

Comment

Consultee	David Griffiths-Eyton (1334987)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	David Griffiths-Eyton (1334987)
Comment ID	PS460
Response Date	02/03/23 11:14
Consultation Point	Policy SP 17 North East Thatcham Strategic Site Allocation (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Bookmark	Griffiths-Eyton, David

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

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 LPR does not explain how the necessary educational requirements will be met. It is unsound because there is no detail on when, where or with what funding the required schools will be built. It states that a secondary school won't be viable but the proposal will be too big for the existing local schools to cope.

The LPR is illegal and unsound because it does not provide the strategy documents to support its Sustainability Charter/Appraisal so we have no idea how it will mitigate the ecological damage from building in a greenfield site.

The plan is unsound because it doesn't explain how increased traffic on Harts Hill Road will be handled. It is already an unsafe route with no pavement so totally unsuitable for walking, cycling or more cars.

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

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