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Parish boundaries. A review of parish boundaries would not be a planning matter and is therefore outside the scope of the SPD.</p> <p>The reference within the site context section, describes the cycle routes available in a factual manner rather than inferring that they would reduce peak hour car use.</p> <p>Again, this is a factual reference.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>public footpath that leads beyond the A339 towards Greenham Common. That can only be done by diverting the eastern end of the existing path to meet the A339 at the extreme south end of the site boundary, then to create a safe crossing to the north west side of the Swan roundabout, from where a tarmacked footway exists towards the public footpath through Bunkers Farm to the GAMA site on Greenham Common. This should be specified in the SPD.</p> <p>Parish boundaries. This section implies that the site is in Newbury. It should be acknowledged that the site is very much split between the town of Newbury and the parish of Greenham. Both road access points onto Monks Lane and the Andover Road bus access are in Newbury, as is 40% of the built area proposed. However 60% of the built area and 80% of the total site area - including all of the country park - is in Greenham parish. Almost all the impact in terms of traffic, primary health care and education, on the other hand, will be felt by Newbury residents. The proposed Local Centre is virtually on the parish boundary.</p> <p>Overall, this does not bode well for creating a cohesive community and it should be acknowledged as a significant issue which any outline planning application for the whole site must address.</p> <p>It would be appropriate to review parish boundaries between Greenham and Newbury before the first occupants move into dwellings on the site. Any site-wide aspects of an outline planning application need to take account of the possibility of Sandlesford Park becoming all in one parish. For example,</p>	<p>Paragraph 35 of the SPD has been updated to reflect this comment.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		management of open spaces needs to be secured with one agency (probably the local council) and not necessarily with the local council(s) as they currently are.	
Jenny Graham	West Berkshire District Council	<p>Site Context - Opportunities and constraints (Section D pg. 23/ 24)</p> <p>Para 109 – Suggested new wording: ‘Development of the site will result in additional traffic loads particularly affecting Monks Lane, the A339 and Andover Road (A343)’</p> <p>It would be useful to include a map of the local area showing local facilities and links to them from the site both existing and potential.</p> <p>The development provides an opportunity to improve the link from the public right of way across the site east to Greenham Common. This would need to look at ways of overcoming the barrier of the A339 and improving the route south from the entrance to St Gabriel’s school. If the public right of way through the country park is to become a leisure cycle route then this improved link to Greenham Common can be considered in the context of walkers and cyclists.</p>	<p>Paragraph 109 has been amended to read ‘Development of the site will result in additional traffic loads particularly affecting Monks Lane, the A339 and Andover Road (A343)’</p> <p>Comments about improving the link from the public right of way across the site east to Greenham Common are supported and will be assessed in more detail through the planning application process.</p>
Martin Small	English Heritage	We welcome the archaeological survey work that has been undertaken and the recognition within the draft SPD of the heritage assets in close proximity to the site, particularly the Grade I listed Sandford Priory and its associated Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden.	Noted
Rachel Page		Section D Site Context	The trees shown on the map (outside of the woodland areas) are not those which are considered important and to be

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>85 – please let me know where the arboricultural report can be seen – and please supply details of which trees have been identified as being in scope for potential removal. Does this report include trees along boundaries which may be outside of the development area e.g. along Kendrick road/wildwood roads, or along Park House school boundaries? Ref Fig 4 p25. Are the trees shown on the map (outside of woodland areas) the ones which are considered 'important' and to be retained?</p> <p>108 – can the ecology reports commissioned by the developers/landowners (WYG) be made available to public? WYG consultant mentioned on 18/4 that reports had been done, and that certain bat corridors were identified between the areas of ancient woodland, which would mean that light levels had to be reduced in those areas. These are not shown within the SDP.</p> <p>It would be helpful to know what other species have been identified and what protection is proposed.</p> <p>65 Access: The SDP states that the site is in an accessible location with potential for good links to the town centre.... there is no recognition of the considerable gradient between town and site.</p> <p>73 – does the 2km maximum walking distance from site to station quoted allow for the gradient?</p> <p>74 cycle access –  <i>“there are a number of lightly trafficked roads suitable for</i> </p>	<p>retained.</p> <p>A list of the reports which were prepared to support the allocation of the site through the Core Strategy process is available as part of the Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination which are available from the West Berkshire Council website at <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=30992&amp;p=0">http://www.westberks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=30992&amp;p=0</a></p> <p>The documents themselves are available to download from this link.</p> <p>Some of the very detailed points within this response will be dealt with via a planning application for which additional (for example) ecological reports will be prepared.</p> <p>The recommended maximum walking distance is not adjusted for gradient.</p> <p>In terms of cycling, any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p><i>cycling in the local area</i> “ - these roads will no longer be lightly trafficked in light of the increased traffic from the development which is recognised in the SPD under Constraint 109 on p24</p>	
Barrie Prentice	Falkland CP School	<p>Item 92 : Education Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We fully support the statement that there would need to be new provision for primary education from the time of occupation of the first dwelling.</li> <li>• Recent years have seen oversubscription of pupil places and there is an immediate need for extending primary provision in South Newbury. The number of pupil places required needs to be effectively understood and planned for, well ahead of the annual admissions process.</li> <li>• Any advance pupil place planning would need to be accurate and have flexibility to turn on/off provision during the early years of development at Sandleford Park. The current funding structure for education is at the start of a cycle that is far tighter than in recent years and any significant movement of pupil numbers may have significant effects on the current school network due to pupil movement in the precarious funding position. Of course pupil placement should always recognise the wishes of parents, based on their view of where good education is provided, however the local authority will need to carefully manage this situation to prevent large amounts of spare place availability.</li> </ul>	<p>The responsibility for ensuring sufficient pupil places across the District includes Academies, and therefore it is essential to ensure sufficient mitigation measures for Park House School, as this is the catchment area school for the Sandleford Park site. The mitigation measures sought are only for ensuring sufficient places to meet the impact from the development and not for 'growing and developing the school'. There are no current financial funding streams for either Academies or LA maintained schools, other than developer contributions, for meeting the impact of new housing.</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Strategic Objective 10 it is stated that one objective of the development is 'To provide.....contributions for the expansion of Park House School.' We are delighted to hear that there is a clear willingness to improve infrastructure at Park House School, but would wish to be clear that we believe that there are factors which may be important to consider.</li>   <li>• Park House School has now achieved academy status and it should be finding its own financial way to grow and develop. We wholeheartedly support the wish of Park House to do this, and yet where developer's funds are flowing into the Local Authority for education provision, then these should be used for provision of education at schools in Local Authority control. Park House School Academy should enter into its own arrangements with developers, with perhaps some facilitation from the Local Authority.</li>   <li>• We believe that 'money should follow the child' to fund education provision. We know that from our catchment in Wash Common approx. 40-50% of pupils do not make the transition to Park House School, but instead choose St.Bartholomews School. This pattern has existed for at least ten years. This balance in movement at transition may change as Sandford Park and Park House School develop but needs to be understood to ensure correct planning of provision by those schools involved.</li>   <li>• Secondary school development has had a complex local investment history and Park House School deserves encouragement and investment to balance previous</li> </ul>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>investments elsewhere.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We anticipate that there would need to be some transitional temporary arrangements for education provision in the early years of the development, using temporary classrooms as the population expands. We see this transition being most effective through a close affiliation, or integration, within the current local network of schools.</li> <li>• With a national problem with the availability of headteachers we believe that there would be significant benefits and efficiencies for extending this initial transition into a longer term 'federation' of the new school with an existing primary school. This would utilise the experience and understanding of proven professionals in the primary school sector. We believe that Falkland School should be considered first for such a role as the Sandleford Park site sits within our current catchment area. We also have a well proven track record of good outcomes for our children and we have a strong history of developing leaders who have moved on to lead other local schools.</li> </ul>	<p>The use of temporary classrooms to manage the early year(s) of the development is only one option. Work is ongoing to establish the likely early impact and options for mitigating that early impact.</p>
Barrie Prentice	Falkland CP School	<p>Section 104 : Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We understand that the proposal is that the Sandleford Park site will have vehicular access arrangements that will feed into the eastern side of the site and the A339. There would be bus access through Warren Road to the A343 Andover Road. (Strategic Objective 2). We agree that connection of Sandleford Park to the A343 should not be a strategic objective and with our regard to pupil safety we</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted and the concerns are understood. Whilst the site has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport assessment work which was carried out to support the allocation of the site with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network specifically looking at 2 additional</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>would express concerns about the necessity of bus provision. We would definitely not wish to see this extended to allow full vehicular access through Warren Road to the A343, and any connection of the site to the A343 should minimise additional traffic near to the schools and pupils.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our anxiety arises from a long standing concern about the volume of traffic that is using a short stretch of Andover Road that provides access to Park House School, Falkland School, St.Georges Church and a petrol station/mini-supermarket. In all of these situations we regularly hear of dangerous situations as vehicles travel across the line of the pavement, and we already have to communicate our concerns to parents at regular intervals. This is especially focussed at either end of the school day.</li> </ul>	<p>accesses, an all vehicle access off Warren Road onto the A343 and one onto the A339. The bus link would need to remain.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport. Therefore the matters raised, which the Council is already aware of, would need to be addressed as part of this process.</p> <p>In terms of the potential all vehicle access onto Warren Road, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>The solution will depend on the specific issue. For example 'green light on demand' could be designed in as part of a traffic signal junction</p>

## Section F

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
<b>Section F – Development Principles</b>			
Christopher Winchester		<p>P1 Growing areas</p> <p>Allotments are increasingly popular as people's concern grows about the environment and food production, and there is currently a waiting list for an allotment in Newbury. The building of houses and homes in Sandleford and on the Racecourse can only lengthen them.</p> <p>I welcome the mention of 'opportunities...to provide growing areas...such as allotments' and would like to see allotments included in firm plans (commitments) for Sandleford.</p> <p>OVERALL</p> <p>I am sorry that such an attractive area of countryside will be developed, and remain concerned about the impact on the setting of Sandleford Priory (already damaged by the Household Waste Recycling Centre). That said, I am impressed by the plans, and the amount of thought that has gone into them. If the thoughtful approach of the planning document is carried through into the development, then it should be an attractive place to live.</p> <p>My main question for local bodies is 'What will be the budget impact'? Will the local council be responsible for maintaining the Country Park and, if so, will these costs be exceeded by increased income from local taxes? If there is a shortfall, how will that be made up?</p>	<p>Support for allotments noted. Allotments will be provided at the site to cater for the needs of the residents.</p> <p>The maintenance of the Country parkland will be agreed through the planning application process and funding will be required on an ongoing basis.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Philip Kenny		<p>Transportation plans are inadequate.</p> <p>Education plans are inadequate</p> <p>This is cramming people into a small space.</p> <p>This is destruction of an irreplaceable green space.</p> <p>All about money, not about people, sad, greedy and running a fine place to live.</p>	<p>The principle of development of the site has been established through the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>The density on the site will reflect the fact that the site is expected to deliver predominantly family sized homes. The maps and plans included within the SPD show where the residential development will be delivered, taking into account the opportunities and constraints of the site. This will be focused in part of the north and west of the site.</p> <p>Additionally, only 39% of the site is proposed for development with the rest taken up by open space and woodland.</p> <p>The formation of the Country parkland will protect the sensitive landscape area in perpetuity.</p> <p>In terms of education – work has been carried out in tandem with the allocation of the site and the preparation of the SPD to assess in detail what the education requirements are for the site. These have been discussed with education providers in the area. The detail will be taken forward through the planning application for the site rather than set out within the SPD.</p> <p>In terms of the transportation – the allocation of the site was informed by 4 phases of transport assessment work which are publicly available. These have concluded</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
			that the site is deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to evaluate the benefits of other options in terms of the comparative effects of traffic flows onto the highways network.
Airlie Dyson		<p>Section F (pg 32) "L4 Where possible all important existing trees and hedgerows should be retained..."</p> <p>"L5 The development will include measures to ensure that views into and from the site... will be protected and enhanced"</p> <p>On the west boundary of the site along single tracked Kendrick Road, there is a line of mature trees and hedgerow. WILL THESE TREES AND HEDGEROW BE RETAINED? IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THEY ARE RETAINED.</p> <p>Section D (pg 25)</p> <p>A 15m buffer to woodland is planned.</p> <p>On the west boundary of the site along single tracked Kendrick Road, there is a line of mature trees and hedgerow. WILL A 15m BUFFER BE APPLIED TO THIS MATURE WOODED BOUNDARY?</p>	<p>Where possible, all important existing trees and hedgerows will be retained. Details of which trees to be retained/removed will be considered as part of planning applications.</p> <p>The 15m buffer does not apply to this boundary. However, additional strategic planting in accordance with the Strategic landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan will be an important part of the first phase of development. This will include stand offs to important trees.</p>
Richard Page	Kendrick Road Residents	We are concerned about the effect of the Sandleford development on Kendrick Road and request that every effort is made to minimise the	It is agreed that Park Edge principles could sensibly be applied to the perimeter of CA5

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>impact on this area.</p> <p>Kendrick Road could be considered to be a semi-rural location with no street lighting and subject to very low levels of light pollution and noise. We feel it is important to maintain these characteristics within the development principles of CA5-Wash Common, particularly where it borders Kendrick Road. This will ensure that the development blends into the local area.</p> <p>In particular we would like to see the following added to the CA5-Wash Common development principles in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Additional strategic planting along site boundaries as proposed for Park Edge to form a buffer area and a sight screen. This buffer should extend down from Kendrick Road up to Wild Wood.</li> <li>2) Mandate no lighting or a maximum of low level lighting around all woodland and site boundaries.</li> <li>3) Orientation of housing to ensure access roads are away from the perimeter of the CA 5 area .</li> <li>4) Ensure that all mature trees along the Kendrick Road/Wild Wood boundary are retained.</li> <li>5) Kendrick Road is a private road and cannot be used for access, vehicular or pedestrian, nor for the routing of utilities to the development site.</li> <li>6) Kennel Cottage is an 18th century, grade II listed, building. The</li> </ol>	<p>and figure 13 has been changed accordingly.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>development should treat the surrounding area sympathetically.</p> <p>Some of the above could be addressed by assigning Park Edge (CA3) design standards to the perimeter of this area (CA5). The SPD shows Park Edge status assigned to the woodland facing edges of the other main areas of the development (Fig 13).</p> <p>Richard and Rachel Page, Beech Hedge, Kendrick Road</p> <p>David and Janet Torrance, The Old Orchard Kendrick Road</p> <p>Robert and Joan Withers, Ramblers, Kendrick Road</p> <p>John and Christine Scott, Charlcombe, Kendrick Road</p> <p>David and Pat Rushton, The Little House, Kendrick Road</p> <p>Bob and Jean Heaton, Little Rossett, Kendrick Road</p> <p>Glenn and Sarah James, Wishanger, Kendrick Road</p> <p>Phil and Clare Bishop, Kennel Cottage, Kendrick Road</p>	
Tony Hammond		<p>Section A. Access and Movement:</p> <p>Transport &amp; Access points:</p> <p>Earlier objections to the proposal based on accessibility were dismissed as being subjective opinions and the site was deemed deliverable on the basis of the two access points on Monks Lane and a bus entrance on Warren Road – demonstrated by an objective</p>	<p>The site has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport assessment work which was carried out to support the allocation of the site with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Transport Assessment.</p> <p>So there should be no need to modify this if the council truly believes in the accuracy of its transport assessment.</p> <p>Both routes also have practical issues:</p> <p>Warren Road:</p> <p>The proposed access point at Warren Road should not be pursued. There appears to be an assumption that traffic would only use it to turn south down the Andover Road to the by-pass junction and would take the strain off Monks Lane and it's junction with the Andover Road.</p> <p>However this will not be the case. For neighbourhood B this will become the primary access point for several reasons. Firstly the proposal is that the internal access roads will all be restricted to 20 mph (see CA1 – P54-55), so there is no incentive for residents of neighbourhood 2 to drive through the entire estate if they can turn into Warren Road and then right onto the Andover Road and head into town. Secondly the nature of the main internal access road as proposed will have gradients over the valley head (even with a bridge over the green gap) and will be deliberately curved and open to restrict speed so will not be attractive compared to the straight 30mph Andover Road. Simple psychology will draw residents out onto the Andover Road.</p> <p>Also an access point on the Andover Road is at an already busy location, since it is adjacent to 2 schools and St George's church and near to the ongoing development of the Falkland garage. Junction</p>	<p>work is currently being carried out to evaluate the benefits of other options. This involves assessing the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and that these would need to be addressed. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements.</p> <p>In terms of this potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>The solution will depend on the specific issue. For example 'green light on demand' could be designed in as part of a traffic</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>improvements will not help the already busy pedestrian traffic in the area and will increase the likelihood of accidents involving children at peak school times (near misses are common already in this area).</p> <p>So Warren Road should be dropped as an access point as it will not fulfil the simple function proposed.</p> <p>If it is to remain a proposed bus entrance it should be used as an entry point only, so buses can travel up the Andover Road and then make a simple left turn into Warren Road, travel through the development and exit at one of the Monks Lane access points to return into town. This would make junction improvements simply and avoid buses making the difficult right turn onto the Andover Road.</p> <p>A339 access:</p> <p>The case for an access point directly onto the A339 is also difficult. A roundabout that also removes the ludicrous detour residents need to make to drop of "green waste" would be welcome, but for anyone trying to leave the development and head south to the bypass there would still be the difficulty of a right turn across the main flow of traffic into town. Secondly if the internal roads are all 20mph an access route at the far east of the development will only be attractive to residents in that half of Neighbourhood A. The valley corridor to the northern woodlands would not allow a direct route from the western half of Neighbourhood 1 across to an access point (see map on P52) – so residents there would more naturally use the original Monks Lane access points. Likewise as described above Neighbourhood B residents would want to minimise a slow exit and head straight for Monks Lane rather than loop all the way to the A339.</p>	<p>signal junction</p> <p>If this option were to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a roundabout, with the access to the Household Waste Recycling Centre being reconfigured.</p> <p>Any access route onto the A339 would be subject to negotiations with Newbury College over land. There is therefore no certainty over delivery.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Finally the access route would need to purchase land from Newbury College – what would happen to the college land to the south of the possible route? It has obvious additional and undocumented development potential (My guess – a 4 letter word starting with A).</p> <p>And there's a suspicion that any further traffic modelling will simply support a decision that's already been made and that this further consultation is simply window dressing.</p> <p>Cycle paths:</p> <p>On carriage-way cycle paths on the main roads should be separated from the main road by some form of kerbing or low barrier rather than road markings to clearly define a dedicated lane.</p> <p>Although there is lot about internal cycle paths on the development, there nothing about improving cycle and pedestrian access along the whole of Monks Lane (except some mention of crossings to link up with the town centre). However the Monks Lane paths are heavily congested at key times with Park House pupils who can easily block the pathway – if this pathway is supposed to be a key link to local services (e.g. the surgery and existing retail facilities) then this needs substantial improvement alongside the road improvements.</p> <p>Section P Public Open Space and Recreation:</p> <p>Country Park:</p> <p>The key question is who will own and run a country park. There is a</p>	<p>In terms of the cycle path on the main access route, there is some potential for this to be designed as a semi raised cycle lane and this is now reflected in the text of the SPD.</p> <p>The wider impacts of the site will be dealt with through a planning application and the issues raised are noted.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>suggestion that the management could be run by a community group, but it's unclear what constitutes a "community group" (i.e. the suggestion that St Gabriel's school could make a bid) and what upfront costs any would need to make a bid that would convince the council or developers that it is sustainable. My experience has been that councillors, for example, are very sceptical of community self-management as a viable option.</p> <p>Secondly it's unclear if the management scope also covers the woodland and valley corridors that would require some degree of specialist management.</p> <p>West Berkshire Council should therefore be more forthcoming with criteria for what a management group would need to provide.</p> <p>NEAP:</p> <p>The map on page 45 shows a proposed NEAP within the valley corridor, but design principles CA7 and CA9 say that views need to be maintained and lighting will be minimised – these appear to be contradictory aspirations. Also it seems odd to locate an area for older children away from residential areas and out of view – which many would see as an open invitation for anti-social behaviour. This should be reconsidered.</p> <p>It's also interesting that the document can specify how many and where play areas will be but not give details of locations of schools.</p> <p>F Community facilities and services:</p> <p>At the original consultation the community area was located within</p>	<p>The ownership of the Country parkland is a matter of detail for the planning application to address through a detailed Country Parkland Design and management Plan. This is set out in development principle L3 of the SPD.</p> <p>There will be a detailed Landscape and Green Infrastructure Design and Management Plan which will look at the open space in the wider sense.</p> <p>In terms of the NEAPs, the final locations for these can be amended and the comments raised will be taken into account and discussed as part of the planning application. They are indicative locations at the moment however proposed to be centrally located in order to maximise accessibility. However, the Council's ecologist has requested that they be moved out of the valley wetland areas currently shown on figure and instead adjoin that area.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Neighbourhood A. However in this new plan (figure 13, page 52) it shows the community centre in Neighbourhood B, which is further from the Monks Lane access points and suggests that it will be a built in a later stage of development or would be built in isolation to support Neighbourhood A, which would not seem a good way to attract retailers.</p> <p>Also the plan talks about there being a space for community use, but does not take into account the varying needs of adults and children or organisations that have to store “kit” and those that need an open space.</p> <p>There is a real risk of disappointment in the community space if it is not properly designed and one that will not allow community groups to flourish on the site. Existing community facilities in Wash Common are already oversubscribed and would not be able absorb extra demand.</p> <p>So this area needs to be properly planned and scaled to reassure residents that it is not a cheap optional add-on.</p> <p>Primary education:</p> <p>Also at the original consultation the discussion pointed towards a primary school located in a community area within Neighbourhood A, as this would be part of the first part of the site to be developed and the school places would be needed from first occupancy given the lack of capacity in existing schools.</p> <p>However in this plan the community area is shown in Neighbourhood</p>	<p>In terms of being definite about the numbers of play areas, this is based on information provided by the Council’s Grounds Maintenance Manager which is in turn based on the best practice guidance provided by Fields in Trust (FIT).</p> <p>F. All locations are indicative at the moment and will be finalised based on information including the outcome of this consultation and previous consultations. However the proposal is for the Local Centre to be located on the main access route through the site and at the centre of the largest neighbourhood, Sandford Park B. The need for a high quality community building which serves the needs of a variety of community groups is recognised. The community space will need to be fit for purpose for the community which it is intended to serve. It is not, however, required to address any existing deficiencies in any surrounding residential areas.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>B, again apparently isolated from the initial development that would provide the pupils.</p> <p>Secondly if the revised school numbers indicate a second primary school is needed then logically there should be one in each Neighbourhood. It's unclear how Park House, for example could accommodate a complete primary school – which has been suggested - as well as an extension without building on playing fields and is also an example of how the new development is moving outside the supposed sustainable area for development. This would also focus education on the western side of the site to the detriment of residents in the east.</p> <p>Health Care:</p> <p>Where is there space to extend Falkland Surgery? Land close by has already been used for the disabled child unit and other space remains rugby club land. There is no identifiable land on the site for health care provision.</p> <p>Also direct access to the surgery from the site is blocked by the Rugby Club, so new patients would either have to walk all the way round, or more realistically will drive, with additional pressure on the Monks Lane.</p> <p>The question arises why a really local surgery within the development cannot be provided.</p>	<p>Feasibility work on both the format and location of the primary provision to serve the site is well advanced and will be taken forward through the planning application process.</p> <p>It is not proposed that a primary school be provided on the Park House site. However, feasibility work on accommodating education provision on site is ongoing to explore future linkages between primary provision and Park House School.</p> <p>Development principle A2 of the SPD has been amended to clarify the connections and linkages. The expansion of Falkland Surgery is a requirement identified within the Infrastructure Plan for the site, and discussions are underway regarding the best way to accommodate the increase in patients and the additional requirements arising from this.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Allan Mercado		<p>1) Warren Road exit to Andover Road means - if restricted to bus traffic - that Monks Lane access points will become very congested at morning/evening occasions.</p> <p>2) One small retail shop is not enough for 2000 houses proposed.</p> <p>3) Park House school is full. What provision will there be for junior/senior pupils living on site.</p>	<p>1) The site has been modelled through Transport assessment work as deliverable with 2 all vehicle accesses off Monks Lane, with associated highways improvements. However – as set out in other responses, additional accesses are being modelled to see if there is an option which will work better for the site in terms of the comparative effects of traffic flows onto the highways network.</p> <p>2) The level of retail provision will be appropriate to serve the day-to-day needs of the future residents. The site is well connected to local and town centre services, meaning that there is no requirement for large scale shopping facilities to be provided on site.</p> <p>3) Park House will be expanded to meet the requirements from the development – feasibility work is being progressed on this issue in partnership with Park House School.</p>
Mr and Mrs Ronald Nutt		<p>1. Retain the existing single lane carriageway in each direction along the full length of Monks Lane.</p> <p>2. Existing hedgerows and greenery in Monks Lane to be preserved where possible in order to maintain its rural effect.</p> <p>3. Restrict and enforce the speed limit in Monks Lane to 30mph or less.</p>	<p>1. Monks Lane is currently proposed to remain single carriageway.</p> <p>2. Existing hedgerows and greenery will be preserved wherever possible and the character of Monks Lane will be maintained through the strategic planting planned for the site.</p> <p>3. The speed limit of Monks Lane is likely to</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>4. With regard to the proposed sites A and B, why has it been decided to build low density housing on the south side and high density on the north side.</p>	<p>be kept to 30mph unless this becomes an evident issue.  4. The density of the development responds to the character of the surrounding area and Sandleford B will form a semi-urban interface with existing housing and the college and the rural interface with the Country Park. In contrast, Sandleford A includes the urban edge from Monks Lane and the urban/semi-rural interface with the Rugby Club and the College and a more formal approach to buildings, open spaces and street design.</p>
Kim Whysall-Hammond		<p>Road Access onto Andover Road</p> <p>I am very concerned about the safety of children and carers travelling to/from Falkland Primary School, if a full road access is provided from Sandleford development onto the Andover Road. This is a very busy road especially at school times.</p>	Noted.
G. Marcello		<p>Access and Egress</p> <p>The current plan proposes access and egress at 2 points along Monks Lane at the Sandleford Park A site and a bus access route at the Sandleford park B site which is not the most practical solution.</p> <p>Please consider the following: -</p> <p>Only one access point on Monks Lane, but located further east. The green space at the east end of Monks Lane could be used to locate a fit for purpose roundabout. This is marked as an access point (1) on</p>	<p>The principle of 2 accesses onto Monks Lane has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport Assessment work which has been undertaken in order to support the delivery of the site through the Core Strategy. However, as set out in the draft SPD, additional all vehicle accesses (Onto Warren Road and onto the A339) are also being explored through additional technical work to see if they would be preferable in terms of the comparative</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>the attached plan.</p> <p>A new access point could be made onto the A339. The road would cut across the location for site infrastructure then follow the site boundary onto the development. This is marked as access point (2) on the attached plan (see 'Giorgio Marcello Attachment').</p> <p>The third access point remains at Warren Road as in the proposed plan but becomes a road suitable for all vehicular access/egress, marked as (3).</p> <p>I believe this solution lessens the developments carbon footprint operationally.</p>	<p>effects of traffic flows onto the highways network.</p>
Dr. Janice Bridger	British Horse Society	<p>Information needs to be available now on the access points for vehicles AND for walking and cycling. Dedicated pleasant routes need to be provided for the latter to encourage people out of their cars. There also needs to be a route to connect to Greenham Common on foot &amp; by cycle for informal recreation. These issues are vital to the quality of life in the area and should be integral any planning from the start, not as an afterthought.</p>	<p>Noted. The development will include a network of green links which will make connections via paths and open spaces throughout the site between the wider urban area, the country park, the areas of ancient woodland, the school and the areas of children's play. They will also be provided between the residential areas.</p> <p>The development provides an opportunity to improve the link from the public right of way across the site east to Greenham Common. This would need to look at ways of overcoming the barrier of the A339 and improving the route south from the entrance to St Gabriel's School. This improved link to Greenham Common should be considered in the context of walkers and cyclists.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
David Fenn		<p>I agree that the development needs a small shop/hall centre etc. Nearby community facilities at Wash Common are already well made no more will be needed.</p> <p>A new primary school and extending Park House and the doctor's surgery are essential.</p> <p>The open space to the South is important; I think it is essential that allotments are provided as currently Greenham Parish Council does not provide any.</p> <p>Traffic is my main concern. I agree with the two roundabouts onto Monks Lane. Access from Warren Road should probably be restricted to buses only because of the proximity to schools playgroups, church facilities on the busy Andover Road.</p> <p>I would like to see an exit from the development near the recycling centre so traffic leading south and west from The Swan roundabout does not have to meet the roundabout onto the A339 by Newbury College.</p> <p>I would like to see road improvements at the Newbury College end of Monks Lane. I am a daily user of Monks Lane and briefly discussed my ideas at the presentation event.</p> <p>Details are attached (David Fenn Attachments)</p>	<p>Noted. All of these uses are proposed to be provided as part of the development and are therefore included within the draft SPD.</p> <p>Noted. The potential of all vehicle accesses off Warren Road and the A339 are currently being explored to gauge the comparative effects of traffic flows onto the highways network.</p> <p>Noted. Road improvements at the Newbury College end of Monks Lane will be required to accommodate traffic from the development.</p>
		<p>Where is the extra land coming from to widen Warren Road so that buses can use it? Is it from Park House school grounds? Two extra roads entering onto Monks Lane added to the traffic already very heavy at times.. We have been told that there will be priority junctions</p>	<p>Any land take required as part of future road widening would be a matter for future negotiation. The site has been modelled as deliverable</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		on Monks Lane, or more traffic lights - mini-roundabouts. The access to and from these new houses needs to be rethought.	with 2 accesses onto Monks Lane and the wider traffic impacts assessed through Traffic Assessments. However, further TA work will be required as part of the planning application process to continue this process.
Mr. Golton	CPRE Berkshire	<p>Impression so far.</p> <p>Suggest "home zones" strategy in suitable local area.</p> <p>Our main principles, raised at the WBC meeting some time ago,</p> <p>1) Work to limit heights so that buildings are not seen above woodland as viewed from Sandford Priory.</p> <p>2) The "countryside park" should not develop into a "theme park"</p>	<p>Building heights across the development will be designed to ensure minimal visual impact. Where taller buildings are proposed, this is in order to make more efficient use of land and will be carefully located to minimise the impact on views.</p> <p>A key role of the Country parkland is to protect the sensitive landscape area in perpetuity, as well as protecting the registered historic landscape and setting of the former Sandford Priory and protecting the views when approaching Newbury along the A339. It will only be suitable for low key informal recreation which does not detract from its main purpose.</p>
Rachel Page		<p>Section F Development principles</p> <p>CA5 Wash Common</p> <p>I would like to see the lighting principles set out for CA3 (Park Edge) also applied at least to the boundaries of CA5, to ensure that the current levels of very low light pollution in this area are maintained.</p> <p>Full height black painted column lighting as per p65 is likely to</p>	<p>Noted. Agreed.</p> <p>Noted. Many of the comments relate to matters of detail which it is more appropriate to consider as part of any planning application.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>significantly increase light pollution.</p> <p>I would like the CA3 designation assigned the woodland edges of Sandleford A &amp; B in figure 13 (p52) applied also to the CA5 boundaries.</p> <p>I would like the SDP to define that housing/garden orientation to be such that roads are away from the perimeter of CA5 (as a minimum where CA5 borders existing development at Kendrick Road / and Round End).</p> <p>Additional strategic planting along boundaries ( this is shown on figure 13 where Sandleford park B borders the country park, but I believe this should be included in the SDP for all boundaries of the site.</p> <p>Access and Movement</p> <p>A1 – the council states its preference is to explore All Vehicle access through Warren Road.</p> <p>As mentioned above this is back tracking on previous assurances that the site was viable just with the Monks Lane access, and will greatly increase existing congestion during peak times between Essex Street/Andover road/Monks Lane junction and Warren Road ( which already queues most mornings at school time). It will also make children's walks to school ( primary and secondary) even more hazardous.</p>	<p>Further details on strategic planting for the site will be set out within the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan for the site which will be prepared as part of the planning application process. However, the aim is not to hide the site from the surrounding area. Development principle L5 of the draft SPD sets out more information on views into and out of the site and what is proposed, and sets the framework for the more detailed process of the planning application.</p> <p>Transport assessment work has concluded that the site is deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to evaluate the benefits of other options. The Council is aware of the wide ranging issues and concerns regarding additional access routes and any scheme would need to be designed to accommodate all of these issues.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>A4 p 38. Please ensure sufficient residential parking is built in to the layout so that pavements are not taken up with on street car parking, e.g. in the recent developments at Deadmans Lane and others it is very congested as there is often parking on the pavements making it hard to get pushchairs or young children's bikes through, let alone disabled access (per A5)</p> <p>H – Hydrology and drainage:</p> <p>p41 – “design of buildings should seek to provide grey water recycling” ... (good but how will this be enforced?)</p> <p>P – Public Open space and Recreation</p> <p>p42 – Will funding for country park ranger be enduring after the development is complete?</p> <p>Allotment sites – these are proposed to be within the country park area. From personal experience, it is much better to have the allotments within easy WALKING distance from the houses, both for ease of transporting tools/ equipment/produce (without needing cars) , and for security of the sites. In addition, protection of crops from wildlife damage would be easier within the residential areas rather than within the country park where rabbit, deer and other wildlife could destroy crops.</p> <p>Concerns raised by other respondents in the previous consultation over appearances of allotments could be mitigated by provision of standard mini sheds on each plot – or shared storage areas for</p>	<p>In terms of the approach to parking standards for the site, this is set out in development principle A4 of the SPD. The Council is aware of the issues raised and will seek to reflect this in the level of parking provided across the site. Surveys of existing residential areas are taking place to provide evidence to ensure the right provision and layout.</p> <p>This will be taken forward through the planning application for the site and will form part of the Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) requirements for the site.</p> <p>The Ranger post will be funded by developer contributions and this will be taken forward through the planning application process.</p> <p>Noted. The final position of any allotments is yet to be agreed and these comments will be taken into account in this process.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>community tools. This ideally would be near to the schools too to allow for opportunities for secondary school horticulture enrichment activities ( as is done on site at St Barts) and for primary schools to have allotments ( as is the case with Falkland Primary school which backs on to the allotments at Wash Common).</p> <p>General points</p> <p>Library provision ( F1 p50.) - is this a new provision on site, or an expansion to Newbury main library or wash common library. Given that the main library had to reduce opening hours due to council cuts, what will the developers be obliged to deliver here?</p> <p>Bus routes – are the proposed bus subsidies for a maximum of 5 years or until commercially viable with no time limit. Is the 5 year window from the start or end of the development? Will Sunday and evening bus services run, as they don't at present on most bus routes in the area.</p> <p>Cycle paths – the proposed “on-carriageway” cycle routes for CA1 ( main access) ( and “on street” cycling for CA2 – residential streets) will NOT encourage people, especially families with children to choose cycling over car use for local journeys.</p> <p>I understand from the council traffic planning lead at the 18/4 meeting that this was proposed as cycling groups do not like shared pedestrian/cycle routes (when they are no wider than the monks lane and Newtown Road pavements), and I share this concern , as currently the sizing of the shared use cycle routes is too narrow in many places for safe shared use ( particularly along monk's lane by the PH school entrances at either end of the school day.).</p>	<p>The details of the library provision will be dealt with within the planning application for the site.</p> <p>This is for the more detailed stage of the planning application process, to be worked through with a bus operator and developer as part of any planning application.</p> <p>Roads on site will be limited to 20mph so there should not be a need for segregation apart from on the main routes. The space for cycle lanes and paths within the development will not be restricted in design to a standard approach or to match facilities elsewhere in the local area. There is the opportunity for being more creative and this is now better reflected within the SPD. There could be potential, especially on the main access route to have a semi-raised cycle lane.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>On street cycling in the other areas of the development is also a concern as it does not prioritise and encourage cycling and walking over car use, and if on-street parking is allowed to become like other nearby developments ( e.g. the congested Deadman's Lane development) , then neither pavement or roads are safe for children to cycle with families or older children to cycle to school.</p> <p>As the vision for Sandleford park put forward in the draft SPD states “the development will mitigate against climate change and minimise carbon dioxide emissions”, the priority given to cycling infrastructure needs to be significantly increased.</p> <p>For example I would like to see the SDP state that developers will have to provide separated , dedicated pedestrian and cycling routes that are not shared with cars. This is a green field site and there is no excuse for not providing dedicated cycle ways, especially on the main access routes.</p> <p>This is particularly important on the routes to schools, both primary and secondary, (on site and in local surrounding areas) so that the impact of extra car journeys at already busy peak times can be mitigated.</p> <p>The opportunity should be taken with the Monks Lane CA4 area to provide a separate dedicated cycle route along Monks Lane but on the southern side of the existing hedgerow. P62 suggests that the intention is to continue with the existing shared pedestrian/cycle route.</p>	<p>The Council's preference is not for on-street parking at the development.</p> <p>How children travel to school is key to reducing traffic movements within the development. The Council wants walking and cycling to be seen as the normal mode of travel to school and routes to school need to be considered as part of the planning of the layout of the site to ensure that the routes are easy, direct and allow desire lines to be followed.</p> <p>Opportunities to improve cycling provision along Monks Lane will be looked at as part of the detailed transport assessment work for the planning application for Sandleford.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Graham Smith		<p>May I please make the following comments.</p> <p>My cottage is directly opposite crooks copse and sits above the level of proposed development. May I suggest that new houses faces towards the new internal road systems and not face monks lane. Would it be possible to plant extra screening to beef up the existing hedge - semi mature trees would be ideal. This would help prevent overlooking the site.</p> <p>I imagine that the two entry roads off to Monks Lane will be roundabouts and would suggest the present 30 mph be reduced to 20mph as is proposed for the internal roads. Traffic calming is needed for this lane as it is used as a race track.</p> <p>With regard to the internal road system would you please give consideration to naming the roads after local people. For instance the Butler family farmed Sandlesford for over 100 years. Former owners of the "Priory" would also be worth consideration.</p>	<p>The site is being planned to maintain the character of Monks Lane through the strategic planting planned for the site. Dwellings will front onto the internal streets of the development.</p> <p>Noted. If traffic calming is necessary in conjunction with the 2 roundabout accesses, then this will be provided.</p> <p>Noted. This will be passed on to the team which deals with this issue.</p>
Mary Hepburn		<p>"Entrance" for building of the site, is my concern, but now find you may have a 4th entrance in - so I would hope this would be used, as the A339 is not going to disrupt an established development.</p> <p>I live opposite St Georges Church and we have traffic problems at the moment, with 2 churches, 2 schools, petrol station and community centre at St Georges, with traffic in and out all day and weekends.</p> <p>Also this road must be left available for Fire Engines, Ambulance and</p>	<p>The site has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport assessment work which was carried out to support the allocation of the site with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to evaluate the benefits in terms of comparative</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Police cars, as it gets to accidents on the A34 Ring Road.</p> <p>I regret this whole site is now being built on, attached to Newbury - Newbury is just right now in 2013 and a "New Town" would have been better somewhere in another area of Berkshire or Hampshire.</p>	<p>traffic flows of other options.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address these issues. If this access were to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements.</p> <p>In terms of this potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>The principal of developing the site has been established through the Core Strategy process and the SPD process is about providing a more detailed framework to guide the planning application.</p>
Jeremy	Newbury Society	Cycle Paths	Noted. The Council is aware of the issues

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Holden-Bell		<p>We would welcome a direct cycle path to Greenham Business Park along the top of the ridge, with multi-level crossing of the A339. Currently the A339 beyond Newtown Road is subject to flooding, and the current entry to Greenham Business Park often means going back towards Sandleford and up a hill e.g. to English Provender, Slater Centre etc.</p> <p>Garages</p> <p>Where provided, they should be large enough to actually be used by modern cars (see 'Jeremy Holden-Bell Attachment'), plus cycles, freezers, lawn mowers are usually kept in them! Where no garage is provided, there should still be a secure indoor storage space for the cycles etc.</p> <p>Size of Houses</p> <p>These should be big enough for tomorrows latter wider and heavier people, particularly for their larger beds and wider stairs. There should be adequate storage space and room for children's desks for computers/writing homework.</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>The society is very pleased that such extensive consultation has been carried out.</p>	<p>and will seek to improve access to the Greenham area. This would need to look at ways of overcoming the barrier of the A339 and improving the route south. Any improved link to Greenham Common should be considered in the context of walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>In terms of garages, ongoing work on parking standards is likely to recommend a garage size of 3m by 6m for the future rather than the current 2.5 by 5 m standard.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
David Cooper		<p>(1) Safe pedestrian and cycling access is required from entrance to park opposite St Gabriel's. A safe crossing is needed and pavement towards Newtown.</p>	<p>1) Agree. Delivery is currently being considered. Possibility of reducing this section of road to one lane northbound, with</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>(2) Warren Road must not be opened to general traffic, for safety reason (it goes past 2 schools and church and nursery)</p> <p>(3) Cinder cycle path around perimeter of country park.</p>	<p>a central refuge provided.</p> <p>2) Whilst the site is deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road, technical work is currently being carried out to evaluate the benefits of other options in terms of comparative traffic flows onto the highways network.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address these issues. If this access were to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements.</p> <p>3) Noted. Any cycle path taken forward in the Country parkland will be provided with an appropriate surface that does not impact negatively on the ecology of the site.</p>
Anonymous		<p>-Newbury should not be building more affordable housing - without having a strategy of growth in employment opportunities.</p> <p>-Newbury needs to first have time to get used to the very recently built housing in stock and additional housing being built on the</p>	<p>The principal of developing the site and the mix of uses, including affordable housing, has been established through the policies of the Core Strategy. This has been supported by Transport Assessment work which has</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>racecourse and other smaller developments</p> <p>-This development is not providing enough much needed facilities i.e. sports centre/swimming facilities, healthcare, policing.</p> <p>-Traffic volume will be an ever increasing problem within the town</p>	<p>modelled the site as deliverable. The SPD process is about providing more detail to guide a future planning application.</p> <p>The infrastructure requirements (including facilities) for the site have been assessed through partnership work with service providers.</p>
Anna Lee		<p>We note that development in and around Newbury will have an impact on the A34, which passes through the Vale of White Horse district. We therefore request that West Berkshire Council takes account of any likely impacts on the A34 when planning for the Sandleford Park site.</p>	<p>Noted. The Council has liaised with the agents of the Highways Agency throughout the Core Strategy process and will continue to do so as work on the implementation of the site progresses.</p>
Rod Thomason		<p>Light Pollution</p> <p>The street lighting should be of a type which lights up areas like pavements and roads etc, but not reflect or shine light skywards. I find using a telescope for "star gazing" is difficult these days because of "western" light shining heaven wards. Light shining skywards is a main problem for astronomers.</p>	<p>The detailed Landscape and Green Infrastructure Design and Management Plan will include a lighting strategy for the open space links, public open spaces and the Country parkland edges. Lighting needs to be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the links. There will be areas of the site where lighting should be kept to a minimum to maintain darkness – such as adjacent to the development edge with the woodlands.</p>
Judith Cooper		<p>1) Access</p> <p>I strongly oppose the use of Warren Road for anything other than bus and cycle access to and from Sandleford Estate. Looking at the</p>	<p>Noted. The Council is aware of the traffic issues which have been raised through the consultation including the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>areas of proposed build, the entire western area of the new development would use this road for access. The junction with Andover Road would present a hazard to safety for hundreds of school children going to Park House and Falkland School as well as toddlers being brought to St Georges Church Hall. I favour access to A339 near the "Civic Amenity Centre" where cars trying to drive out of Newbury either to Basingstoke, Andover or A34 access can do so without interacting with the Wash Common community.</p> <p>2) Country Park</p> <p>A cinder cycle path along the perimeter of the park (Richmond Park Style) would provide safe cycle recreation for the whole area. A safe crossing point for pedestrians and cyclists is needed at the SE corner of the park to facilitate movement towards Greenham Park.</p> <p>3) Wash Common "Village" at the Falkland Memorial</p> <p>The village atmosphere needs to be preserved. Traffic movement towards the western side of Monks Lane is not wanted. Road design must be discourage traffic flow in this direction.</p>	<p>access and would need to address these issues. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements.</p> <p>In terms of this potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>Noted. It is not yet known if a cycle path around the perimeter of the Country parkland is appropriate in terms of overall impact on the ecology of the site. If it is, then an appropriate surface will be sought.</p> <p>3) The overall aim is to deliver the development in a way that minimises the impact on any one part of the highways network.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Any changes to the current "Master Plan" referencing access roads should be accompanied by public consultation as even changing vehicular restrictions on Warren Road is a major change.</p>	<p>In terms of the access roads, any changes to the agreed policy will not be included within the SPD but instead are matters for the planning application. However, there will be additional opportunities for public consultation through the public consultation that will be carried out as part of the planning application process.</p>
<p>Philippa Gardner</p>	<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 22 March 2013 inviting the Highways Agency (HA) to comment on the Consultation on Sandleford Park draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).</p> <p>The HA is an executive agency of the Department for Transport (DfT). We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (SRN) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport.</p> <p>The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p> <p>We have reviewed the consultations and do not have any comments at this time.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>David Stubbs</p>		<p>Comments / observations in respect of crime prevention and community safety.</p> <p>(Quotes from SPD in italics – my comments in plain type)</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD has been amended to reinforce the requirement to address crime prevention and safety but the Council does not accept that there is a serious omission as the requirement is already set out in the</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>As a retired police crime prevention design adviser (CPDA) with a Master's Degree in Community Safety and Crime Prevention and an Advanced Certificate in Crime Prevention and Environmental Design, I am deeply concerned about the almost complete lack of guidance or mandate included within the SPD to ensure that the development achieves a safe and secure environment for the human occupants. There is no mention of any standards to deliver secure buildings, whether residential, educational or commercial and no inclusion of well accepted principles of environmental design to reduce crime, the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>It is said that the SPD is too early in the development to lay down specific detail, but unless the major issue of human safety, crime prevention and community cohesion is addressed as an essential component, developers assume they can avoid the budgetary loading that addressing these needs on a new development requires, leaving the future costs to be picked up by the occupants, local authority, housing provider and the police.</p> <p>The Supplementary Planning Document for Sandford Park contains a number of highly aspirational statements in respect of safety and security and some ambivalence regarding the status of routes and spaces. The SPD appears to be trying to blur the fact that this is a blue print for a 2,000 dwelling housing estate which – if it provides a safe urban environment for housing, vehicle parking and human movement must have a harmful impact on wildlife. Conversely, whilst the document contains much about the intentions as to how wildlife and ecology will be protected, it skims alarmingly over the national, local – and moral planning mandates for safe and crime free environments to protect the human occupants of the built form of the new development.</p>	<p>Development Plan. Core Strategy Policy CS14: Design Principles states that developments will be expected to create safe environments, addressing crime prevention and community safety. The explanatory text states that developments should incorporate “Secured by Design” principles to reduce opportunities for crime and the fear of crime. This is cross referenced at the outset of the urban design principles of the SPD and there is no reason to repeat the content as policy CS14 will be used as part of the process of determining any planning application for the site.</p> <p>Additionally, the development will be designed in accordance with Manual for Streets which sets out a commitment to designing public spaces which are both sustainable and inclusive.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Sandleford Park is NOT a small edge of urban or village development where wildlife and human habitation can be dovetailed without adverse impact to either element. Examples of a potentially dangerous blurring of this distinction would be the section on 'Green links in residential areas (Section L6 – page 34) which quotes as follows:-</p> <p>“Green links will be provided within the residential areas as part of the wider pedestrian and cycle network across the site. They will contain areas of informal open space and planting to create spatial variation between development, areas of benefit to the community and to encourage ecological migration through the site. Buildings will either front or side onto the green links to ensure that they are safe and secure routes. Lighting will be carefully considered to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the links”.</p> <p>There is overpowering evidence and planning policy that movement routes should not undermine the security of dwelling boundaries and the above paragraph makes it clear that if dwellings 'front' onto a green route, their main access will have to be from the rear and that the layout would happily accept an unlit green 'alley' creating permeability along the side (and potentially rear) of buildings and garden boundaries, which in a large urban development will create unacceptable opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Ironically, features which in previous generations of highly permeably urban layouts, have led to the avoidance of such routes by law abiding occupants and abandonment to the anti-social element!</p> <p>For the SPD to simply state that the development will be permeable</p>	



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>and accessible places no requirement on the developer to take advice as to how appropriate and necessary such permeability will be. Excessive and unnecessary footpath links in residential areas undermine neighbourhood cohesion, facilitate anti-social activity and by failing to focus footfall onto a few well designed, well used and well enjoyed routes, excessive permeability reduces usage and 'encounter' rates, leading to a sense of isolation and loss of safety.</p> <p>There is a clear intention that light pollution should not adversely affect wildlife BUT no understanding that variation of light levels from urban to none (in the green corridors) will adversely affect safe human movement and perceptions of safety.</p> <p>Access &amp; Movement</p> <p>Section A – relating to Access and Movement, states that:</p> <p>A1. The layout and design of Sandleford Park will promote a hierarchy of streets, spaces and routes which create a legible and permeable place</p> <p>A5. The design of buildings and spaces will be accessible to all members of the community.</p> <p>Again, a blanket statement such as this makes no concession to the need to create 'defensible space' and good natural surveillance over public space and movement routes in a heavily developed environment. It is critical to avoid unnecessary or excessive permeability, which is proven to undermine neighbourhood cohesion, and to allow residents to maintain stake holding in their surroundings without this being watered down by high flows of non residential</p>	<p>The wording on lighting specifically refers to the need to balance safety and ecological reasons, this is reflected in the character area principles and a lighting strategy will be required as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>Again, these issues are picked up by policy CS14 which will be used in the determination of the planning application.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>movement through their immediate environment. This is an urban housing neighbourhood – NOT a town centre!</p> <p>Aspirational statements such as the development principle at Sec. F on page 40 that the development should “Achieve safe, comfortable and healthy environments” make the common assumption that by simply including this in the SPD, it will come about on completion. Some reference to a measurable way of achieving this (such as compliance with the principles of ‘Secured by Design’ and ‘Safer Places’) MUST be given equal weight to the content on ecology and even the detail on issues such as SuDs and surface water drainage!</p> <p>There appears to be some confusion about the status of some routes.</p> <p>Are they urban footpaths – well lit and overlooked by being properly integrated into the urban grain or country field paths, unlit, isolated and with some lengths well outside the urban envelope? The ability to alter the character of a path or route as landscape and context changes is important, but with light levels and perceptions of safety, the human eye and consciousness does not adapt instantly to changes of level and context.</p> <p>It is therefore important that once a person commits to the use of a particular route, clear design cues indicate if the urban footpath that they set out on is going to migrate into a muddy, unlit and isolated cross country ramble.</p> <p>Play Facilities</p> <p>The statements about the design and orientation of the play facilities</p>	<p>There is not confusion about the status of routes. There is a balance between providing convenient links and making sure that they do not exacerbate opportunities for crime. Their design will reflect their intended use, and all will be designed with Manual for Streets principles in mind.</p> <p>They serve different purposes. Some are for leisure – such as the routes into the Country parkland and linkages between them, and will be informal, and others are for the day to day movement around the development and will be well lit as well as overlooked.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>– see below, are important and fully supported:-</p> <p>“design and layout of the NEAP &amp; LEAP should: Utilise the existing landscape assets of the site including land form and vegetation. Have good pedestrian and cycle links. Use natural materials where possible to provide a natural approach to play. Minimise the potential for nuisance to neighbouring properties. Be over looked by development to promote their secure use at all times.</p> <p>It is important to design play areas so that ball rebound from domestic garden fencing or gable end walls is not a temptation.</p> <p>Access routes should be clear and open and easy access to concealed alleys which will accommodate anti-social activity must be avoided. There is nothing requiring appropriate informal gathering places for ‘youth’! In the absence of suitably located youth shelters or facilities specifically geared for the loose social activity of this age group, they will colonise younger children’s play areas, bus shelters or gather in front of shops or houses, to the annoyance of legitimate occupiers.</p> <p>Public Open Space</p> <p>Likewise, in respect of public open spaces:-</p> <p>“The public open spaces should: Be flexible in their use. Serve the needs of the whole community. Create places that all individuals feel comfortable in with no security issues or dominance by particular sectors of the community. Encourage local people to feel proud and create a sense of ownership of the space encouraging self management.</p>	<p>Informal gathering places for youth will be taken into account through the detailed planning of the site and there may be additional provision for this age group in the NEAPs.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>However, again, some steer as to how these aspirations will be achieved or the methodology to ensure the aspiration is met is essential”.</p> <p>Local Centre</p> <p>The content regarding the local centre is likewise, necessary and supported:-</p> <p>The local centre should be characterised by high quality built form and public realm forming a focal point which provides a strong identity to the development. Residential uses should be incorporated to ensure 24 hour activity and surveillance of the public areas. Parking and servicing should be carefully considered to ensure that they are not obtrusive and allow for active frontages to the street. Parking should be incorporated within the design of the street and large surface car parks should be avoided”.</p> <p>Taking account of the eventual number of dwellings and occupants, the local centre is going to be busy and heavily trafficked. As with the parking provision at Monument Parade, Wash Common, traffic quickly congests, the parking layout must facilitate easy flow and safe pedestrian movement.</p> <p>Residential access to flats above shops or other incorporated dwelling use should not be via the rear or through the service yard / back of house area.</p> <p>Access to schools.</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>The provision of access to schools should be carefully considered to allow for picking up and dropping off without detriment to the safety of pedestrians and cyclists, movement of traffic and amenity of residential properties in the area.</p> <p>This is another aspirational statement that without clear guidance and careful planning will invariably lead to congestion at school entrances and dwellings in close proximity coming into conflict.</p> <p>Sec. F Development Principles</p> <p>Some of the development principles stated, leave the way they will be achieved worryingly vague – which will lead to exploitation on the grounds of cost saving unless the aspiration for ‘quality’ design is clearly laid out.</p> <p>“U2. The development will create a series of streets and spaces with clearly defined public and private areas.”</p> <p>How will these be ‘clearly defined’? In many places, a change of surface or a transition between grass and tarmac – or even a knee rail, may be perceived as clear definition in the mind of a planner or developer, but to a group of children chasing a ball or a dog walker, they are almost unenforceable, leading to perceptions of intrusion onto private space and raised tension.</p> <p>“U4. Sandleford Park will be an easy place to move around with a permeable layout and good connections to the wider area, including links to existing local facilities and Newbury Town Centre”.</p> <p>Again, there is a need to create necessary, effective and well</p>	<p>Whilst this comment is noted, walking and cycling should be seen as the normal mode of travel to school. The schools will all need to submit a specific school Travel Plan to be in place before they open.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>designed permeability but to rigorously ensure that permeability does not undermine resident's security or territoriality.</p> <p>There are a number of high crime and low quality public routes in the nearby movement network which are strenuously avoided by many people – completely undermining the original intent of making movement easy.</p> <p>“U5. Sandleford Park will be a legible site providing recognisable routes, spaces and landmarks to help people move around the site safely and efficiently”.</p> <p>As above – what is conceived as ‘safe and legible’ on the drawing board, frequently does not translate to the same perception in the mind of the public once a development is built and occupied.</p> <p>The aspiration is fully supported, provided the intention is fully consulted and worked through using the principles of ‘Safer Places’ and knowledge of factors that create a sense of safety in the public mind.</p> <p>Lighting</p> <p>There are a number of references to lighting in the document, which use phrases such as ‘low level’ lighting, and ‘lighting along the development edge will be minimised to avoid light spill towards the woodland’.</p> <p>Lighting is one of the most fundamental contributions to perception of human safety in the built environment, and whilst fully accepting the need to protect wildlife and woodland from avoidable light spill, the</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>SPD should make clear that the developer must use the modern available technology in current luminaires to accurately direct appropriate light levels for human safety, rather than simply using inadequate light for human movement to protect the benefit of wildlife. There is a cost to this mitigation but the SPD is the place to indicate that in a wildlife sensitive area such as Sandleford, this is not an 'optional extra'!</p> <p>Low level lighting is usually interpreted as 'bollard' lights – which are for wayfinding and trip hazard avoidance only. Such lights give no illumination at human head level to allow identification and recognition. This again increases apprehension and reduces neighbourly greeting opportunities.</p> <p>The use of bollard lighting in parking areas must be seriously discouraged. The short light columns are highly prone to damage from reversing vehicles, they throw light at wing / reversing mirror level which hampers reversing visibility, and again, they inhibit recognition of who is moving about in parking areas.</p> <p>Lighting of movement routes and communal parking areas beyond the adopted highway MUST be properly supplied and metered from a landlord or communal supply. In numerous recent developments (The old MOD site in Thatcham was one local example), a number of luminaires, both columns and bollard lights, were found to be wired to the consumer unit of nearby individual dwellings, who, when they discovered they were paying to light the public realm, simply removed the fuse from the lighting circuit, leaving parking and shared surfaces in darkness!</p> <p>There is no need for high levels of 'bright' light for human safety.</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>The human eye can function in comparatively low 'luminosity' but the real need is consistency. Moving from high brightness suddenly into lower levels (or back) is disconcerting and dangerous as the eye take some time to adjust.</p>	
Mr . K. I. Kincaid		<p>Affect on Wash Common/Andover Road Area</p> <p>The Wash Common/Andover Rd. area used to be a very pleasant residential area, with a village atmosphere and community spirit. This character has already been eroded since the provision of access to the bypass via Andover Rd., with increased noise and light pollution. Therefore, I request that: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There be no direct to Andover Rd from Sandleford Park or, at the very worst pedestrian, cyclist and buses only via Warren Road.</li> <li>2) There should be access to the A339, near the waste recycling plant.</li> </ol> <p>Please bear in mind that South of Monks Lane, the A339 does not run through a substantially built up residential area, but the Andover Road definitely does!</p> <p>I would also point out that, if the proposal was for a sensible number of homes (say 500 maximum), it could be sensibly absorbed, instead of changing the character and overwhelming the amenities of the existing community.</p>	<p>The principle of development of the site has been established through the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>Noted. However, the Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p>
Howard Bairstow		<p>Housing is needed somewhere and this merely extends the southern boundary of Newbury.</p>	<p>Noted. Whilst the site has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport assessment work which was carried out to</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>However , there will be upwards of 4000 cars in the end wishing to access Monk Lane each day - twice.</p> <p>This to me is the biggest draw back of this plan.</p> <p>I am not satisfied with the Warren Road entry to the site. This is a small road with quiet side roads which will be blighted if buses, vehicles and constant bike or pedestrian traffic take to it.</p> <p>I like the idea of an eastern entry, with perhaps a roundabout to allow good flow of traffic allowing both north and south transit.</p> <p>The variety of street scenes give a very varied and pleasant environment but there should be at least 2 car parking spaces per property with adjacent "overflow" visitor parking.</p> <p>In building the houses, as much energy saving practices, must be used to help people to buy and maintain their houses.</p> <p>Not a perfect place but it ticks most of the boxes for development.</p>	<p>support the allocation of the site with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highways network.</p> <p>In terms of the number of parking spaces, it is accepted that whilst the development will be built to encourage sustainable travel, the majority of people are still likely to own a car and therefore car parking facilities need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>Further local parking surveys are being carried out to ensure that the parking standards put in place for the site are realistic.</p> <p>In terms of energy saving, the site will be developed to high standards of sustainable design and construction to reduce carbon emissions and energy consumption.</p>
Anthony Pick	Conservative Group, Newbury Town Council	<p>1) The country park to woodland elements are all thought through also the landscape and topography.</p> <p>2) This is a unique opportunity to arrange access to Greenham Common over the A339, linked to the PROW across the site. It</p>	<p>1) Noted.</p> <p>2) The development provides an opportunity to improve the link from the public right of way across the site east to Greenham Common. This would need to look at ways of</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>should not be missed.</p> <p>3) Section F (pages 49-50) needs elaborating in greater detail. What control facilities are envisaged.</p> <p>4) Integration with the local needs and more detail. Where will the buses stop? Warren Road?</p> <p>5) The traffic assessment is eagerly awaited including the published improvements mentioned on page 84.</p> <p>6) A project implementation plan is essential.</p>	<p>overcoming the barrier of the A339 and improving the route south from the entrance to St Gabriel's School. This improved link to Greenham Common should be considered in the context of walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>3) and 4). These are points of detail which will be addressed through the planning application rather than through an SPD.</p>
Ian Dyke		<p>I am commenting on the proposed bus route from Warren Road into the Sandford Park development. Whilst Warren Road is not ideal as a bus route for the residents of Sunley Close, it is of concern that consideration is being given to extending its use to vehicles.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the current parking problems experienced in Warren Road and Sunley Close, particularly at the school drop-off and pick-up times, though complaints have been made about this despite white and yellow lines having been painted on the road, all of which ignored by selfish drivers.</p> <p>For Warren Road to work successfully as a bus route, all parking would need to be banned, purely from a safety point of view. However, this would exacerbate the parking problems in Sunley Close. We not only suffer problems from the schools but also from the Roman Catholic Church when large services are held.</p> <p>In view of the foregoing, I would like to suggest that Sunley Close</p>	<p>Noted. The site has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport assessment work which was carried out to support the allocation of the site with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to evaluate the benefits of other options. This involves assessing the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would not be prepared to worsen the existing issues. If the access becomes</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>becomes a residents only parking area. A procedure for this has already been in set in Wash Common and would avoid the sometimes fractious arguments that occur when drivers block driveways.</p>	<p>an all vehicle access, there would have to be a wide range of highways improvements alongside this.</p> <p>In terms of Sunley Close, this is an existing issue which will need to be discussed with the Council's Traffic management and Road Safety Team who have criteria for assessing whether roads are suitable for Residents Parking Schemes.</p>
Pete Errington	Hampshire County Council	<p>The County Council notes that the draft SPD mentions the need to ensure that internal walking and cycling links connect with existing routes to services and facilities around Newbury and within West Berkshire. We suggest that there would also be benefit, in terms of both sustainable transport and green infrastructure provision, in making provision for the following connections to the wider countryside across the county boundary to the south of the site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a footpath/pedestrian link from the southern boundary of the site to Newtown Footpath 3 at GR 446923 163585. This would provide pedestrian access from the proposed country park to the wider countryside and the rights of way network around Newtown Common and into the Hampshire Downs.</li> <li>2. Connect cycling routes within the site to the minor road network to the south and south-east of the site through Newtown to provide wider recreational cycling opportunities, avoiding use of the A339.</li> </ol> <p>Both of these proposals would improve the coherence of the walking</p>	<p>Noted. There will be a review of proposed links to the surrounding footpath and cycle network through the implementation of the site.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>and cycling network across the county boundary between Hampshire and Berkshire, and meet the following priorities identified in the Countryside Access Plan (ROWIP) for the Hampshire Downs area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing dependency on the car for transport between main conurbations, rural settlements and the countryside</li> <li>• Reducing the need to use or cross busy roads to link up rights of way and other off-road access</li> <li>• Providing additional links in the network, to give access to a range of off-road, circular routes</li> </ul>	
Penny Silverwood	Berks Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust	<p>Thank you for inviting the Berks, Bucks &amp; Oxon Wildlife Trust to comment on the Sandleford Park Draft SPD. BBOWT welcomes the sensitive approach to connect up the important ecological features of the site and to deliver strategic biodiversity enhancements within the Greenham and Crookham Plateau Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA). However, set out below are some areas of concern and suggestions to further protect and enhance both Sandleford Park and the surrounding area.</p> <p>Recreational Pressure on Greenham and Crookham Commons</p> <p>We have concerns over the impacts; through additional recreational pressure, of these proposals on Greenham and Crookham Commons SSSI which lies less than 600m (as the crow flies) to the east of Sandleford Park, and the vulnerable ground nesting birds that this area supports. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 states that:</p>	<p>Noted and proposed links to the surrounding footpath and cycle network will be reviewed.</p> <p>The wording and emphasis of wording in the SPD is considered to be appropriate to protect ecological interests. This was explored through the Core Strategy Examination by the Inspector and BBOWT withdrew an objection that they had at the time based on the changes to the wording of the Core Strategy policy (policy CS3 – now adopted). One of the purposes of the Country parkland at Sandleford is to take pressure off particularly Greenham and Crookham Commons.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>‘So far as lies within their powers, a competent authority in exercising any function in or in relation to the United Kingdom must use all reasonable endeavours to avoid any pollution or deterioration of habitats of wild birds.’</p> <p>Therefore it is West Berkshire Council’s duty to ensure that there is no additional recreational pressure on this site from the Sandford Park proposals. We welcome the siting of the Country Park to the east of the site boundary; acting as a buffer to the proposed residential land to the north west. However, there can be further improvements to the Country Park proposals to promote it as a suitable alternative green space to Greenham and Crookham Commons for recreation; including dog walking which is known to cause disturbance to the vulnerable ground nesting birds on these sites. Natural England’s Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) guidelines were drawn up in relation to the protection of Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) which suffers from similar recreational pressures. However these guidelines could be used to help inform how the Country Park could be developed so as to be attractive as an alternative to Greenham and Crookham Commons by providing certain features such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate car parking on site</li> </ul>	<p>A limited amount of car parking will be available for the Country park at the District Centre.</p> <p>A circular walk is desirable and the wording of the SPD has been updated to reflect this.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Circular walk, starting and finishing at the car park</li>   <li>• Unrestricted access (to certain less sensitive areas) so that dogs can be exercised freely off the lead.</li> </ul> <p>A suggested new statement to be included in the Country Park section of the SPD to incorporate the above is as follows:</p> <p>‘Key Design principle: Opportunities should be made when creating the Country Park management plan so that the Country Park minimises the impact of breeding birds in the wider area.’</p> <p>In line with the above we suggest that the Country Park is promoted to new residents of Sandleford Park from the outset i.e. through the production of an information leaflet for all new residents.</p> <p>A suggested new statement to be included as an overarching principle of the Country Park section of the SPD is as follows:</p> <p>‘To promote the sustainable use of the Country Park, opportunities should be maximised to inform residents of how best to utilise the Country Park from the outset.’</p> <p>The development of the Country Park in this area also provides opportunities to reduce the recreational pressure on Greenham and</p>	<p>The wording has also been updated to reflect the principle that the Country park needs to be easily accessible on foot from all areas of the development.</p> <p>Noted. This will be bottomed out through the Country Parkland Management Plan but one option is to have restricted and unrestricted areas for dogs.</p> <p>Noted. Changes have been made to the text of the SPD.</p> <p>Noted, however, whilst the Country Parkland will cater, for some degree, for existing</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Crookham Commons from nearby residential areas. For example we suggest that the installation of a pedestrian route across the A339 from the residential area south of Pinchington lane and east of the A339, to the Country Park would promote the Country Park as a more attractive recreational area to visit, thus reducing recreational pressure on the more sensitive sites to the east of this residential area.</p> <p>A suggested new statement to be included in the Country Park section of the SPD is as follows:</p> <p>‘Opportunities should be maximised to promote and ensure the Country Park is accessible to residents in the surrounding area.’</p> <p>Location of NEAP and LEAP</p> <p>The siting of both the NEAP and one of the LEAPs within the Valley Corridor detracts from the ecological principles of this part of the site through additional recreational pressure associated with the use of these facilities. Although best practice guidance suggests NEAP should be a maximum of 800m from housing and LEAP a maximum of 400m away, we propose relocating the NEAP to the south west of its current proposed position, and moving the LEAP to the east or west out of the valley corridor. This would only cause a minimum impact on the area proposed for residential land, with only a small corner of the north east of the site being outside the 400/800m area.</p> <p>Establishing ecological networks</p> <p>We welcome the reference of green links throughout the site through SUDs features. The SUDs should be designed to provide a network</p>	<p>residents, it is not intended to seek to attract them.</p> <p>See above. This statement has not, therefore, been included in the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD has been updated and the locations of the LEAP and NEAPs have been reviewed to avoid the valley corridor.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>for biodiversity within the residential area, linking up with the isolated woodlands and the central valley corridor. This would ensure the requirements of the NPPF ('establishing coherent ecological networks' para, 109) are met.</p> <p>Further comments on biodiversity enhancements</p> <p>To ensure that the proposals set out in the SPD comply fully with the NPPF's overarching aim of 'providing net gains in biodiversity' and West Berkshire Council's Core Strategy Policy CS17 we recommend the following additions to statements within the SPD:</p> <p>Bullet point 4 of CA8. (page 71) should include the wording underlined:</p> <p>'Woodland edge habitats will be retained or new edge habitats will be implemented and maintained to maximise the biodiversity value and landscape amenity of the woodland.'</p> <p>Bullet point 8 of CA8. (page 71) should include the wording underlined:</p> <p>'Buffer zones to be a mix of grassland and native shrub planting and managed for biodiversity, in keeping with the landscape, ecological and heritage objectives for the buffers as identified in the Detailed Landscape and Green Infrastructure Design Management Plans.'</p> <p>Bullet point 3 of CA9. (page 73) should include the wording underlined:</p> <p>'The management of existing and created species rich grassland will</p>	<p>Noted. Changes have been made to the SPD to reflect this.</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>maintain and maximise biodiversity value. Locally sourced seed mix should be used where possible for the creation of new grassland'</p> <p>A new bullet point with the following wording should be included in CA9. (page 73):</p> <p>'Path surfaces will be developed so as not to have any impact on the hydrology of the valley corridor.'</p>	
Graham Hunt	Newbury Town Council	<p>Hi</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Consultation on the Sandleford Park Draft Supplementary Planning Document. A sub-group of Newbury Town Council has met and formulated this response, which was ratified at the Planning &amp; Highways Committee meeting on 22 April 2013.</p> <p>a) The Draft SPD is very good in parts, but sketchy in others.</p> <p>b) It is good on landscape / topology / country park / woodland / wildlife corridor / houses and their relationship with the countryside / roads and PROWs within the sit.</p> <p>c) It needs more detail on infrastructure aspects, such as community facilities, education facilities.</p> <p>d) There are still open questions re boundaries, and how the Sandleford Park community will fit with the adjacent Greenham, Wash Common and Newbury Town communities. Although boundary changes don't necessarily result in integrated communities, the fact that Wash Common already has multiple Community Hall provision</p>	<p>C) The detail of these issues is beyond the scope of the current SPD, feasibility work is, however underway to inform these aspects of the planning application and there will be further opportunities to comment through that.</p> <p>d) There are no plans to change boundaries</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>might negate the need for such provision in Sandlesford Park, if the two communities were to be integrated (with relevant improvements in crossing the A343).</p> <p>e) Conversely, it may be appropriate for larger scale primary education facilities to be provided on Sandlesford Park site, freeing the existing Falkland School site for housing development.</p> <p>f) More is needed on public transport integration – mandating a bus link from Warren Road to central Newbury and integration with the rest of the local bus network.</p> <p>g) A clear, timelined, infrastructure implementation plan needs to be mandated, similar to that which appears to be successfully followed at the Racecourse development, with clear dependencies and trigger points.</p> <p>h) Additional traffic assessments are required urgently, to establish the need for additional access routes beyond those already defined in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>i) An access onto the A339 at the Amenity Site (with relevant cycle / pedestrian facilities) may assist with A339 traffic calming (safety improvements), the start of better access to Greenham Common (accessibility / integration improvements) and better access to the amenity site from Newbury (environmental improvement).</p> <p>j) A traffic calmed crossing (or even tunnel / bridge) and additional new PROW access to Greenham Common (south of Sandlesford Priory) could be created for cycle / pedestrian access from the end of the existing PROW at the south eastern aspect of the site.</p>	<p>at the current time – that would be an outcome of the development once it is being built.</p> <p>e) the format and location of the primary scale provision to serve the site is being discussed, with feasibility work underway.</p> <p>f) Again, this is too detailed for the SPD but will be discussed with the developer and the bus companies as work on a planning application progresses.</p> <p>g) Noted. This will be prepared as part of a planning application for the site. An IDP covering the site has been prepared in conjunction with service providers.</p> <p>h, i) The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>j) The development provides an opportunity to improve the link from the public right of way across the site east to Greenham</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>k) There remain concerns about the impact of domestic pets on the ancient woodlands and the corridors between but it is unclear what action could be taken to mitigate.</p> <p>l) The local generation of renewable energy should be mandated as being beyond the existing requirements of the Core Strategy, with site-wide as well as in-building provision.</p> <p>m) There is lots of discussion of cycle routes, but very little mention of cycle parking at potential destination points (and covered cycle parking at key locations, such as schools / shops / community areas).</p> <p>n) Allotments and Community Growing Areas must be mandated, and be accessible for communities outside of Sandleford Park.</p>	<p>Common. This would need to look at ways of overcoming the barrier of the A339 and improving the route south from the entrance to St Gabriel's School. This improved link to Greenham Common should be considered in the context of walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>k) The Council is aware of the concerns raised about domestic pets but cannot impose restrictions on households regarding this. The majority of the birds that breed in the woodlands are not ground nesting.</p> <p>l) Noted. This will be covered by the legal agreement for the planning application.</p> <p>m) All development at the site will need to provide cycle parking in line with West Berkshire Council's cycle parking guidance. This can be clarified within the final SPD. Residential cycle parking should be covered and secure, and could be provided in a garage, shed or dedicated cycle store. Local centre and school cycle parking should be covered and secure where appropriate (e.g. for long stay or staff parking). Sheffield stands should be used.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>o) Has there been any consideration of a public house?</p> <p>p) We would like to see some recognition of the potential benefits of community ownership e.g. of the Country Park, the Community Hall, Community growing / allotment areas, site-wide renewable energy provision – all of which would assist community integration / adhesion.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Graham Hunt</p> <p>Chief Executive Officer</p> <p>Newbury Town Council</p>	<p>n) noted. However the allotments would primarily be for the use of the residents of the Sandleford Park site.</p> <p>o) Whilst this has not been discussed to date, it could form part of the pre-application discussions for the development.</p> <p>p) Noted.</p>
Gregg McGill	West Berks Ramblers	<p>Sandleford Park draft planning proposals</p> <p>Comments by West Berks Ramblers</p> <p>With reference to the invitation to comment on the draft proposals, West Berks Ramblers have the following comments to make. They relate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. improvements to the footpath network within the site, and</li> <li>2. linkages to the wider footpath network.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted. Proposed links to the surrounding footpath and cycle network will be reviewed. Changes to principle A2 have been made to address the need for better integration to surrounding uses. The points made with regard to desire lines are agreed and further wording about integration with surrounding uses has been added to the SPD.</p> <p>Green links provide traffic free connections across the site in order to promote cycle and</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Improvements within the site</p> <p>We consider it important that the footpath layout relates to desire lines whilst taking advantage of the sloping landscape for views and the existing woodlands for recreation and nature study. We see the major desire lines as focusing on Wash Common, the school, the college and the retail park at Pinchington Lane with a separate but important emphasis on the proposed meadow land within the development site. All, in our view, should be accessible, as far as possible, away from roads used by vehicular traffic. The diagrammatic site layout suggests otherwise and the written statement relies too heavily on walking along Monks Lane rather than within the site. The idea should be to make it as attractive and as safe as possible (e.g. with low level lighting) for future residents so that they would want to walk to these important destinations. It would be a lost opportunity if footways simply became part of the road/pavement network.</p> <p>Linkages to the wider footpath network</p> <p>There is a need for footpaths and other walkways to link to the wider footpath network. With Greenham Common to the east (via the footpath at Bunker Farm), Newtown Common to the south (via lanes near the Swan PH) and a network of footpaths to the west of Wash Common there should be easier and safe access to all of these areas. This would then serve not only future residents at Sandleford Park but also many existing residents in neighbouring areas. It would be a huge boost for many people and be greatly appreciated by many walkers.</p>	<p>pedestrian access. The detail of these will be set out in more detail in the Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure Plan</p> <p>The development provides an opportunity to improve the link from the public right of way across the site east to Greenham Common. This would need to look at ways of overcoming the barrier of the A339 and improving the route south from the entrance to St Gabriel's School. This improved link to Greenham Common should be considered in the context of walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>Noted. These linkages and the footpath links to them from within the site will be clarified as work on the site progresses.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>There is, however, one drawback to the creation of such a network and that relates to the existing footpath which runs east-west across the site to the A339 opposite Sandleford Priory. The draft planning document simply states that access is provided to the A339 but this is not good enough. The existing access to the A339 is very dangerous, the road is almost impossible to cross and the absence of a footway on the west side of the A339 makes it worse. It is no wonder that it is not used by many walkers.</p> <p>However, with the development of Sandleford Park, we see a solution as one of creating a new footpath within the development site that would take walkers to the south east corner of the site as close as possible to the roundabout at Newtown and largely avoiding the A339. Here, we would ask that highway engineers devise a scheme for constructing as safe a crossing as possible, with appropriate footways, somewhere in the vicinity of the Newtown roundabout and that this be implemented under town planning obligations or perhaps the new community infrastructure levy. We envisage this could be incorporated as part of the planning approval process for the Sandleford Park development. It would be appreciated if this could be added to the final planning document.</p> <p>Greg McGill  Countryside Secretary  On behalf of West Berks Ramblers  23 April 2013</p>	<p>Noted. This will form part of the wider implementation of the site.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Mark Grantham		<p>If I have to accept the necessity for development on the south side of Monks Lane it should be contained between the college and the Rugby Club. Any further development south of this will overload the roads causing complete chaos. The Andover Road and Monks Lane are especially busy at the start and finish of school time causing traffic havoc at the moment so more vehicles will completely overload the streets. Buses trying to come out of Warren Road onto the Andover Road are unacceptable and dangerous.</p> <p>I believe this is an over development and will spoil the character of the area.</p>	<p>The principle of development of the site has been established through the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p>
Graham Powell		<p>Having read the document dated March 2013 and given the fact that we have to accept this large housing development, I feel it is imperative that an extra access point is made to the site. Two entrances along Monks Lane will not be sufficient. The obvious place is at the entrance to the recycling centre. This would have the additional benefit of simplifying the access to the recycling site when approaching from the north. Additional access to the housing development via Warren Road would create a large increase in congestion at peak times on the Andover Road and so be ineffective.</p>	<p>Whilst the site has been shown to be deliverable with 2 accesses off Monks Lane, this was an unpopular option through consultation. The Council therefore wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network.</p>
Simon Dackombe	Thames Valley Police	<p>Thames Valley Police (TVP) has no objections or comments to make on the broad principles outlined in the draft SPD.</p> <p>These comments relate solely to the identification within the Draft SPD of the necessary infrastructure required to support a development of some 2000 new homes.</p> <p>TVP has made representations to WBC with regard to the infrastructure necessary to mitigate against the impact of growth and development upon policing in West Berkshire over the plan</p>	<p>Noted. The IDP in the SPD reflects the Core Strategy at adoption and the IDP used to underpin CIL. However, the wider infrastructure issues will be dealt with as part of a future planning application as set out in section G of the SPD.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>period. We have specifically identified a need to provide additional infrastructure and equipment to mitigate against the impact upon policing from the development planned at Sandford Park.</p> <p>TVP are disappointed that our requests are not reflected at Appendix 3 of the Draft SPD.</p> <p>TVP would request that the need to mitigate against the impact upon policing is identified in Appendix 3 of the Draft SPD with particular reference made to the need for police infrastructure to be delivered.</p> <p>Under the heading NECESSARY – The following text should be added</p> <p>COMMUNITY SAFETY – Police Infrastructure</p> <p>West Berkshire Wide</p> <p>Provision of infrastructure and equipment to ensure the maintenance of an appropriate level of policing.</p>	
Robert Withers		<p>While Kendrick Road (a private road) and the private drive to Wildwoods are not planned as access roads for the Sandford Park development, there will be those in houses near them who will use them as 'rat runs' unless some kind of barrier – hedging would be preferable - is put in place.</p>	<p>The SPD does not allow for any access from the site to either Kendrick Road or the private drive to Wildwoods.</p>
G. Marcello		<p>Section F: Development Principles</p> <p>The development will comprise of the 2 storey and taller 3 and 4 storey buildings. Please consider locating taller buildings where the land naturally dips to reduce the overbearing impact of these</p>	<p>Taller buildings are proposed in order to make more efficient use of land and should be carefully located in order to minimise impact on views into and out of the site and upon existing dwellings.</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>structures particularly in character area CA4 so has to be in keeping with existing dwellings.</p> <p>Ensure new dwellings in CA4 are well screened from Monks Lane and are set back from the road. Consider running the back gardens of the new dwellings at right angles to Monks Lane.</p>	<p>Comments regarding Monks Lane dwellings are noted.</p>
Elaine Cox	West Berkshire Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please ensure previous comments from me are put forward to this latest consultation. I can provide copies if needed.</li> <li>2. Adequate arrangements need to be made for the future maintenance of new pathways through the site. Are they to be adopted as highways or public rights of way?</li> <li>3. The brief mentions the importance of non-vehicular links to Greenham Common. The existing line of the public footpath through the site meets the A339 at a bad point for crossing. A point further south would be preferable, so the route then can link to the wide verge and on to the southern side of Greenham Common.</li> <li>4. Care needs to be taken with the treatment of the existing public footpath through the site. It should not be subsumed into estate roads or pavements of roads. It would preferable for this to form a 'green corridor'. If the route needs to be altered then a formal diversion of the footpath will be required prior to commencement of any development on its existing line.</li> <li>5. The brief clearly attempts to retain some aspects of the rural nature of this site. I request in addition that care is taken to reduce the intrusive nature of any external lighting</li> </ol>	<p>All purpose routes would be adopted as public highway, however leisure routes would not.</p> <p>Consider improved crossing point on A339 at/south of Sandleford Priory.</p> <p>Noted. Lighting throughout the site will need to balance the safety of people and the ecological value of the links.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Mr. & Mrs. Raymond Cooper		<p>Our main concern is the idea of using Warren Road as a major access point to Sandleford Park, for several important reasons -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Having made several inquiries, we understand that in several places Warren Road is not wide enough to allow a two-lane road to service a development the size of Sandleford.</li> <li>2. Alternative arrangements would have to be made for parents dropping off, and picking up, pupils from Falkland School, and Park House School, as they would not be able to stop in Warren Road, or Andover Road anywhere near the junction.</li> <li>3. Park House School would need to provide their own parking spaces for those pupil and staff who have for several years used Warren Road for all-day parking during term time. During this time, Warren Road is virtually a single lane road.</li> <li>4. Warren Road, by our properties, is very close to classrooms at Park House School. Extra traffic would cause considerable disruption with noise.</li> <li>5. There is a deep well, about 2 metres wide, outside Park Cottage in the middle of the road. How secure is this vibration etc. from heavy traffic?</li> <li>6. Safety of children should be a major concern. Hundreds of them attend the two schools. Park House have an entrance in Warren Road. The Roman Catholic Church's entrance is in Warren Road. Sunley Close leads off Warren Road and Warren Road residents themselves. A two way road would be extremely dangerous for us all.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted. Warren Road would need widening to make it a 6m wide route suitable for buses.</p> <p>In terms of drop off/pick up from Falkland and Park House Schools, both of these would need to be taken into account as part of any scheme for Sandleford Park. Park House is being extended, and access arrangements will be reviewed as part of this process, including the location of any access.</p> <p>The site has been modelled as deliverable through the Transport assessment work which was carried out to support the allocation of the site with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work is currently being carried out to evaluate the benefits of other options. This involves assessing the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address the issue. If this access was to go ahead, it</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>7. The junction of Warren Road with the Andover Road is at present very busy. More so between 7.30am - 9.30am and 2.30pm - 4.30pm. Existing Warren Road to the right is very hazardous, and at times, very dangerous. Opposite is the entrance to St Georges Church Hall, St Georges Church, and Falkland School, as well as a nursery. Both churches can produce a lot of extra traffic at times during the week, with weddings, funerals and other functions. It is, or can be, very dangerous for those children attending the schools, as well as other pedestrians, and road users.</p> <p>8. It would be seem that a substantial roundabout with traffic lights would be needed at the junction. This would cause severe disruption for Park House School, Falkland School, the two churches, and local residents, and in our view, a very grave risk to pedestrians, particularly children. Bear in mind also that there will be a lot more traffic using Andover Road, when the garage is altered and a Sainsbury's shop is built on the site - deliveries, shoppers etc.</p> <p>9. Relating to the well mentioned earlier (number 5) there is a drainage ditch opposite our houses, by Park House School. The ditch has been badly damaged by all the traffic, especially lorries using the "illegal" industrial estate in Warren Road. This drainage ditch would need to be considered</p> <p>Considering all these points; we feel it is utterly ridiculous even to think of making Warren Road a major access to the Sandleford development. Although not ideal, Monks Lane or the A339 must be a better option and certainly far less dangerous for all the children in the area, as well as the local residents and road users.</p>	<p>would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements.</p> <p>In terms of this potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>The solution will depend on the specific issue. For example 'green light on demand' could be designed in as part of a traffic signal junction</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
John Holt		<p>We submit that a scheme the size of Sandlesford Park is the ideal opportunity to help enable the development of a large and prestigious community project, one that smaller schemes would find more difficult to accommodate.</p> <p>Our project is to develop community hydrotherapy and gym rehabilitation services for Newbury, Thatcham and the surrounding villages and catchments. Our detailed research indicates the need for an 80 sq m pool, with changing facilities suitable for several physically disabled clients, and a gym fitted with specialised motorised rehabilitation equipment, all requiring a building with a footprint of circa 800 sq m and parking for up to a maximum of 42 cars. This would fit on a stand-alone basis into 0.75 acres, but a shared building and shared parking could be envisaged subject to management arrangements.</p> <p>The facilities will provide a health and well-being benefit to many types of clients, including those with short and long term medical conditions, those with learning disabilities or affected by ageing or in pregnancy, also those recovering from sports injury or surgery. A facility of this type will benefit approximately 700 local residents each week.</p> <p>Subject to discussions that would need to be held with other parties, we believe our proposals could be developed either within the general scheme as part of the community facilities or as part of the development of secondary school capacity or alongside the new facilities required for primary an early years education.</p> <p>If located on or near Sandlesford Park, our facilities will be used by those living in the Park itself and will be a benefit for the schools,</p>	To be discussed with the landowner – no changes proposed to the SPD.

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>college students, sports clubs and health centres in immediate proximity as well as to the wider, surrounding catchments. Few other opportunities are likely to arise to develop these community facilities.</p> <p>Preliminary discussions with the Managing Director of one of the developers generated a positive response to what we are trying to achieve. Wider discussions are being held within the consortium regarding our proposals.</p> <p>Sixteen local voluntary and sporting groups have backed our proposals in writing and we have numerous other letters of support from local clinicians and others. We have a sound business plan and an organisation capable of delivering a sustainable and enduring business.</p> <p>We can provide a substantial dossier of research and evidence of need and benefit and urge that our proposals are included into Sandford Park as one specific element of community provision.</p>	
Jenny Graham	West Berkshire District Council	<p>The comments below relate mainly to access, car and cycle parking and travel to school. Some will be relevant to the wording, maps and details within the draft SPD and other comments may highlight things that are better dealt with once a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>Access to the Site</p> <p>(Section F: A1 pg 38)</p> <p>Transport Policy is supportive of the additional accesses onto the A339 and Warren Road. Additional technical work now available</p>	Comments noted. In terms of changes to the SPD, the following are proposed.

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>suggests that there would be a significant benefit in having these additional accesses to the site. Additional accesses to and from the site allow for more travel options for residents living on the site and would help to lessen the traffic impact outside the site. In terms of the potential access onto the A343 via Warren Road, if this goes ahead it is strongly suggested that consideration be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury town centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing the two schools (Falkland and Park House). As well as keeping congestion in this area outside the schools to a minimum, it will help to ensure that pupils travelling from the site to Park House School will be walking or cycling. Provision for buses to still be able to turn right at this junction towards the town centre will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>(Section D para 74 pg 19)</p> <p>Existing cycle access to the site includes reference to Newtown Road cycle path. Although this is officially a shared use path it is not really suitable for cycling down hill (from the college into Newbury) due to a combination of its width and the gradient of the road.</p> <p>(Section F: A2 pg 38)</p> <p>For the local facilities that neighbour the site (e.g. Park House School, the College, the Rugby Club and through to Falkland Surgery) opportunities should be sought for direct pedestrian and cycle access from the development site to encourage people to walk and cycle to them.</p>	<p>No amendments to paragraph 74 are proposed as this is a factual description of a route rather than a promotion of it.</p> <p>Noted. The wording of A2 has been amended to clarify this.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Cycle Parking (Section F: A3 and Character Areas)</p> <p>All development at the site will need to provide cycle parking in line with West Berkshire Council's cycle parking guidance.</p> <p>Residential cycle parking should be covered and secure, and could be provided in a garage, shed or dedicated cycle store.</p> <p>Local centre and school cycle parking should be covered, and secure where appropriate (e.g. for long stay, or staff parking). Sheffield stands should be used.</p> <p>Car Parking (Section F: A4 and Character Areas)</p> <p>While the development will be built to encourage sustainable travel, the majority of people are still likely to own a car (even if they don't use it regularly) and therefore car parking facilities do need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>Evidence collected locally through parking surveys in residential areas shows that people are likely to park on the road in front of their house where parking is provided in a parking court or away from the main route into the house. Therefore, residential areas need easily accessible car parking located to the front (or main access) of the dwelling.</p> <p>While double yellow lines would stop people parking on the road in areas where this is not desired, these should not be necessary (and may be particularly undesirable in this development) if the residential areas are well designed.</p>	<p>Principle A3 has been amended accordingly.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Survey results also show that garages are not typically used for parking and in many cases are converted. This should be reflected in the level of parking provided across the site.</p> <p>Travel to School (Section F: F2 pg 50)</p> <p>With new primary school provision and the secondary school on the edge of the site how children travel to school is key to reducing traffic movements within the development. Walking and cycling should be seen as the normal mode of travel to school. The schools will all need to submit a specific School Travel Plan which will need to be in place prior to opening.</p> <p>Drop off / pick up areas should be kept to a minimum, while still providing space for a coach to safely stop to pick up and drop off children.</p> <p>Routes to school need to be considered as part of the planning of the layout of the site to ensure that the routes are easy, direct and allow desire lines to be followed.</p> <p>Public Open Space and Recreation (Section F: P pg. 42)</p> <p>Local consultation and comments from other residential areas in the district highlight the desire for Skate / BMX parks within open spaces. Within the Neighbourhood Area of Play there could be potential to include such a facility. The Newbury Skate Park (in Victoria Park) is very well used and there are no similar facilities close to the Sandlesford site.</p> <p>Renewable Energy (Section F: R pg. 46)</p>	<p>The wording of the SPD has been updated to reflect this comment.</p> <p>Noted. The potential for this will be explored further as the detail is progressed.</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Electric charging points are referred to within Appendix 2 relating to the Travel Plan. However, there should be reference to this elsewhere within the main document. Renewable energy might be the appropriate place.</p> <p>Character Areas (Section F: C pg 54- 76)</p> <p>Road design</p> <p>The space for cycle lanes / paths within the development should not be restricted in design to a standard approach or facilities elsewhere in the local area. There is the opportunity for being more creative if this shows greater benefits.</p> <p>There could be potential, especially on the main access route, to have a semi-raised cycle lane (this has been trialled elsewhere and has been quite successful – examples include Cambridge, Brighton, Southend and Manchester) (see attachment 'Transport Policy Attachment (Road Design)).</p> <p>Valley Crossing</p> <p>Dedicated foot / cycle ways should be provided on the bridge.</p>	<p>Noted. The wording of the Renewable Energy section now reflects this.</p> <p>Noted. This will be discussed further through pre-application discussions.</p> <p>The wording on page 69 can be amended to reflect this.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Lady Jeannine Barber	Newbury & Hungerford CPRE	<p>Sandleford Park – draft supplementary planning document</p> <p>Comments by CPRE on the Country Park</p> <p>The best way to manage a country park is for there to be a robust system of supervision which could be provided by the local wildlife trust (BBOWT). They would then find a grazier who would probably put sheep or cattle on it. This would be a less expensive and more natural option than trying to turn it into a species rich grassland, as at the Olympic Park.</p> <p>However, if the object is for the country park to be “an informal and natural approach to recreation” then it cannot be run as if it were a proper agricultural concern. Sculpture trails, educational trails, picnic areas and areas of mown grass are urban in concept and are not commensurate with real countryside. Even managed habitat areas will not succeed if they are in close proximity to where the public has access.</p> <p>Jeannine Barber</p>	<p>Comments noted. The future management of the species rich grassland could include grazing. The overall management of the Country Parkland is an issue to be agreed as part of the planning application process.</p>
David	Thames Water	WEST BERKSHIRE – SANDLEFORD PARK DRAFT SPD	Noted. It is considered that these comments

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Wilson		<p>Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames Water's appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water.</p> <p>Thames Water are the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for West Berkshire and are hence a "specific consultation body" in accordance with the Town &amp; Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. The provision of sewerage/waste water and water infrastructure is essential to any development.</p> <p>We have the following comments on the consultation document:</p> <p>Infrastructure - Omission of Section on Water and Waste Water/Sewerage Infrastructure</p> <p>A key sustainability objective for the preparation of the Local Development Framework/Local Plan should be for new development to be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states: "Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater...."</p> <p>Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: "Local planning authorities should works with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for</p>	<p>are adequately reflected within section G of the SPD as well as within the SPD. A Sewage Impact Study for the site was a Core Document for the Core Strategy Examination.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”</p> <p>In relation to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan mentioned at paragraphs 88 &amp; 89, Thames Water advised that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- wastewater capacity does not exist to serve the proposed development at Sandford. A developer funded study will be required to determine what upgrades are necessary;</li> <li>- There is no identified supply deficit for the Kennet Valley Water Resource Zone during the period to 2034 and it is therefore anticipated that the level of planned development within West Berkshire to 2026 can be accommodated without the need for further water resources schemes to be implemented. However, there may be a need for additional water supply infrastructure, in the form of pumping stations, supply pipe work etc, and Thames Water will work closely with landowners and developers in relation to site specific requirements.</li> </ul> <p>The Sandford Park Developers and the SPD therefore need to consider the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve the development and also any impact the development may have off site further down the network, if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewage flooding of property is to be avoided.</p> <p>It is therefore essential that the list of issues covered in the SPD should therefore make reference to the provision of water and sewerage infrastructure to service development as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developments demand for water supply and network</li> </ul>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developments demand for sewage treatment and sewerage network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met</li> <li>• The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the area and down stream and can it be met</li> </ul> <p>To accord with the NPPF text along the lines of the following section should be added to the SPD:</p> <p>“Water Supply &amp; Sewerage Infrastructure</p> <p>It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water &amp; sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water authority to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.</p> <p>Further information for Developers on water/sewerage infrastructure can be found on Thames Water’s website at:  <a href="http://www.thameswater.co.uk/cps/rde/xchg/corp/hs.xsl/558.htm">http://www.thameswater.co.uk/cps/rde/xchg/corp/hs.xsl/558.htm</a></p> <p>Or contact can be made with Thames Water Developer Services</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>By post at: Thames Water Developer Services, Reading Mailroom, Rose Kiln Court, Rose Kiln Lane, Reading RG2 0BY;</p> <p>By telephone on: 0845 850 2777;</p> <p>Or by email: developer.services@thameswater.co.uk”</p> <p>Water Conservation</p> <p>Thames Water would also welcome the opportunity to work with the Council and developers on opportunities for incorporating water efficiency in the new development.</p> <p>Water conservation and climate change is a vitally important issue to the water industry. Not only is it expected to have an impact on the availability of raw water for treatment but also the demand from customers for potable (drinking) water. Therefore, Thames Water supports water conservation and the efficient use of water.</p> <p>Thames Water have their own water efficiency website:</p> <p><a href="http://www.thameswater.co.uk/waterwisely">www.thameswater.co.uk/waterwisely</a></p> <p>By exploring the interactive town, Waterwisely, you can discover how you can start saving water, help protect the environment, reduce your energy bill and even cut your water bill if you have a meter. You can calculate your water use, see how you compare against other Thames Water customers and the Government's target, and get lots of hints and tips on how to save water.</p> <p>Thames Water customers can also order a range of free devices to</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>help save water.</p> <p>However, managing demand alone will not be sufficient meet increasing demand and Thames Water adopt the Government's twin-track approach of managing demand for water and, where necessary, developing new sources, as reflected in Thames Water's Water Resource Management Plan.</p> <p>Flood Risk</p> <p>In relation to flooding, the SPD should include guidance in relation to flooding from sewers. The technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework which retains key elements of PPS25: Development and Flood Risk states that a sequential approach should be used by local planning authorities in areas to be at risk from forms of flooding other than from river and sea which includes "Flooding from Sewers". The Brief should therefore include reference to sewer flooding and an acceptance that flooding could occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site infrastructure is not in place ahead of development.</p> <p>It is vital that sewerage/waste water treatment infrastructure is in place ahead of development if sewer flooding issues are to be avoided. It is also important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- local network upgrades take around 18 months</li> <li>- sewage treatment works upgrades can take 3-5 years</li> </ul> <p>This therefore increases the importance for the proposed text above</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>in relation to water/sewerage infrastructure, to be taken into account and be specifically covered in the SPD.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>David Wilson</p> <p>David Wilson BA (Hons), BTP, MRTPI</p> <p>Associate Director Planning</p>	
Cllr Tony Vickers		<p>Section F: Development Principles</p> <p>General. Noting that this is a landowner led development proposal, constrained by the limits of the area within Sandleford Partnership ownership, we have little confidence that the site limits reflect either the most desirable features that could be produced within a less constrained site nor that they will, in reality, be so constrained within a few years.</p> <p>We would expect (and hope) that land deals with several adjoining owners will be concluded before any new homes on the site are occupied and possibly before any planning application is determined.</p> <p>We note that nothing prevents a planning application being submitted which incorporates the Core Strategy site as well as adjacent land. This should be acknowledged for public consumption and addressed within the Master Plan, because such an application would have to be judged against its contents.</p> <p>In several respects, the development might be substantially improved</p>	<p>There have been a small number of submissions, in response to the Council's recent "Call for Sites", of sites to the south west of the proposed Sandleford Park development. These will need to be assessed and considered through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD. If land deals are concluded with adjacent land owners and an application is made for a larger area than allocated, then the determination of this application would need to consider any material considerations which justify departing from the Development Plan.</p> <p>The main constraint to enlarging the site is the need to respect the landscape sensitivity of the wider area and to protect the registered historic landscape and setting of the former Sandleford Priory. The site is therefore constrained to the south east of the</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>by being extended into land to the north and west of the 'red line'. Our comments are therefore framed with this in mind, whereas we realise that the Planning Authority may have to work within the constraints of the Core Strategy and the red line.</p> <p>Access Roads There appear to be clear benefits to the wider area of Newbury and to the future residents of the site from a different combination of access roads. In particular, traffic conditions on nearby roads might be significantly improved by having a major access road from the A339, immediately north of the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC). We believe that no outline planning application should be determined for the site until there has been a detailed analysis of likely peak time future traffic levels using this access for most of the housing on the site, rather than the Monks Lane access roads.</p> <p>No future planning application should be constrained by ownership: the Council should make known that it will consider compulsory purchase of land for this access road if it can be demonstrated that the overall cost of the development (taking account of off-site critical transport infrastructure costs) would be less as a result of using it. A similar condition would apply to the potential all-vehicle access onto the A343 Andover Road via Warren Road, although there are understandable concerns about this because of its proximity to two existing schools.</p> <p>In terms of permeability for vehicles, we are not persuaded that site roads can be designed in such a way as to deter significant rat-running, unless congestion at the roundabouts either end of Monks Lane during peak hours is – after necessary highway improvements to those junctions – not significantly worse than now. We therefore</p>	<p>site by the proposal for an area of County parkland. It is also constrained to the north by Monks Lane, to the east by Newbury College and to the west by the Rugby Club, Park House School and existing residential development</p> <p>Access Roads. Traffic modelling has been carried out to assess the impacts of additional access routes, including an access from the A339 adjacent to the Household Waste Recycling Centre. This was partly in response to the earlier public consultation when significant numbers of residents raised concerns over having access only from Monks Lane.</p> <p>The site should be designed to be permeable and the internal roads designed in such a way as to discourage rat-running. This will be a matter for the more detailed design, when the question of access routes has been determined.</p> <p>A Travel Plan will be required to accompany the application.</p> <p>Local Centre. The local centre will need to be in an accessible location on the main route through the development</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>suggest that roads are designed to make it impossible for vehicles (other than buses) to rat-run, as was done for Kennet Heath Estate in Thatcham and also in Holybrook. This could also encourage cycling within and through the estate and make it easier to produce 'home zone' conditions.</p> <p>As for the siting of the two road access points onto Monks Lane (which are part of Core Strategy and therefore cannot be taken out of policy), it would be preferable to move these towards A343 and A339 by sharing the existing Rugby Club and Newbury College junctions, for reasons set out under Site Context. Again this would require land acquisition.</p> <p>In concluding this section, we believe the knock-on effect of any change of access roads will be very significant on the whole estate layout. Therefore we suggest two specific changes to the SPD:</p> <p>a. The word "The" in "The principle vehicular accesses into the site..." (page 38) should be omitted, which would allow for flexibility in the number and location of road accesses overall, without changing the Core Strategy.</p> <p>b. The word "should" in the third line of that paragraph be replaced by "must" and the section "Vehicle Access" conclude with a sentence stating that full public consultation would be required again, at the expense of the developer, if it is deemed preferable to what is in the Core Strategy by that developer.</p> <p>Also irrespective of the access arrangements the full Travel Plan must be insisted upon in any planning application. Frequent and reliable bus links will be especially important.</p>	<p>Design Out Crime. The SPD has been amended to reinforce the requirement to address crime prevention and safety but the Council does not accept that there is a serious omission as the requirement is already set out in the Development Plan. Core Strategy Policy CS14: Design Principles states that developments will be expected to create safe environments, addressing crime prevention and community safety. The explanatory text states that developments should incorporate "Secured by Design" principles to reduce opportunities for crime and the fear of crime.</p> <p>The explanatory text to CS14 also states that Design and Access Statements should demonstrate how a proposal addresses the design considerations set out in the policy, in the SPD Quality Design – West Berkshire and other relevant documents.</p> <p>Density of Development. The density will vary across the site with the southern neighbourhood (Area B) proposed for development at slightly lower levels than that adjacent to Monks Lane (Area A). It is important that land is used efficiently but also that that the design incorporates open space and community facilities. Other than incidental and local open space, the open</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Local Centre / 'One Community'. The topography of the site, as confined by the red line, militates against successful creation of a single cohesive community. This is because the only way to link the two neighbourhoods is a single bridge across the central valley. The two neighbourhoods are separated by at least 400m of valley and ancient woodland. If there is a single Local Centre in one of the two neighbourhoods, the other neighbourhood will come off 'second best'.</p> <p>However if the land at the head of the valley, owned by Park House School, was part of the development, the main access road could go round the head of the valley and the Local Centre be situated where it is more accessible to both neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Design Out Crime. Urban Design Policy U4 refers to permeability. Policy U5 refers to legibility. None of the policies refers to security or 'designing out crime'. We have seen the detailed comments of Mr Dave Stubbs, a police adviser on the subject. We support his general point that this is a serious policy omission. However we also support the policies of permeability and legibility and would not want to see the urban design lose either permeability or legibility.</p> <p>Density of Development. We applaud much of the content of 'character area' descriptions. However we have some concerns that the stated housing density levels appear unachievable within the constraints of available land designated for development. The illustrations in the draft DPD appear to offer the prospect of an unachievable openness of urban design in those areas where housing will mainly be built. We would like to see reference to detailed evidence that the numbers of dwellings at these maximum densities on the areas designated is feasible. With the emphasis on</p>	<p>space and community facilities would not be included in the area used for any density calculation. The densities proposed, between 30 to 50 dwellings per hectare, have been successfully achieved in other developments and it is not clear why the respondent feels these are unachievable. The policy is for up to 2,000 homes – if this number can not be accommodated whilst adhering to the principles set out in the SPD and the Development Plan then a lesser number will be planned for.</p> <p>The support for the requirement for management arrangements for the country parkland to be included in the future planning application is noted. The document specifies that a detailed Country Parkland Design and Management Plan should be agreed with the Council to be implemented from the beginning of the development. This can this be extended to all publicly accessible areas.</p> <p>The footpath was seen as important to the local community in the earlier round of consultation and its alignment takes it through the centre of the country park. There will be additional footpaths and cycleways that will link the individual parts of the development and also provide</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>3-5 bed family homes, this seems highly improbable. We are told by officers that this evidence was seen by the Core Strategy Inspector. However that was before the more detailed urban design that appears in this SPD.</p> <p>Country park / open space management. We support the requirement for details of the management arrangements for the country park to be included in the overall initial outline planning application (Policy L3, page 31). This should be extended to the site's entire set of open areas. It is desirable that good management of common areas be secured in perpetuity through a Legal Agreement as part of the planning permission.</p> <p>Poor management of open areas is often linked to high levels of anti-social behaviour, fear of going outdoors and poor community cohesion. There should a policy in "P" of this Section that specifies more than merely "a Ranger" (page 42) but requires a comprehensive management plan for all publicly accessible areas of open space to also form part of any planning application for the site.</p> <p>In CA10 (page 75), the first bullet point should be amended to take account of the situation described above under Site Context regarding the public footpath.</p> <p>Functionality of footpaths is more important their defunct historic significance.</p> <p>Renewable Energy. Given the extensive areas of ancient woodland within the site, it would seem reasonable to require the developer to link good management of these woodlands with the provision of onsite renewable energy generation, using biofuel for at least part of</p>	<p>opportunities for linkages beyond the site.</p> <p>Additional wording on renewable energy has now been included within the SPD.</p> <p>Schools. As with other infrastructure, provision will be required to meet the needs of the development and the requirement for schools will be based on the latest available evidence. Feasibility work is underway, both on primary provision and in terms of the expansion to Park House School.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>the site: school, community centre, sheltered housing for example, if these can be closely co-located. Thames Valley Energy and Elm Farm Organic Research Centre, in the District, are participating in several projects of this type already.</p> <p>This section is weak and needs to be strengthened by elaborating on what “opportunities” (R2) might come forward at the Council’s instigation and how this development would be expected to contribute.</p> <p>Schools. There is no mention of the fact that the forecast shortfall of existing primary spaces has doubled in less than a year. It would be expected that this will have a significant impact on the financial viability of the development, whether or not the second school is provided on land within control of the current landowner. It seems inadequate to cover this issue in half of one line on page 49, when it is has major implications for the local population and the LEA.</p> <p>We are also unclear whether an even larger expansion of Park House School can be accommodated. This blunt aspirational statement seems inadequate as planning policy.</p> <p>Other Community Facilities and Services. Similar to schools, the statements in the Master Plan seem inadequate. We are told that discussions are taking place with various existing providers – some of whom are named in the document – but we have little confidence that provision is feasible within a reasonable distance and timeframe.</p>	
Martin Small	English Heritage	We are satisfied that the proposed Country Park on the southern part of the site, together with Development Principles L5 and L8, would conserve the significance of this Historic Parkland, including the	Noted.

<b>Contact Full Name</b>	<b>Contact Company/Organisation</b>	<b>Consultee Response</b>	<b>Council Response</b>
		walled garden (subject to control over any structures or uses that might be proposed within the Country Park).	
Barrie Prentice	Falkland CP School	<p>Thank for the opportunity to respond to the draft document and we would wish to comment on three Strategic Objectives.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective 2 : Vehicular Access</li> <li>2. Objective 9 : Sustainable Communities</li> <li>3. Objective 10 : Education Provision</li> </ol> <p>As a school we are aware of significant local opposition and concern about the Sandleford Park development. However, we have not, and do not wish to, become involved in pressure groups as we see our role is to act as providers for the local community, and have publicised the information and consultations through our contacts with local families. We hope that we can use our knowledge and experience, especially of the local area, to develop and improve the plans for Sandleford Park for the benefit of current and future families of Southern Newbury.</p> <p>From this basis of experience and local knowledge we would wish to comment on the following sections of the development principles of the draft planning document.</p> <p>Section 123 : Development Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section A3/A4 – The location of the school(s) on the site should be determined to discourage and prevent additional traffic coming into or using the road network on the Sandleford Park site itself. Any</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Any school should have easy access to major routes for cars but also good access by other means.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>school(s) should have easy access to major routes for cars, but exemplary arrangements should be put in place for other ways of getting to school for parents and pupils - by foot, cycle or other non-motorised means.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section P1/P2 – Any new school will benefit greatly from close access to, and use of, play areas (NEAP/LAP) for sport and educational activity.</li> <li>• Section F – We are aware of examples (Peatmoor, Swindon) where a primary school was specifically developed in a way to be central to its newly developed local community. The school facilities, managed by the Governing Body, were made available to the local community for clubs, health and fitness groups, and community activities as well as providing internet access. The school ‘hall’ and other additional meeting spaces developed at the school (and catering facilities) were arranged in such a way that the whole community gained from its central location as a hub for learning, health and community involvement. We believe such a model has many benefits that it could lend to such a new development and would be happy to discuss this further.</li> </ul> <p>We look forward to see the next stage of planning for Sandleford Park.</p>	<p>Any school would be provided with suitable and sufficient playing field space for sport and recreation.</p> <p>Fully support that the location and design is integral to the community with a layout that’s capable of supporting non school activities.</p>
Revd. Paul Cowan	St. Georges Church Hall	<p>The Diocese of Oxford recognises the rapid growth and expansion in many parts of its ecclesiastical area. Undoubtedly, the scale of the development proposed will significantly impact locally upon the parishes both in terms of environmental and social change, and change on such a scale presents significant challenges for resources and the ability and capacity within the parish affected to ensure</p>	<p>The role of the church as a key stakeholder</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>pastoral care can be extended to all. This is why, the Diocese of Oxford is currently reviewing existing resources in order to establish its priorities and to determine how best to respond to the challenges presented by large-scale development and growth.</p> <p>The Sandleford Strategic Allocation development falls within the Berkshire Archdeaconry and more specifically it will impact upon the parish of St George The Martyr, Newbury, within the Deanery of Newbury (please note that in ecclesiastical terms, Sandleford falls within the parish boundary of St George's Wash Common rather than St Mary's Greenham). Since new residents will form part of this parish we consider ourselves to be a key local stakeholder with a direct interest in ensuring all residents, including the new arrivals to the area, are served both in terms of the provision of public services and community facilities, but also through the provision of pastoral care that supports the life of the community.</p> <p>It is our sincere hope to work with the local authority and the developer as partners in delivering a sustainable and successful community at Sandleford.</p> <p>The Supplementary Planning Document envisages the development Sandleford Park to delivering up to 2000 dwellings with associated services and facilities including, primary schools, local centre, and open space. We are pleased to see the early incorporation of schools within the heart of the development.</p> <p>Faith Space</p> <p>The effects of development and growth are acutely felt at parish level; ensuring pastoral care is widely available to all can be a draw</p>	<p>in the future of Sandleford Park is welcomed. The wording of the SPD has been amended to refer to places of worship under community facilities.</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>on ever depleting resources. We welcome therefore, in section F. Community Facilities and Services, your policy to ensure space for indoor community use. However, we believe this sentence could make explicit that community use may include a “place of worship” and therefore incorporate “faith space”.</p> <p>Shared Spaces</p> <p>We believe church activities can occur at the heart of community life, they can include activities for youth and children, mothers and the aged, as well as gatherings for expressions of church. Such practice is well modelled here in Wash Common. The SPD does not encourage the developer to consider combining sites and uses, and to co-locate facilities such as a community centre and/or other public services accommodation such as Early Years and Children’s provision to ensure these places operate cost effectively but also create a hub of activities. We feel any future master plan should demonstrate how services can be combined in order to provide multi-user accommodation and a community hub.</p> <p>Timing of Delivery</p> <p>We have questions and concerns about the timing of delivery of indoor community facilities. You have already recognised the pressure for primary school places and the need to get one of the schools built sooner rather than later. As one of the key local providers of community space, we have concerns about the timing of delivery of shared indoor community space within the development. We and other sites are close to capacity and will not be able to cope with the extra demand if such community facility development falls too far behind population growth in the area. I am also aware that the</p>	<p>Noted, the wording of the SPD in principle E1 has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>The SPD now better reflects the opportunities of shared facilities – the wording of principles F1 and F2 has therefore been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Whilst this concern is noted, the timing of community facilities will need to reflect the timing of the development on site rather than any deficiencies in surrounding provision.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>local children's uniformed organisations are already stretched to capacity and will need use of such facilities early on to respond to the inevitable demand. Please make the building of indoor community facilities an early priority and make a point of liaising with St George's Church and the local uniformed organisations as plans are developed.</p> <p>In summary, we acknowledge the SPD is intended as a guide to future development of the site, and to that end we offer our support for much of its content. However, we would welcome some discussion on altering the wording so as to ensure community uses within community facilities could include a place of worship, should the need arise to accommodate expressions of church. Also, the principle of shared spaces and co-located services to create a community hub and timing of their delivery needs to be further discussed.</p>	
Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency	Section F: Development Principles	Noted. However the wording of principle L1 clearly refers to the Strategic Landscape and

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Landscape and Heritage</p> <p>Whilst we support L1, L2 and L3, these need to have greater emphasis/cross linkages to ecological issues. The Landscape and Green Infrastructure Design and Management Plan needs to tie in with the Strategic Ecological Enhancement Plan to ensure that it is clear that the green infrastructure/green networks are to be managed for wildlife as well as for landscape value and for people.</p> <p>Ecology and Wildlife</p> <p>In E1, there should be more emphasis on the ecological benefits/management of green links and SUDS - again more than just landscape. This is applicable to the green links mentioned in L6.</p> <p>With regard to E2, buffers to watercourses, springs, flushes etc should be specifically included, tying in with the buffer proposed around the Ancient Woodland areas.</p> <p>Hydrology and drainage</p> <p>In H1 we recommend that this should show a greater commitment to control of runoff.</p> <p>‘Surface water drainage methods shall ensure that volumes and peak flow rates of surface water leaving Sandleford Park are no greater than the existing greenfield run-off rates.’</p> <p>With regard to H2, consistent with Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy,</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure Plan being informed as a minimum by the Strategic Ecological enhancement Plan.</p> <p>In E1 the green links and the SUDS features are specifically identified as providing opportunities for ecological enhancement within Sandleford Park and therefore no changes are proposed.</p> <p>Principle E2 is a holistic principle and therefore it would not be appropriate to draw out specific features in the way suggested.</p> <p>Noted. Changes to principle H1 and principle H2 have been made so that ‘should’ is changed to ‘shall’.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>we would recommend that this is more prescriptive.</p> <p>‘Surface water drainage shall be managed with a variety of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).</p> <p>Picture 16 shows that areas of the site are subject to a high water table and land is very wet most of the year. This needs to be incorporated in the SUDS system to ensure existing springs continue to function.</p> <p>We give strong support to H3 dealing with the wildlife value of SUDS, and would ask to be involved in the design of the SUDS to ensure that the ecological benefits of these are maximised.</p> <p>We support H4.</p>	<p>Noted. Changes have been made accordingly.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Phil Newton	West Berkshire District Council	<p>The main feed back concerns point R2 under section F.</p> <p>Discussion has been held on the viability or otherwise of a District Heat Scheme for this development with the balance of agreement being that this was unlikely to be economically viable for this development.</p> <p>A proposal for a ‘micro-grid’, however, was not ruled out as this is smaller and more ‘discrete’ and therefore potentially more economically attractive</p> <p>A micro-grid depends on using heat sinks and it makes sense that</p>	<p>Comments noted. The supporting text to the principles in this section has now been updated.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>heat-sinks are co-located</p> <p>This requires planning and agreement at an early design stage to properly coordinate the co-location of the various heat sinks and the properties to be affected(e.g. commercial, school, social housing)</p> <p>The preferred fuel source(s) for a micro-grid also need to be identified and assessed for impacts early in the design and planning process.</p>	
Peter Norman	Say No to Sandeiford	<p>Wash Common Community Group</p> <p>Response to West Berkshire Council's Draft Supplementary Planning Document – March 2013: Consultation</p> <p>Background:</p> <p>Wash Common Community Group has recently been formed to bring together various interested parties who live and work in the Wash Common area, with a view to enhancing the area for its residents. Its current constituents are listed at the end of this document and it is anticipated that the group will grow as its activities become more widely known. The response to WBC's consultation looks at the areas of primary concern to the Group that are likely to arise from the development of 2,000 homes on Sandeiford.</p> <p>A Access and Movement</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>The Group is pleased to note that the Council acknowledges that two access points to Monks Lane with a bus route along Warren Road are unlikely to be adequate for a development of this size. This issue is made more acute by the change in demographics envisaged with the need to house two primary schools. However the Group has a number of reservations about the additional routes proposed, and given the potential issues relating to either of the proposals would wish for there to be further consultation before either route is finalised:</p> <p>A1 All Vehicular Access</p> <p>All Vehicular Access to A339 close to Household Waste Recycling Centre.</p> <p>Introduction of a roundabout at this junction would be an improvement and would eliminate unnecessary car journeys to the Swan roundabout for those using the recycling centre. However gaining access to Sandeford Estate from this junction has two potential issues:</p> <p>1] Creation of a rat run that people will use to avoid congestion on Monks Lane even with a 20mph restriction.</p> <p>2] Opening up swathes of Newbury College land to development which is likely to worsen rather than improve the traffic flows at peak times. Given the prime position of this land it is hard to see how a road here would not lead to further development.</p>	<p>Work carried out through the transport assessments which supported the Core Strategy show that the site can be delivered through 2 all vehicle accesses onto Monks Lane and a sustainable transport route onto Warren Road. However, additional access routes are being explored in response to issues raised through consultation to assess the comparative effects on the highways network.</p> <p>As the SPD can only elaborate on existing policy, any additional accesses will be a matter for negotiation through the planning application process. There will be further opportunities for comments to be made through the planning application process.</p> <p>The detailed internal design of the road layout will be used to make rat running an unattractive option.</p> <p>There is additional committed but not implemented development at Newbury College, the traffic impacts of which are included within the existing modelling. Any</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>All Vehicular Access to Warren Road</p> <p>Again whilst this would relieve the pressure on Monks Lane, in conjunction with the A339 it could create a rat run. The Group is particular concerned with enhancements to this road given its proximity to two schools and is a route for many primary children to Falkland School. The Council would need to ensure funding of any development of this road to provide: Adequate pedestrian and cycle access along this route especially given the close proximity of Park House School, pavements need to be sufficiently wide to handle school children at peak periods. Be cognizant of the single track access to St Francis and its community hall where cars currently queue along Warren Road and will cause major disruption if the road is upgraded beyond a bus route. Funding would be needed to improve this access. Major junction improvement on to the A343, which needs not only to ensure the safe crossing of students from Park House and Falkland Schools, but also be aware of the increased traffic resulting from the nearby development of an enhanced petrol station and mini market at the Total Petrol Station, opposite Park House School.</p>	<p>further development of the College site would have to be accompanied by further highways assessment work to gauge impacts and deliverability.</p> <p>Any road through the site will be designed in a way to make it unattractive for rat running.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and any Transport Assessment to be provided as part of a planning application would need to address the issues raised. If this access were to go ahead as an all vehicle access, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements, with the solution dependent on the particular issue to be addressed. Any solution would take account of existing and committed development proposals.</p> <p>In terms of this potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Monks Lane and the junction with Andover Road A343</p> <p>There is currently a significant safety issue with students leaving Park House School where the pavement width is inadequate for the number of students exiting on to Monks Lane and there is no adequate pedestrian crossing either at this point on Monks Lane or the nearby mini roundabout at the junction with Andover Road. At 3:30pm on a school day the pavement all the way along to the Rugby Club entrance is dangerously congested and Monks Lane often ceases to flow as coaches and parents stop to pick students up. The cycle lane at this time is unusable. Adding a further 400 students to the mix from the Sandleford development will raise serious health and safety concerns.</p> <p>Funding will be required to:</p> <p>Enhance the pedestrian entrance to Park House School so that the numbers of students can be safely handled</p> <p>Widen the pavement along Monks Lane all the way to the access point of the Sandleford Estate and potentially delineate a separate</p>	<p>Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>The solution will depend on the specific issue. For example 'green light on demand' could be designed in as part of a traffic signal junction</p> <p>Park House School will be extended to accommodate the additional pupils arising from the Sandleford development. This is likely to lead to the school being substantially reconfigured, during which process the accesses to the school will be considered. Feasibility work on the most appropriate layouts is currently ongoing.</p> <p>The comments are noted. These issues will</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>cycle path from the pedestrian path.</p> <p>Introduce a pedestrian crossing near the entrance to Park House School on Monks Lane and near to the mini roundabout junction across Andover Road.</p> <p>Double Mini Roundabout Junction Monks Lane/Andover Road A343 and Essex Street.</p> <p>This junction is a major bottleneck in South Newbury that struggles to cope with existing traffic levels. The situation is made worse by the single entrance/exit to the parade of shops, where vehicle movements clash with peak hour traffic. The additional traffic created by Sandleford Park is likely to bring the current junction to a standstill. Funding will be required to improve this junction and as part of this enhancement should look to enable a separate entrance and exit from the shop parade.</p> <p>Falkland Surgery</p> <p>Any increase in the number of patients using Falkland Surgery will put pressure on parking spaces where the rugby club is already being used informally as an overspill parking facility. While it is true that most of the proposed development is in easy walking distance of the surgery, the Group is anxious that the Council is aware that there is no direct pedestrian route from the site to the surgery and if people are ill they are likely to travel by car which will result in extra traffic on Monks Lane and extra demand for parking spaces. Funding needs to be available to deal with this as well as conversations started with the Rugby Club about how they may be able to assist in this area.</p>	<p>be explored further through a detailed transport assessment to be prepared as part of any planning application.</p> <p>Junction improvements including improvements for pedestrians and cyclists would be required here as part of any planning application. The solution will ultimately depend on the design and location of the accesses to the site.</p> <p>Noted. Discussions with the Clinical Commissioning Groups have taken place to inform the infrastructure delivery plan for the site. They have stated that their preferred solution to accommodating the development from the Sandleford site would be for an extension to the current premises at Falkland Practice. The feasibility of this, including car parking requirements and the</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>A3 Alternative Forms of Transport</p> <p>The SPD needs to enhance provision outside of the red line of development. An example of this is where in describing Cycle and Pedestrian Access under A1 it states “internal pedestrian and cycle routes will link into Newbury’s existing accesses onto the A339 Newtown Road and Monks Lane”. As previously described the current width of Monks Lane pavement is inadequate for pedestrians at peak times let alone cyclists, a situation exacerbated when the hedges are fully out narrowing the footpath. There is a strong safety case to segregate cycle ways from pedestrian paths and dedicated cycle ways need to be created from Monks Lane to the town centre if this mode of traffic is to be encouraged. Current Cycle Ways along the North end of Andover Road near the St John’s roundabout are inadequate as they frequently have cars parked on them causing cyclists to have to come out into the road. The Newtown Road pavement is far too narrow with too many junctions to be used safely as a dual cycle way / footpath. Cycling provision needs to be significantly enhanced beyond the Sandleford development if it is indeed to be a sustainable development and funding found to achieve this.</p> <p>F Community Facilities and Services</p>	<p>need for ancillary services being discussed direct with the Practice.</p> <p>For all of the local facilities that neighbour the site including Falkland Surgery, opportunities will be sought for direct pedestrian and cycle access from the development site to encourage people to walk and cycle to them.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is aware of the issues raised and key enhancements have already been identified as part of the IDP. The SPD has a focus on improvements within the site but also refers to eider linkages. More will be considered as part of any Transport Assessment carried out to inform a planning application.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>The Group are particularly concerned to ensure that sufficient provision is made for community facilities, and indeed given the stretched resource of current facilities in the locality that these are phased in early to the development. It is noted that the Local Centre is located in the southern half of the development which would suggest that it will be delivered later in the project. In particular:</p> <p>Provision of primary school educational facilities: the Group notes that the projections now require two two-form entry primary schools which will result in a significant increase to the secondary school intake of Park House. Whilst the Group are satisfied that conversations are ongoing with Park House and that Park House are comfortable with being able to extend to accommodate the numbers on their existing land, there is a great deal less certainty about the location of the two primary schools or when they will be built. The phasing of these schools will be crucial and discussions need to be taking place with Falkland School if they are likely to have to accommodate early residents to the estate (and the fact that such students are unlikely to want to move once the new schools are open if they are already embedded at Falkland). Given the fact that Falkland have just introduced a third entry form for the first time any such phasing plans need to be discussed with them at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Extension of Park House School: whilst Park House are comfortable with the student projections and their ability to accommodate them through extension, the increase in student projections will result in significantly more vehicle movements from the development as a result of ferrying to and from after school activities and steps need to be taken to mitigate this.</p>	<p>Noted. The phasing of these will be dependent on the timing of the development that takes place on the site, rather than phased to help address any wider deficiencies in the area.</p> <p>The final locations of facilities and services will be agreed through the planning application process. The phasing of the site will also be agreed through the planning application and is likely to be dependent on the final arrangements regarding accesses.</p> <p>Feasibility work is ongoing to discuss and agree the locations and format of primary school provision on site. The SPD sets out that the impact will need to be met from the occupation of the first dwelling; however discussions are underway with Falkland Primary School in case an interim solution is necessary.</p> <p>The traffic movements from Park House School will continue to be included in all transport assessment work for the site. Travel planning work will continue to help encourage walking and cycling to be seen as</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Early Years and Children's Centre provision for the new population: again when is this going to be phased in as existing provision at Falkland School is at capacity?</p> <p>A space for indoor community use: the Group is very concerned that a single hall will be inadequate for a development of this size. Both St George's Community Hall and St Francis' are near capacity and the Wash Common and Greenham Scout Groups are oversubscribed. Given youth activities are in the evening they often conflict with other hall uses. At a minimum there needs to be a good size community hall with a separate building for youth activities.</p> <p>Health Care Facilities: Falkland Surgery as is could not accommodate the increase in patient numbers resulting from the Sandleford development. Whilst the current premises could be expanded this will put pressure on the limited parking available at the surgery. The alternative is for a split site which could be managed by the surgery however funding and land would be required to achieve this. Again we would urge planners to speak with the Surgery before completing the requirements of the SPD so that adequate funding is put in place to achieve this.</p> <p>Post Office: the size of Sandleford and Wash Common combined would justify the presence of a new Post Office either within Sandleford or in the Wash Common Parade. This would again reduce the need for car journeys either to St John's Post Office or the main town PO. Whilst the PO is now an independent commercial</p>	<p>the normal mode of travel to school. There will need to be an access for walking and cycling direct from Sandleford into Park House.</p> <p>The phasing of this provision will be agreed through the planning application – education planning work is well progressed and has been carried out alongside the progression of the SPD. The Education team are fully engaged in the process.</p> <p>In terms of community use, the size of the provision will be appropriate for the size of the Sandleford scheme and be designed to be multi-use. It is not expected to address existing deficiencies in the surrounding area.</p> <p>The expansion of Falkland Surgery is a requirement identified within the infrastructure plan for the site and discussions are underway regarding the best way to accommodate the increase in patients and the additional requirements arising from this.</p> <p>There are no current plans for a post office</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>organisation we would expect the Council/Developers to facilitate discussions with respect to opening a new facility in the vicinity.</p> <p>P Public Open Space and Recreation versus E Ecology and Wildlife</p> <p>The Group is very concerned to ensure that adequate facilities are provided to keep all ages of young entertained whilst also reducing the need for car journeys for after school activities and also preserving the ecology of the area. The SPD is very vague on all these areas. The location of the NEAP and the north LEAP would seem at odds with the ecological goals and should be located within the residential areas where there is likely to be better control over anti social behaviour, littering and destruction of the sensitive wetland valleys.</p> <p>In addition we would like to see a commitment to the provision of a good level of high quality fixed play equipment early in the development phase to be a focus for safe exercise of younger children. Within the design there seems no provision for older children to go out and kick a ball around, and there would seem enormous scope to enhance sport provision at the Rugby Club to encompass all sports including a running track. This would have the dual benefit of providing facilities for older children whilst reducing the need for car journeys for after school activities. It will also reduce pressure on the country park and ecologically sensitive areas. Adequate provision in the park needs to be made for bins and dog bins at regular intervals and the Council to have in place a programme for the regular emptying of both. The Group supports the idea of community orchards and see the provision of allotments as essential given the likely limited size of individual gardens. However the SPD again is very vague on these matters as to size (how many</p>	<p>on site; however this could be an option to be explored further through the planning application.</p> <p>The recreational requirements of the development have been assessed taking account of the best practice guidance provided by Fields in Trust (FIT). However, further discussions have suggested that the locations proposed within the draft SPD could impact adversely on ecology; therefore it is proposed to move them to the edge of the residential areas. The outcome of this is set out within the SPD.</p> <p>There will be a Public Open Space strategy for the site, provided as part of any planning application. The final locations of the NEAP, LEAPs and LAPs will be discussed and agreed through the process of preparation of this strategy and the planning application process, taking these comments into account</p> <p>There is large potential for informal</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>allotments) and location. We would want the SPD to be much more definitive on these points. The Group also welcomes opening access to the Country Park but notes that bizarrely access points are given to most of the ancient woodlands whilst younger woodlands appear closed to access. Whilst clearly access to woodland is an essential part of the park it would seem sensible for some of the woodlands to be cordoned off in their entirety whilst other woodlands are "sacrificed" for communal use. As such it would seem logical that Crooks Copse to the north and Barn Copse to the west are made open access whilst measures are taken to preserve Stockett's Copse, High Wood and Dirty Ground Copse as non accessible woods for example. We would also suggest the opening of the woodland at the southern perimeter of the site to give access to the River Enborne. It is also understood that part of the motivation for the Park is to take pressure off Greenham Common for recreational use and as such what provision if any is being made for parking so that residential areas are not used for parking by visitors? Finally we understand that there will be provision of a Country Ranger for the Park however there is no clarity as to how this role will be funded. Moreover the SPD is scant on detail on Park Governance and who will have responsibility for the park. As a Group we believe that the addition of 2,000 homes in the area presents an opportunity to re-visit ward boundaries and as part of this exercise a new parish of Wash Common should be created which would encompass land to the West of the A339, Monks Lane and the land to the South of it, Essex Street and the land to the East of it, with the River Enborne making the Southern border. The elected body would then be the natural home for governing and maintaining the park with appropriate funding from the development to enable it to do this in perpetuity.</p>	<p>recreation of all kinds at the site as 60% of it will be undeveloped. This will be managed to ensure that it can be accommodated within the ecological and landscape capacity of the site.</p> <p>The role of the SPD is to set the framework for the planning application and its supporting documentation such as the Country Parkland Management Plan which will provide the detail. This will take into account all of the evidence available.</p> <p>Noted. It is not possible to fence off woodlands for access. None of the woodlands are proposed to be closed to access, but the emphasis will be on managing access. In terms of opening up the woodland at the southern perimeter of the site, this is a matter to be explored further through the Country Parkland Management Plan. However, this woodland is not intended to be closed off in any way.</p> <p>There will be some parking available at the Local Centre for the site.</p> <p>The Ranger post will be funded by developer contributions and this will be taken forward</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>R Renewable Energy</p> <p>This section of the SPD appears very weak. We would like to see a strong commitment to renewable energy, that street design and roof layout will seek to maximise potential of use of photo voltaic panels, there should also be a commitment for the use of ground source heat pumps. In paragraph R3 we would prefer the wording to be changed to: "Design Coding/Design Principles will embody sustainable design and construction principles including the Code for Sustainable Homes in any future planning application as these evolve over the years."</p> <p>U Urban Design Principles</p> <p>We note that the proposal is now for two neighbourhoods as opposed to three envisaged at the previous consultation. It is not clear as to what differentiates CA5 Wash Common from Sandleford Park B but believe the document to be clear that pepper potting of affordable housing throughout the site includes CA5. Moreover there should be a commitment for the affordable housing to be externally</p>	<p>through the planning application process. In terms of the management of the Country parkland, this will be set out in the Country Parkland Design and Management Plan to be implemented from the beginning of the development (development principle L3 of the draft SPD).</p> <p>The review of ward boundaries is beyond the scope of the SPD.</p> <p>Noted. This section has now been expanded further as part of the process of finalising the SPD.</p> <p>The pepperpotting of the affordable housing will be across the site to help to create a mixed inclusive community. It will also be</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>inextinguishable from other housing throughout the site. However the SPD is unclear as to the level of parking that will be made available to each property as well as space for securely storing bicycles. It is very important that the scenarios that have dogged many recent developments in the area where inadequate parking facilities leads to extensive on pavement parking, ruining verges and blocking cycles ways. Given the emphasis on family homes a minimum of 2 parking spaces per property would seem essential.</p> <p>Wash Common Community Group</p> <p>Mike Estlea – Budgens</p> <p>Emma MacPherson, Tim Walter – Falkland Surgery</p> <p>Sean Bates – Newbury Rugby Football Club</p> <p>Jim Kay, Christine Scott, John Scott – St Francis-de-Sale’s Church</p> <p>Paul Cowan – St George’s Church</p> <p>Tony Hammond, Peter Norman, Richard Page - snts</p>	<p>externally indistinguishable from other types of housing on the site in accordance with Council policy on this matter.</p> <p>In terms of the approach to parking standards for the site, this is set out in development principle A4 of the SPD. The Council is aware of the issues raised and will seek to reflect this in the level of parking provided across the site.</p>
Sean Bates		4 - We are concerned regarding the traffic and pedestrian situation particularly as it relates to Monks Lane. Great care has to be applied	Rugby club suggests more explicit references to pedestrian linkages including



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>to any modelling analysis that may not properly deal with the human factors surrounding school peak hours. In practical terms pedestrian and cycle traffic can be seen to overflow onto the highway regularly and the risks are obvious for all to see. Increases in population will place additional stress on this difficult situation. Off road pedestrian ways would seem to be a better solution.</p> <p>5 - A1 refers to cycle and pedestrian links being established to the rugby club and whilst we would like to support this I would ask that this is formalised in order to make the SPD meaningful.</p> <p>6 - A2 refers to "important links" and excludes the rugby club from consideration. This omission implies that the rugby club is not considered for integration and hence makes A1 and other points raised defective.</p> <p>7 - The rugby club sits between the new development and Park House School and Falkland Surgery, both of which suffer from traffic / parking problems and there needs to be a coordinated strategy to deal both with overflow parking at the rugby club and with pedestrian traffic that will otherwise seek to use the rugby club as an informal thoroughfare.</p> <p>9 - With housing provision so close to the rugby club boundaries, security is a concern particularly as our estate is not manned after 9:30 pm.</p> <p>10 - The rugby club will seek to benefit from bar, retail, office, conferencing and other business as a result of the new development in order to fund its sporting operations and the SPD draft does not contemplate this sufficiently to establish policy in this regard.</p>	<p>through their land to Falklands Surgery. However, the SPD already sets the framework for taking this issue forward through the planning application process. .</p> <p>Development principle A2 has been reworded to refer to an additional important connection: Newbury Rugby Club</p> <p>7. The parking issues of Park House School and Falkland Surgery will be addressed through the more detailed ongoing work on their expansion and adaptation to the development.</p> <p>10, 13. The wording of development principle F1 will be amended to refer to include the Rugby Club in the wording regarding shared use.</p> <p>11. Principle A2 will be amended as set out above.</p> <p>12. Noted. The reference to school will be changed to 'college' in relation to Sandford B.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>11 - The rugby club is not mentioned along with other neighbours for example with regard to "important connection"</p> <p>12 - The reference to "Sandleford B" (Section N) refers to "college" and this might mean "school"?</p> <p>13 - F1 refers to "shared facilities" and excludes the rugby club</p>	
Paul Goddard	West Berkshire District Council	<p>Provision of accesses and internal road layout</p> <p>1. I refer to the latest consultation in the development of the masterplan in developing Sandleford Park.</p> <p>Background:</p> <p>2. For the Examination In Public (EIP) process the development has been progressed with the provision of two accesses onto Monks Lane with Monks Lane East likely to consist of a roundabout with Monks Lane West likely to consist of a T junction.</p> <p>3. During the EIP process the Councils SATURN traffic model software package was used to ascertain the distribution of traffic to and from the site in a series of Transport Assessments. The primary purpose of SATURN is to distribute traffic and to identify what junctions would be affected by the proposal.</p> <p>4. During the EIP and since, to estimate the actual traffic levels projected with the development, the Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) was used. TRICS is a database with traffic survey data from many different land uses within the United Kingdom</p>	Comments noted and will be taken forward through the planning application process.

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>including residential. This is a very standard approach in estimating traffic generation. Comparisons were also made with traffic surveys undertaken for the Newbury Racecourse development.</p> <p>5. The Core Strategy was found sound by the Planning Inspectorate including the concept of developing Sandleford Park for development.</p> <p>6. To progress even further, access arrangements into the site, the landowners' highways and transportation consultants White Young Green (WYG) commissioned extensive traffic surveys around much of Newbury during May 2012. From these surveys and from reference to Census data WYG issued further traffic distribution charts and data for two accesses onto Monks Lane during November 2012. I also ensured that the earlier work with the SATURN model was also encompassed.</p> <p>Traffic distribution Results:</p> <p>7. The traffic distribution for traffic travelling to and from the site with two accesses onto Monks Lane was agreed with WYG during February 2013. However further public consultation since the EIP has warranted consideration of additional all vehicle accesses into the site including onto the A343 Andover Road via Warren Road and onto the A339 Newtown Road to the north of the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC).</p> <p>8. As requested, WYG have therefore produced further traffic distribution diagrams (see attachment 'P. Goddard Attach (Sandleford Park Traffic Distb)) that I have checked with the following scenarios:</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>a) The original two accesses onto Monks Lane with an additional access onto A343 Andover Road via Warren Road</p> <p>b) The original two accesses onto Monks Lane with an additional access onto the A339 Newtown Road to the north of the HWRC.</p> <p>9. The results are contained within the attachment (see 'P. Goddard Attachment Sanddeford Park Traffic Distribution Results').</p> <p>10. The provision of the additional accesses do make a considerable difference on how traffic is distributed to and from the site as follows:</p> <p>a) An access onto the A343 Andover Road would reduce development traffic onto Monks Lane by 43 to 46% that would reduce traffic through the Andover Road / Monks Lane / Essex Street Mini Roundabouts and fronting Parkhouse School by some 300 vehicles for both peak travel periods.</p> <p>b) An access onto the A339 Newtown Road would reduce development traffic onto Monks Lane by 36 to 38% that would reduce traffic on Monks Lane between the Newbury College access and the A339 by some 240 vehicles for both peak travel periods.</p> <p>c) Both accesses will reduce traffic on the A339 through Newbury town centre by some 100 vehicles during both peak travel periods.</p> <p>Access Options:</p> <p>11. From these results, the Highway Authority would prefer all four accesses to be provided, and would consider that it is essential that</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>at least three accesses serving the site be provided. It is considered that access arrangements into the site could be as follows:</p> <p>Monks Lane East – has been planned as a full sized roundabout with a central island with splitter islands that I consider should enable pedestrians and cyclists to cross. A roundabout would have the advantage of reducing traffic speeds along Monks Lane. There would be no difficulty in providing this access as the land would be owned and controlled by the developer and the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Monks Lane West – has so far been planned as a T junction, however during consultation concern has often been raised regarding traffic speeds along Monks Lane. Consideration should therefore be given to a roundabout as described above. Again, there would be no difficulty in providing this access as the land would be owned and controlled by the developer and the Highway Authority.</p> <p>A339 Newtown Road – I would recommend as a full sized roundabout with a central island with splitter islands that enable pedestrians and cyclists to cross. As mentioned above the provision of a roundabout would reduce traffic speeds. However I would be concerned regarding the provision of a new access so close to the existing ingress and egress to the HWRC. I would therefore recommend that the ingress and egress would be removed and access provided to the HWRC onto a Sandlesford Park access road. The access to the HWRC should be to the west of the existing balancing pond. This would enable any junction onto the access road for the HWRC to be at an appropriate distance from the A339. The provision of an access onto the A339 to serve Sandlesford Park would rely on negotiation with Newbury College as land from the college would be required. The provision of an additional access to the</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>college could have advantages, as a new southern access to the college could be provided that would enable easier access to the college, and would reduce traffic even further onto Monks Lane with a reduction in traffic from the college. Should the college pursue an additional southern access, I would envisage the provision of a Sandleford Park Access Road / Newbury College Access / HWRC Access Roundabout.</p> <p>A343 Andover Road – has so far been planned as an access that would be used by buses, cyclists and pedestrians only. The provision of an all vehicle access in this location is more technically challenging than an access onto the A339. Due to limited space at the A343 Andover Road / Warren Road junction, a roundabout is not possible, and therefore a traffic signal junction would be required. However traffic signal junctions have the advantage of including pedestrian phasing that would be crucial in such close proximity to the Parkhouse Secondary School and Falkland Primary School where pedestrian traffic including children / young people is high. Accesses serving the Falkland School and St Georges Church and halls would be onto or in very close proximity to the signal junction, and would need to be considered in any junction design in liaison with these parties. The provision of an access via Warren Road onto the A339 to serve Sandleford Park would rely on negotiation with Parkhouse School as land from the school would be required. The land containing Parkhouse School is owned by West Berkshire Council however negotiation would still be essential, especially as much on street car parking associated with Parkhouse and Falkland Schools would be displaced by a traffic signal junction. I consider that replacement parking and a potential reconfiguration of accesses serving Parkhouse would be required. If an all vehicle access is not provided via Warren Road then I consider that these items may not</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>be required. To reduce traffic levels on the A343 to the north of Warren Road, it may be preferable to prohibit traffic turning right from Warren Road onto the A343.</p> <p>12. There is also Public Right of Way Footpath Greenham 9 that connects onto the A339 Newtown Road opposite St Gabriel's School. Greenham 9 can form a pedestrian and cycle route to Greenham Common and New Greenham Park to and from the development. An appropriate crossing facility on the A339 would be required to accommodate the additional pedestrian and cycle traffic to and from the development. I consider that the A339 northbound lanes should be reduced to one to provide such a crossing. A crossing could be incorporated into a turn right lane facility into St Gabriel's School. This facility may be required due to increased traffic on the A339. I would envisage reducing the northbound lanes to one from the A339 / B4640 Swan PH Roundabout to at least a location north of St Gabriel's School. Not only would this enable the provision of these facilities, but may also assist in discourage traffic from using the A339 into Newbury</p> <p>Site layout:</p> <p>13. The provision of a greater number of accesses would comply with the government publication Manual for Streets (MfS). MfS also encourages permeability especially for buses, cyclist and pedestrians through a development with pedestrian routes provided alongside carriageways and cycle routes provided on carriageways.</p> <p>14. I accept that the internal road layout is not currently particularly detailed, however I am concerned that the current layout does not lend itself to a 20 mph layout required for safe permeability by</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>pedestrians and cyclists. A 20 mph layout should be encompassed within the layout rather than needing to rely on artificial speed reducing measures such as speed tables. I consider that the layout needs less straight sections of road to not only reduce speeds, but also to discourage traffic from diverting through the site to avoid other parts of the highway network.</p> <p>15. MfS discourages the provision of cul-de-sacs whenever possible to avoid the requirement for large turning heads and to spread traffic more through the development. I consider that there should be more grids and loops within the layout</p> <p>16. Should an access be provided onto the A339, I consider that a road across the northern valley is essential to encourage traffic from within the development to use the A339 access as well as spreading traffic around more within the development.</p> <p>17. Colleagues within Transport Policy have also provided more detailed comments on internal layout issues which I support.</p>	
Stewart Souden		<p>I have 2 comments:</p> <p>1. I wish the document would not say that there will be no outdoor sport area. I have been working on the assumption that the school playing fields would be dual use i.e. available for the community to use outside of normal school hours</p> <p>2. I think the reference to allotments should be removed as the information I have obtained (see below) seems to indicate there is no significant waiting list in Newbury with some vacancies.</p>	<p>The use of school facilities in and out of hours is something that is up to the schools to manage and determine based on the nature of the activity, risks etc.</p> <p>The allotments would cater for the new population from the 2,000 homes on the site rather than respond to the needs of the existing population.</p>



Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>West Mills: Vacant Plots: 3 Waiting List: 0</p> <p>Wash Common: Vacant Plots: 9 Waiting List: 0</p> <p>Southby's: Vacant Plots: 5 Waiting List: 1</p> <p>Parsons: Vacant Plots: 3 Waiting List: 0</p> <p>One Tree Park: Vacant Plots: 2 Waiting List: 2</p> <p>Dairy Farm: Vacant Plots: 3 (2 or which flooded) Waiting List: 0</p> <p>With regards to One Tree Park, the Stewards are arranging to meet the two people on the waiting list, so will soon both be zero.</p>	
Anne White		<p>Unfortunately I was unable to attend the recent meeting at the rugby club regarding the Sandleford proposal. I expressed my concern previously but this has become even more so once I was made aware of the fact that WARREN ROAD is going to potentially be an all vehicle access route for the development. How can this happen? Where this road meets Andover Road it is already HEAVILY congested at school drop off and pick up, due to Park House and Falkland schools. The latter of which are accepting an extra class of 30 children from September and so worsening the situation. The safety of children should be paramount in all this and how can their security be assured with the number of vehicles that would be involved.</p> <p>I don't know what the council would have in mind for this situation, I cannot see a roundabout or even traffic lights being able to be squeezed in and even if it could be it would mean all access routes at</p>	<p>The principle of development of the site has been established through the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>The policy for the scheme is that it will be delivered with 2 accesses off Monks Lane. However, other access options are under consideration and will be a matter for consideration and negotiation through the planning application process. Safety considerations would be paramount if an all vehicle access off Warren Road were to be a preferred option as an all vehicle access – the Council is aware of local concern and the issues raised and this would all be taken into account through the design of any scheme and would be a material consideration for</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company/Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>standstill a number of times during the day.</p> <p>Please consider my thoughts and reconsider your amended proposal.</p>	the planning application to consider.
Derek People	Park House School	<p>Section F: Community Facilities and Services</p> <p>Provision of this nature would support the effective and efficient delivery of Community Facilities and Services detailed in Section F of the Draft Supplementary Planning Document (pages 49-50), with particular reference to indoor space for community use and Library provision. Location of facilities on Park House site would have the advantage of positioning them within an established community hub.</p>	Noted.

**Section G; Appendix 3; and general comments on the whole document**

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
<b>Section G: Delivery and Implementation</b>			
Mr. K. I. Kincaid		<p>I have already sent in my form with my comments on traffic routes for the final plan.</p> <p>However, I would also like to emphasise the desirability of all construction traffic using access via the A339 Newtown Road during the construction phase. This will prevent massive disruption and high safety risk to people living on Monks Lane and Andover Road</p>	<p>Technical work has been carried out to evaluate the benefits of additional access options. Access for construction traffic will be considered at the planning application stage and any planning permission would have a condition attached requiring a construction traffic routing agreement.</p>
Cllr Tony Vickers		<p>Section G: Delivery &amp; Implementation</p> <p>We believe paragraph 125 is too weak: “anticipated” needs to be replaced with “required”. Many elements of policy can only be secured by a Legal Agreement with the owner of the whole site as contained in the red line of a full outline planning application.</p>	<p>The Council has been working with the agents for the landowners and an outline application is expected for the whole site in order that infrastructure requirements are fully set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The submission of an application is ultimately in the hands of the applicant.</p>
Barbara	Network Rail		The Site Travel Plan requirements set out in

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Morgan		<p>Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of Network Rail's infrastructure. In this regard, please find our comments below.</p> <p>Developer Contributions:</p> <p>The Supplementary Planning Document should set a strategic context requiring developer contributions towards rail infrastructure where growth areas or significant housing allocations are identified close to existing rail infrastructure.</p> <p>Many stations and routes are already operating close to capacity and a significant increase in patronage may create the need for upgrades to the existing infrastructure including improved signalling, passing loops, car parking, improved access arrangements or platform extensions.</p> <p>As Network Rail is a publicly funded organisation with a regulated remit it would not be reasonable to require Network Rail to fund rail improvements necessitated by commercial development. It is therefore appropriate to require developer contributions to fund such improvements.</p> <p>Specifically, we request that a Policy is included within the document which requires developers to fund any qualitative improvements required in relation to existing facilities and infrastructure as a direct result of increased patronage resulting from new development.</p>	<p>Appendix 2 include infrastructure funding for rail improvements (for improvements at and access to Newbury Station).</p> <p>The SPD will be amended to make clear that a Transport Assessment will be required to accompany the application. This will need to assess the impact on the rail network and identify any mitigation measures.</p> <p>Developer contributions will be considered as part of any future planning application.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>The likely impact and level of improvements required will be specific to each station and each development meaning standard charges and formulae may not be appropriate. Therefore in order to fully assess the potential impacts, and the level of developer contribution required, it is essential that where a Transport Assessment is submitted in support of a planning application that this quantifies in detail the likely impact on the rail network.</p> <p>To ensure that developer contributions can delivery appropriate improvements to the rail network we would recommend that Developer Contributions should include provisions for rail and should include the following:</p> <p>A requirement for development contributions to deliver improvements to the rail network where appropriate.</p> <p>A requirement for Transport Assessments to take cognisance of impacts to existing rail infrastructure to allow any necessary developer contributions towards rail to be calculated.</p> <p>A commitment to consult Network Rail where development may impact on the rail network and may require rail infrastructure improvements. In order to be reasonable these improvements would be restricted to a local level and would be necessary to make the development acceptable. We would not seek contributions towards major enhancement projects which are already programmed as part of Network Rail's remit.</p> <p>Level Crossings</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Development proposals' affecting the safety of level crossings is an extremely important consideration for emerging planning policy to address. The impact from development can result in a significant increase in the vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic utilising a crossing which in turn impacts upon safety and service provision.</p> <p>As a result of increased patronage, Network Rail could be forced to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using a crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements. This would be in direct conflict with strategic and government aims of improving rail services.</p> <p>In this regard, we would request that the potential impacts from development affecting Network Rail's level crossings, is specifically addressed through planning policy as there have been instances whereby Network Rail has not been consulted as statutory undertaker where a proposal has impacted on a level crossing. We request that a policy is provided confirming that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway:</li> </ul> <p>Schedule 5 (f)(ii) of the Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) order, 2010 requires that... "Where any proposed development is likely to result in a material increase in volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (public footpath, public or private road) the Planning</p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Authority's Highway Engineer must submit details to both Her Majesty's Railway Inspectorate and Network Rail for separate approval".</p> <p>- Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact: and</p> <p>- The developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed.</p> <p>Planning Applications:</p> <p>We would appreciate the Council providing Network Rail with an opportunity to comment on any future planning applications should they be submitted for sites adjoining the railway, or within close proximity to the railway as we may have more specific comments to make (further to those above).</p>	
David Stubbs		<p>There are a number of omissions in this section.</p> <p>"127 The approval of a planning application must secure all the mitigation measures appropriate to the development that is being approved. All applicants must therefore demonstrate at the outset how the mitigation is expected to be achieved."</p> <p>It must be made completely clear, not just through oblique references to a 'safe environment', that mitigation of 'adverse impacts of development' MUST include crime. There is much in the SPD about mitigation of environmental issues, sensitive to this site, but nothing at all about how the residential, education and business occupants will be</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS14: Design Principles states that developments will be expected to create safe environments, addressing crime prevention and community safety. The explanatory text states that developments should incorporate "Secured by Design" principles to reduce opportunities for crime and the fear of crime. Additional wording has now been added to the urban design principles to more fully address this issue.</p> <p>The explanatory text to CS14 also states that</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>protected. It would be expected – and the document makes clear – that equality of access and lack of discrimination will form part of the development’s ethos. This MUST include housing quality, where dwellings sold to the open market MUST have the same level of security (Secured by Design compliance) as that which is mandated for the social / affordable element. The localism principles, West Berkshire Council policy, NPPF and the requirement for ‘high quality’ development, all give weight to including clear requirements in the SPD that the developer properly addresses appropriate dwelling security to nationally approved security standards – Secured by Design - as a minimum. Although West Berkshire is generally perceived as a low crime area, any major new residential development, with all the new white goods, digital technology, vulnerable metal cabling, copper pipe work, boilers and infrastructure WILL be regarded as a honeypot and potential target by the criminal fraternity – ironically aided by the desire for good connectivity with surrounding transport networks facilitating the travelling criminal!</p> <p>"134 The Local Planning Authority will expect any planning application to be accompanied by a comprehensive Design and Access Statement."</p> <p>As alluded to above – the SPD should contain a clear statement requiring that all Design and Access Statements submitted in support of planning applications for Sandford Park include the required element setting out how the proposal will address the need for crime prevention and create environments which are free of crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>	<p>Design and Access Statements should demonstrate how a proposal addresses the design considerations set out in the policy, in the SPD Quality Design – West Berkshire and other relevant documents.</p> <p>The requirement to address issues of crime prevention and community safety and to demonstrate how they are met in the Design and Access Statement is therefore already set out in the Development Plan. The opportunity to make this clearer in the SPD has been taken, with the urban design principles expanded upon.</p>
Simon Millett	Sport England	The proposed development at Sandford Park proposes 2000 residential dwellings. Sport England is therefore disappointed that no	The Sandford site is immediately adjacent to sporting facilities at the Rugby Club and at Park



Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>formal sports provision (indoor and outdoor) is proposed.</p> <p>Sport England would assess any forthcoming planning application for the development against its adopted planning policy objectives. The focus of these objectives is that a planned approach to the provision of facilities and opportunities for sport is necessary in order to meet the needs of local communities. The occupiers of any new development, especially residential, will generate demand for sporting provision. The existing provision within an area may not be able to accommodate this increased demand without exacerbating existing and/or predicted future deficiencies. Therefore, Sport England considers that new developments should be required to contribute towards meeting the demand they generate through the provision of on-site facilities and/or providing additional capacity off-site. The level and nature of any provision should be informed by a robust evidence base such as an up to date Sports Facility Strategy, Playing Pitch Strategy or other relevant needs assessment.</p> <p>This requirement is supported by the Governments National Planning Policy Framework, which states:</p> <p>“Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision taking. (Principle 12 is) that planning should:</p> <p>Take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social, and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.” [Paragraph 17]</p> <p>“To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:</p>	<p>House School, which is an academy school and sports college. Discussions are ongoing with the Rugby Club and Park House School on the opportunities for shared use of existing and future facilities. Additionally there is a vast provision of informal open space on the site.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Requirements identified in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan include improvements to sports pitch provision in step with new development. However, no formal sports provision is currently proposed to be included on site on the basis that there is a large amount of provision on surrounding sites including Park House School, Newbury College, St Gabriel’s and Newbury Rugby Club.</p> <p>Contributions will be sought in line with the Council’s adopted SPD Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>- Plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses, and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments...</p> <p>- Ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services." [Paragraph 70]</p> <p>The population of the proposed development is 4,600 (assuming occupancy of 2.3 persons per dwelling). This additional population would generate additional demand for sports facilities. If this demand is not adequately met then it may place additional pressure on existing sports facilities, thereby creating deficiencies in facility provision. In accordance with Circular 05/05, Sport England seeks to ensure that the development meets any new sports facility needs arising as a result of the development.</p> <p>There is no information within the document regarding a contribution towards sporting provision. Provision should usually be made on site. However, where this is not possible, Sport England would expect a contribution that would support the Sandleford Park development. You may be aware that Sport England's Sports Facilities Calculator (SFC) can help to provide an indication of the likely demand that will be generated by a development for certain facility types. The Sport England Sports Facilities Calculator is available on our website at:</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/sports_facility_calculator.aspx">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/sports_facility_calculator.aspx</a></p>	

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>The calculator currently only provides information on swimming pools, sports halls, indoor bowls and synthetic turf pitches.</p> <p>As an indication, attached is the output from the calculator which shows the following minimum requirements which are appropriate for a development of 2000 new dwellings (assuming occupancy of 2.3 persons per dwelling). (Sport England attachment shows requirements for 0.23 swimming pools, 0.32 sports halls, 0.30 indoor bowls rinks and 0.14 synthetic turf pitches, with associated costs)</p> <p>Sport England would expect these minimum contributions to be provided, as well as an appropriate contribution towards playing field. Should these contributions not be forthcoming, Sport England would object to the document and forthcoming planning application(s).</p>	
Jenny Graham	West Berkshire District Council	<p>Delivery and Implementation (Section G pg 77-79)</p> <p>This section should include reference to the need for a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan to be submitted with any planning application. The Travel Plan is mentioned In the Access section, with details provided in appendix 2, but there appears to be no mention of a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Details of the cycle parking should be included in the Design and Access Statement along with car parking (para 138).</p>	<p>Reference to the need for a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan will be included within the amended version of the SPD.</p> <p>Paragraph 138 will be amended to include details of cycle parking</p>
Sean Bates		<p>8 - Section 104 of the document does not refer to access to the rugby club and this is concerning as access might then become informal including informal access to the surgery via the rugby club.</p>	<p>Paragraph 104 can be amended to include the Rugby Club in the list of nearby facilities. Access to the Rugby Club and to the surgery would need to be included as part of the detailed design.</p>
<b>Sandleford Infrastructure Requirements Identified in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan</b>			

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
Ronald Herd		<p>Above all else the Transport and Access arrangements are wholly inadequate.</p> <p>There is no certainty whatsoever that the various plans to reduce car usage will have any success. The plans only cater for those commuting into Newbury or using the train. The train service to Newbury is very poor for a town of its size and the public transport proposals do not make any provision for commuting to Thatcham, Swindon, Oxford, Basingstoke, many parts of Reading and further afield.</p> <p>The development will introduce a large number of extra journeys into the southern part of Newbury and the upgrades under consideration would not provide sufficient increases in capacity. The roads around the development could not cope. In particular the extra traffic onto Andover Road and Monks Lane will lead to gridlock at the morning rush hour as they will combine with the existing Park House and Falkland Schools traffic and commuters to overwhelm the road network. The proposed junction improvements are merely tinkering around the edges of the problem.</p> <p>Any proposal to make Warren Road an access point would be particularly problematic. The Council needs to carry out a study of the traffic movements around Warren Road and Andover Road associated with school drop off and pick up for Falkland and Park House schools. The roads struggle and feeding any extra traffic into this area will not only worsen congestion but could prove dangerous to the hundreds of school children walking to school or being dropped off in the area.</p> <p>The lack of proper access provision is the fatal flaw in the Sandleford Plan and the developers must be required to provide a more robust set of proposals as to how they will deal with access.</p>	<p>The allocation of the site was informed by 4 phases of transport assessment work which are publicly available. These have concluded that the site is deliverable with 2 vehicular accesses onto Monks Lane and an additional sustainable Transport link onto Warren Road. However, as this option was unpopular through the consultation, technical work has been carried out to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>The modelling in the Transport Assessments did not make any assumptions about modal shift away from use of the car, although measures will be put in place to encourage this. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan includes a number of improvements to public transport provision, including improvements at Newbury train station and improvements to bus services linking Sandleford and Newbury town centre and linking Newbury and Basingstoke. Together with improvements to the pedestrian and cycle way network there will be increased opportunities for more sustainable travel.</p> <p>Any proposal to provide an all vehicle access at Warren Road would need to be carefully designed and would need to consider safety aspects, including school drop off and pick up points. It is likely that the proportion of school pupils walking to</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
			school would increase with significant housing development adjacent to Park House School and with primary provision on site.
Judith Bunting		<p>PRIMARY SCHOOL PROVISION IN SANDLEFORD PARK</p> <p>Ref: "Additional primary school provision, Sandleford site to meet the requirements of the development."</p> <p>The Audit Commission recommends that in the absence of details of housing mix for each of the developments (i.e. mix of 1,2,3 or 4 bed dwellings) 36 primary age pupils should be allowed for per 100 dwellings. With 2,000 homes being planned for on the Sandleford Development, and an emphasis to be given to family housing, this amounts to a requirement for 720 primary school places, minimum.</p> <p>Appendix 1 of the SPD: Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS3 refers to "Provision of a new primary school on site". Note the singular 'school'.</p> <p>Given the Council's own recommendation in the School Places Plan 2010 that primary schools should serve no more than 420 pupils, a single school is evidently inadequate for the Sandleford development.</p> <p>I would be grateful if WB Council would reassure the residents of Newbury that they will provide the minimum of two primary schools to serve the needs of the new residents of Sandleford Park and not place undue pressure on existing primary schools.</p>	<p>The Council has made it clear that primary school provision will be provided to meet the requirements of the development as there is no capacity in the surrounding area. Using its most recent information on projected numbers of children arising from the development at Sandleford, school provision for the equivalent of two 2- form entry primary schools will be required.</p>
Cathy Harrison	Environment Agency	<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>With reference to the identified need for an upgrade to wastewater infrastructure, we would like to emphasise the following information.</p>	<p>The allocation of Sandleford for housing development was made through the Core Strategy and the housing requirement for West Berkshire of 10,500 dwellings over the period 2006 – 2026 was</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>Recent groundwater flooding has highlighted Newbury Sewage Treatment Works and its network to be vulnerable to groundwater infiltration. This has added additional strain on the network and in some places led to pollution incidences and sewage being tankered away from the network. The proposed additional 2,000 homes with result in additional strain on an already stretched network.</p>	<p>initially set out in the South East Plan. The Environment Agency and Thames Water have been fully consulted at all stages and the matters raised will be fully considered as part of the planning application process.</p>
<p>Emma Macpherson</p>	<p>Falkland Surgery</p>	<p>Whilst we see ourselves identified in the SPD and are willing to accept this position as the main health service provider in the area there are a couple of issues to highlight.</p> <p>Sandleford Park population would represent an increase of 30-40% in our current population. Whilst not all patients would register here a significant proportion would, and given the increase relating to the Racecourse development this would “fill up” the surgeries at Eastfield, Northcroft and St Mary’s as we understand is intended to occur.</p> <p>Obviously we could not accommodate this as it is at the moment, even if gradual as proposed by the development.</p> <p>The primary barrier to this is parking and the land footprint of our site, and as a pre-requisite to agreeing to accept more patients this would need to be addressed.</p> <p>The footprint of the building currently cannot accommodate the patients, staff and ancillary services expected, but providing the car-parking issues are resolved early then the building could be reconfigured providing planning permission was granted.</p> <p>We currently run a specific door to door surgery bus 3 times a week,</p>	<p>The Council is engaging with Falkland Surgery regarding provision of health services and recognises the importance of ensuring that provision is adequate to meet the needs of the new community as it grows. It will continue to liaise with the surgery and the clinical commissioning group.</p> <p>The agent will attend future meeting with Falkland Surgery to understand land/building capacity issues and also any potential contributions towards surgery bus.</p> <p>The transport implications, including car parking and bus services will need to be considered in the Travel Plan.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>and would be happy to consider extending this for the development although this is at considerable personal cost as a service to our patients and we would be happy to negotiate how to make this work for both our benefits as part of an integrated transport plan (we don't think public transport is particularly suited to healthcare needs).</p> <p>Finally we are aware of the issue of population flux and would ask that the expectation of population growth is co-ordinated between the Racecourse and Sandleford sites so that there is reduced need for mass migration back and forth both for health and education services.</p> <p>We would suggest an early meeting with the surgery, council and CCG, and suggest you consider health input (e.g. public health) into leisure and sports planning.</p>	
Sean Bates		14 - References to Falkland surgery do not appear to be in response to consultation in as much as the surgery appears not to have capacity to expand, particularly as it currently depends on the rugby club for parking.	See response above. The Council will continue to engage with the surgery and the CCG and the transport implications of extending the surgery will need to be considered in the Travel Plan
<b>Sandleford Park Draft Supplementary Planning Document General Comments</b>			
Peter Davies		It is impossible to understand why the planning officers and the committee have chosen this beautiful land for hideous intense development. On the other side of the A339 lies the unsightly Greenham Common which could be improved by development however hideous. Is there some unexplained reason for the choice?	<p>The principle of development of the site has been established through the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>The reasons for the choice of Sandleford have been explained in various topic papers and in the sustainability appraisal that accompanied the publication of the Core Strategy. The reasons were the subject of much debate at the Examination in Public. The site is in a sustainable location adjacent to the urban area and close to</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
			<p>existing facilities. It provides the opportunity to provide a county park with improved pedestrian access.</p> <p>Greenham Common was not considered to be a suitable location for a strategic urban extension. It is a popular recreational area, is more remote from the urban area and much of it is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest,</p> <p>The Council wishes to see a quality development on the Sandleford site. Housing will be at medium density with a high proportion of family homes, close to educational and retail facilities.</p>
Eric Cleeves		<p>Yes I am afraid this development will have to go ahead. Reason - The weak political parties have allowed too many settlers in to southern England. We will need another Sandleford if it has not stopped</p> <p>Note - This is not an area of outstanding natural beauty. Maybe 75 years ago. AONOB is a cliché.</p>	<p>The need for more housing in West Berkshire is primarily related to the needs of the existing community. Population growth, falling household size and a growing elderly population mean more homes are required. Otherwise housing opportunities, particularly for young people, will become more limited, with a consequent impact on the economy of the local area.</p> <p>The respondent is correct in that Sandleford is not within the North Wessex Downs AONB.</p>
Jon Waite	South Oxfordshire District Council	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this SPD. We do not have any comments to make at this stage.	Noted



Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
David Stubbs		<p>General comments</p> <p>There are good, well evidenced and cost effective solutions to incorporating appropriate security, both in the layout design and in the specification of individual buildings – which developers are notorious for ignoring or avoiding where possible – to save on the capital cost. Sandleford is conceived as a low energy, low carbon, sustainable development. Avoidable crime and anti-social behaviour blights developments that ignore this element, costing local authorities and the community and generating carbon costs in the response and the manufacture, repair and replacement of stolen and damaged infrastructure – meaning the bill is met later by the victims of offending.</p> <p>The developers are required to meet the cost of mitigating adverse impacts – including crime and the SPD should hold them to account for this element as well as the landscape, ecological, heritage and flooding aspects of the Sandleford site.</p> <p>The SPD states that the contents of the document aim to reflect the most up to date best practice principles in urban design and development. However, in the most important component of the safety, security and well being of the eventual occupants of this site, the SPD is currently significantly lacking in addressing this by giving a clear mandate that an equally high level of design is required in ALL areas of practise and principles.</p> <p>If Sandleford is going to become a high quality development that will avoid the mistakes of past development that has resulted in avoidable generation of crime, NOW is the time for the SPD contents to be made robust enough for any prospective developer to fully understand that the safety and protection of the human environment MUST be the priority of</p>	<p>Core Strategy Policy CS14: Design Principles states that developments will be expected to create safe environments, addressing crime prevention and community safety. The explanatory text states that developments should incorporate “Secured by Design” principles to reduce opportunities for crime and the fear of crime. The development principles on urban design now more fully reflect this issue.</p> <p>The explanatory text to CS14 also states that Design and Access Statements should demonstrate how a proposal addresses the design considerations set out in the policy, in the SPD Quality Design – West Berkshire and other relevant documents.</p> <p>The requirement to address issues of crime prevention and community safety and to demonstrate how they are met in the Design and Access Statement is therefore already set out in the Development Plan. The opportunity to make this clearer in the SPD has been taken by expanding on the urban design principles.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>a housing development, while giving as much consideration to wildlife as is practicable. 2000 new dwellings cannot be created without some disruption, but it is a myth to imagine that by enshrining the protection of wildlife and ignoring the needs of the human occupants, a satisfactory outcome will be judged by generations to come.</p>	
Roslyn Deeming	Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above document which was received by Natural England on 22 March 2013</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England has reviewed the Supplementary Planning Document with respect to our interests in the natural environment and considers that it comprehensively covers the landscape and biodiversity issues relevant to the site. We particularly welcome the guidance concerning the country park and the valley corridors which will provide a strong network of green infrastructure for the proposed development.</p> <p>We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	Comments noted
Simon Millett	Sport England	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Sport England is the Government agency responsible for delivering the Government's sporting objectives. Sport England has an established role within the planning system which includes providing advice and guidance on all relevant areas of national and local policy as well as supporting local authorities in developing their evidence base for sport.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Core Strategy contains a policy to protect and enhance green infrastructure, which includes outdoor sports facilities. Saved Policy RL.1 covers public open space provision in residential development and will be replaced by new policy in</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>You will also be aware that Sport England is a statutory consultee on planning applications affecting playing fields.</p> <p>The New Sport England Strategy 2012-17 sets a challenge to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See more people taking on and keeping a sporting habit for life</li> <li>- Create more opportunities for young people</li> <li>- Nurture and develop talent</li> <li>- Provide the right facilities in the right places</li> <li>- Support local authorities and unlock local funding</li> <li>- Ensure real opportunities for communities</li> </ul> <p>Sport England's role is focussed exclusively on sport, although it is recognised that sport can, and does, play an important part in achieving wider social, community and economic benefits (most notably in the context of health). Sport England recognises the vital role that the planning system can play in assisting with the delivery of our strategy. In addition, the development of sport within a local area can provide sufficient benefits to assist local authorities with the implementation of Local Plans. In this, well designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and recreation are fundamental to deliver broader Government objectives.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>Sport England would encourage Local Authorities to develop carefully</p>	<p>the forthcoming Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</p> <p>WBC notes comment...“With regards to protection, Sport England is pleased to note that no existing sporting provision would be prejudiced by the proposed development. In particular, that the playing field land at Newbury College and Newbury Rugby Club is not included within the site boundary”.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>worded policies which protect, enhance and provide for new sports facilities, including playing fields and playing pitches.</p> <p>Protect</p> <p>With regards to protection, Sport England is pleased to note that no existing sporting provision would be prejudiced by the proposed development. In particular, that the playing field land at Newbury College and Newbury Rugby Club is not included within the site boundary.</p>	
Julian Swift-Hook		<p>You will already have received the attached document entitled "West Berkshire Council Liberal Democrat Group Response to Sandleford SPD Consultation" from Cllr Vickers on behalf of the West Berkshire Council Liberal Democrat Group (see attached).</p> <p>As Liberal Democrat Ward Members for Greenham we contributed to the formation of, agree with, and support, the views in that document.</p> <p>We would emphasise that nothing in the attached document should be construed as meaning that we have changed our view - we still consider that such a large housing development in Greenham is neither necessary nor appropriate. However, development on the site is now permitted in principle, in accordance with the District's Core Strategy, so our objective now is to achieve the best outcomes for Greenham from any development.</p>	Comments noted and the Council welcomes responses which aim to achieve the best outcomes, not only for Greenham but for Newbury and West Berkshire.
Sean Bates		<p>Following several meetings within the club and community I am pleased to provide the following comments, concerns and suggestions with regard to the draft SPD.</p> <p>1 - Firstly, I am pleased to say that Sandleford Park is now a reality in</p>	The opportunity for provision of sports facilities in conjunction with the Rugby Club is welcomed.

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>our community and we now work together to ensure its successful integration. This is certainly our position as a sports club.</p> <p>2 - The rugby clubs position is that it wishes to be party to a joined up integration of Sandleford Park into the wider context and to provide sporting opportunity (not just rugby) to the new and existing community. This needs to be carefully planned and funded to be successful.</p> <p>3 - We note no provision for outdoor sports within Sandleford Park and woodland is not a substitute for playing fields in our view. NRFC can and should supply this open space in this instance and this outcome should be formalised via the SPD.</p>	
Clive Narrainen		SUPPORT DPD	Support noted
Jenny Graham	West Berkshire District Council	<p>General mapping:</p> <p>It is recommended that the maps included in the document are checked to ensure they are clear and consistent in the information they show. For example, Figure 6 showing the Masterplan is a little confusing in terms of access and circulation and not all the symbols used on the map are shown in the key.</p>	The Council is aware of some inconsistencies and inaccuracies and all maps will be amended prior to the adoption of the SPD.
Sarah Robinson		<p>Section D</p> <p>Location and context</p> <p>Local opinion has had no discernible influence on the development. By the time "Community Engagement" took place, the decisions were made, using the Core Strategy to overwhelm any other argument. There was no information regarding where people coming to live here</p>	<p>Community engagement was an important part of the preparation of the Core Strategy and is set out in the Statement of Consultation which accompanied the submission of the Core Strategy to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Assumptions on travel have been incorporated into the Transport Assessments which were prepared</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>would be working (or travelling to work) and plans for provision of the required supporting infrastructure remain very sketchy.</p> <p>The character of Wash Common will be transformed. We are told that things have to change. That is a given, but it is not a given that all change is automatically good - which has been the response to any concerns raised.</p> <p>Section F</p> <p>Access and movement</p> <p>The number of properties that can be fitted onto the development has led the process, rather than an examination what existing infrastructure can support or the need to plan new infrastructure before considering such plans.</p> <p>At the consultation event, local residents' knowledge of the area was clearly and repeatedly expressed - that the proposed traffic access onto Monks Lane was inadequate and the effect on the surrounding areas would be unacceptable, despite the computer analyses and transport models.</p> <p>We were originally assured that Warren Lane access would be a single lane bus route, at most, with no access for other vehicles into and out of the site.</p> <p>The Draft Supplementary Planning Document appears to have taken on board that the local concerns expressed regarding access and traffic are valid. However the proposals do not address the primary reason for the concerns: that the development is too large and has too many</p>	<p>as part of the Core Strategy evidence base. Infrastructure requirements are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The preparation of the SPD provides a further opportunity for the local community to put forward their suggestions and concerns. The Draft SPD took on board many of the comments raised at the earlier informal stage of consultation.</p> <p>The planning of Infrastructure has been part of the planning process from the outset. It is critical that infrastructure is in place to meet the needs of the community as it develops.</p> <p>The view that the proposed accesses onto Monks Lane were inadequate was raised at the earlier consultation and this has led to further investigation of additional access routes. The principle of a development of up to 2,000 homes has, however, already been established through the Core Strategy process when there was considerable examination of the evidence base, including the transport assessments and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was prepared alongside the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The construction of the Newbury Bypass led to reduced traffic flows in the town but will have resulted in some local traffic using Andover Road to access the A34 junction south of Wash Common.</p>

Contact Full Name	Contact Company / Organisation	Consultee Response	Council Response
		<p>properties. If local roads and infrastructure cannot sustain the traffic which will be generated, then surely the size and extent of the initial development should be reviewed and other sites should be considered to make up the difference in the number of houses needed.</p> <p>Andover Road experienced a huge increase in traffic flow, noise, pollution and congestion following the construction of the Newbury bypass. Increasing this again as a result of the development at Sandleford will have further and significant and detrimental effects on the area. The suggestion has now been made to make an all vehicle access from Warren Road onto Andover Road which would serve only to increase the existing problems of a great deal of traffic and huge congestion at peak times. The impact on the residential areas of Wash Common and existing residents throughout Wash Common should be taken into consideration.</p> <p>There is no planned access to the site via the A339, "due to the landscape impact". Access to the site from the A339 would seem a necessity.</p> <p>How is it anticipated that residents will access the A34, which presumably will be required by a large proportion of the residents, as there will be the need for many to travel elsewhere for work? ..</p> <p>What route is planned for all the construction traffic to access the site?</p> <p>Surely the A339 would be the most accessible and cause least disruption and congestion to existing areas.</p>	<p>Any proposal to provide an all vehicle access at Warren Road would need to be carefully designed and would need to consider safety aspects, including school drop off and pick up points and impact on the surrounding area..</p> <p>A potential access to the site from the A339 has been considered following the earlier public consultation exercise.</p> <p>Residents will be able to access the A34 from the A339 or from the A343.</p> <p>Access for construction traffic will be considered at the planning application stage. This will be conditioned through any planning application for the site.</p>

