

Comment

Consultee	Sue Morgan (1334325)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	Sue Morgan (1334325)
Comment ID	PS67
Response Date	15/02/23 18:45
Consultation Point	Policy SP 17 North East Thatcham Strategic Site Allocation (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Bookmark	Morgan, Sue

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

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

No

Please give reasons for your answer

- . Traffic – increased traffic through Upper Bucklebury and other villages; The scope for accidents is already too high on these 'rat-runs'.
- . Pressure on secondary schools – Kennet is already over-subscribed; accommodation for additional secondary school places has not been specifically stated. We need a new Secondary School to accommodate the extra children.
- . Consequential damage to the Common – increased footfall; increasing damage to an ecosystem of national importance. In Covid Lockdown, the width and muddiness of the footpaths through to Common were evidence that these are already heavily used.
- . Environment – Greenfield development abutting an AONB with no up-to-date evidence nor strategy for positive impact and overall biodiversity gain. Flora and fauna will not make a home in brick and concrete!
- . Pressure on medical & complementary services – additional GP surgeries are not part of NHS strategy for the future. It already takes many weeks to get a non-emergency appointment at Chapel Row Surgery and it is just not feasible for it to serve any more patients.
- . A 'Country park' – this has a specific accepted definition which is not met in this Plan. The three small, isolated areas inside the proposed settlement boundary have no meaningful environmental

value or commitment to exclude subsequent development. I am not fooled by this intensely insubstantial 'nod' to acknowledge the importance of our environment.

- . Lack of strategic gap between Thatcham and Bucklebury – Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury will effectively merge and Upper Bucklebury will lose its identity. Not only have residents chosen this place to live based on its rural identity but the Plan is disrespectful of the residents that were born and bred in the village and have a right to expect their community identity to continue.
- . Number of houses now “at least 1,500”– From an initial site assessment of 2,500 of which 1,250 were to be built in the Plan period, this has now in fact **increased** to 1,500 houses because the Plan extends to 2039 rather than 2036 (as originally proposed). The Plan proposed far too many houses and up to 50 would be more realistic.

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

- . Traffic – increased traffic through Upper Bucklebury and other villages; The scope for accidents is already too high on these 'rat-runs'.
- . Pressure on secondary schools – Kennet is already over-subscribed; accommodation for additional secondary school places has not been specifically stated. We need a new Secondary School to accommodate the extra children.
- . Consequential damage to the Common – increased footfall; increasing damage to an ecosystem of national importance. In Covid Lockdown, the width and muddiness of the footpaths through to Common were evidence that these are already heavily used.
- . Environment – Greenfield development abutting an AONB with no up-to-date evidence nor strategy for positive impact and overall biodiversity gain. Flora and fauna will not make a home in brick and concrete!
- . Pressure on medical & complementary services – additional GP surgeries are not part of NHS strategy for the future. It already takes many weeks to get a non-emergency appointment at Chapel Row Surgery and it is just not feasible for it to serve any more patients.
- . A ‘Country park’– this has a specific accepted definition which is not met in this Plan. The three small, isolated areas inside the proposed settlement boundary have no meaningful environmental

value or commitment to exclude subsequent development. I am not fooled by this intensely insubstantial 'nod' to acknowledge the importance of our environment.

- . Lack of strategic gap between Thatcham and Bucklebury – Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury will effectively merge and Upper Bucklebury will lose its identity. Not only have residents chosen this place to live based on its rural identity but the Plan is disrespectful of the residents that were born and bred in the village and have a right to expect their community identity to continue.
- . Number of houses now “at least 1,500”– From an initial site assessment of 2,500 of which 1,250 were to be built in the Plan period, this has now in fact **increased** to 1,500 houses because the Plan extends to 2039 rather than 2036 (as originally proposed). The Plan proposed far too many houses and up to 50 would be more realistic.

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.

- . Traffic – increased traffic through Upper Bucklebury and other villages; The scope for accidents is already too high on these 'rat-runs'.
- . Pressure on secondary schools – Kennet is already over-subscribed; accommodation for additional secondary school places has not been specifically stated. We need a new Secondary School to accommodate the extra children.
- . Consequential damage to the Common – increased footfall; increasing damage to an ecosystem of national importance. In Covid Lockdown, the width and muddiness of the footpaths through to Common were evidence that these are already heavily used.
- . Environment – Greenfield development abutting an AONB with no up-to-date evidence nor strategy for positive impact and overall biodiversity gain. Flora and fauna will not make a home in brick and concrete!
- . Pressure on medical & complementary services – additional GP surgeries are not part of NHS strategy for the future. It already takes many weeks to get a non-emergency appointment at Chapel Row Surgery and it is just not feasible for it to serve any more patients.
- . A 'Country park'– this has a specific accepted definition which is not met in this Plan. The three small, isolated areas inside the proposed settlement boundary have no meaningful environmental value or commitment to exclude subsequent development. I am not fooled by this intensely insubstantial 'nod' to acknowledge the importance of our environment.
- . Lack of strategic gap between Thatcham and Bucklebury – Thatcham and Upper Bucklebury will effectively merge and Upper Bucklebury will lose its identity. Not only have residents chosen this place to live based on its rural identity but the Plan is disrespectful of the residents that were born and bred in the village and have a right to expect their community identity to continue.
- . Number of houses now “at least 1,500”– From an initial site assessment of 2,500 of which 1,250 were to be built in the Plan period, this has now in fact **increased** to 1,500 houses because the Plan extends to 2039 rather than 2036 (as originally proposed). The Plan proposed far too many houses and up to 50 would be more realistic.

5. Independent Examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearing session(s)? Yes

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 . No

The publication of the report of the Inspector appointed to carry out the examination . No

The adoption of the Local Plan Review . No