



Proof of Evidence of Councillor Dr Tony Vickers – on behalf of Greenham Parish Council and Newbury Town Council

Sandleford Park, Newtown Road, Newtown, Newbury

Outline planning permission for up to 1,000 new homes; an 80 extra care housing units (Use Class C3) as part of the affordable housing provision; a new 2 form entry primary school (D1); expansion land for Park House Academy School; a local centre to comprise flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5 up to 2,150 sq m, B1a up to 200 sq m) and D1 use (up to 500sq m); the formation of new means of access onto Monks Lane; new open space including the laying out of a new country park; drainage infrastructure; walking and cycling infrastructure and other associated infrastructure works. Matters to be considered: Access.

Planning Application Reference: 20/01238/OUTMAJ

Planning Inspectorate Reference: APP/W0340/W/20/3265460

Proof of Evidence Summary

I am Councillor Dr Tony Vickers, witness for the Rule 6 Parties, Greenham Parish Council and Newbury Town Council, and will say:

- A) I am a retired chartered land surveyor (geomaticist), with over 30 years experience of living in Newbury, of which 15 have been as a Member of the LPA. In my early career as a chartered builder, I had relevant experience in the house building industry. I have represented Greenham Parish Council for 3 years, Newbury Town Council for 2 years. I co-founded the local cycling campaign group SPOKES in 2002 and have been involved in the Sandford proposals for 12 years.
- B) I will explain why the Rule 6 Parties all part company with the LPA (in the main parties' SOCG) and believe that the Appellant's TA is flawed because it fails to sufficiently address the needs of non-motorised travellers and why we disagree that Monks Lane junction locations and designs are acceptable. I will suggest solutions that are compatible with national and local planning and transport policies, for consideration as pre-start Conditions were this Appeal to be upheld.
- C) I will detail:
- a. Doubts about the appropriateness of the SOAs chosen from the 2011 Census as a guide to travel-to-work modal split data, and other assumptions made in traffic modelling for the SSSA;
 - b. The implications for potential modal shift to Active Travel - and consequential increased car dependency - of the number, location and design of access road junctions on Monks Lane and inadequate mitigation of nearby junction configuration, especially Andover Road / Monks Lane¹;
 - c. My analysis of the local terrain and its unsuitability for most cyclists, as endorsed by the recent published DfT LTN 1/20 and other policy developments;
 - d. The impact of proposed phasing of works and order of build-out of dwellings and associated on-site infrastructure on the ability of the SSSA to integrate into the Wash Common and Greenham local communities;
 - e. The impact of the Appellant's failure to agree with the other developer of the remainder of the SSSA on the viability and location of any proposed 'local

¹ With photographs as illustration

centre' in their proposals, as well as access by active travel modes to existing local schools and community facilities – especially for occupants of DPC;

- f. Reasons why we therefore reject the Appellant's claim in their TA to have produced a "Sustainable Access Strategy";
- g. Suggestions for Conditions to be applied to any Consent (and associated UU) if the SoS were minded to uphold this Appeal (without prejudice to our two councils continuing their opposition to this outline application and to the SSSA in general).

D) I will address the position of the Rule 6 Parties on all matters related to the above where the main parties' and/or their witnesses' Proofs of Evidence, or the draft UU show a need for rebuttal. Nothing I shall say is to be taken as acceptance that the proposals by the Appellant - or even the allocation of the SSSA in the Local Plan - is acceptable to the Rule 6 Parties.

Appendices:

1. Author's relevant qualifications and experience
2. Peak travel mode split assumptions and future relevance
3. Monks Lane Cycle Lane diversion
4. Critique of site access and junction mitigation proposals from an Active Travel perspective
5. Terrain and policy analysis applied to local cycling and walking networks
6. Proposals for phasing of works, occupation of dwellings and other Conditions