

## Comment

Consultee	Caroline Farrant (1333522)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	Caroline Farrant (1333522)
Comment ID	PS12
Response Date	22/02/23 20:31
Consultation Point	Policy RSA 19 Land west of Spring Meadows, Great Shefford (Site Ref: GS1) ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Bookmark	Farrant, Caroline

### 1. Do you consider the Local Plan Review is legally compliant?

*Please see the guidance note for an explanation of what 'legally compliant' means*

Yes

### 2. Do you consider the Local Plan Review is sound?

*Please see the guidance notes for an explanation of what 'soundness' means.*

The soundness of the LPR should be assessed against the following criteria from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

*Please tick all that apply:*

**Positively Prepared: The plan provides a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed need and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development.** . No

**Justified: the plan is an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence.** . No

**Effective: the plan is deliverable over the plan period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground.** . No

**Consistent with national policy: the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies of the NPPF.** . No

#### **Please give reasons for your answer**

The plan in no way takes in consideration what current residents want or need in their locality. Evidence of potential flooding has been found, but because the flooding isn't on the actual sites it's ignored, impact on surrounding housing hasn't been considered

#### **3. Do you consider the Local Plan Review complies with the Duty to Co-operate?**

*Please see the guidance note for an explanation of what 'Duty to Cooperate' means.*

No

#### **4. Proposed Changes**

**Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Review legally compliant or sound, having regard to the tests you have identified above (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).**

*You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan Review legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.*

I don't think the plans for great shefford have considered the impact on spring meadows fully, there are sections with footpath and no surplus road width to allow them, the roads are barely two car width wide. It hasn't been considered that the parking is already difficult and there will be at least 30 more cars travelling through the street. 15 houses is too many. Flooding is a major issue In the village the plan identifies that the planned area is at risk of flooding, but it doesn't appear that the current housing flooding risk has been assessed, it's also been identified that there will be too much pressure on the sewage works in east shefford.

#### **5. Independent Examination**

**If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearing session(s)?** . No

#### **6. Notification of Progress of the Local Plan Review**

**Do you wish to be notified of any of the following?**

*Please tick all that apply*

**The submission of the Local Plan Review for Independent Examination** . Yes

**The publication of the report of the Inspector appointed to carry out the examination** . Yes

**The adoption of the Local Plan Review** . Yes