

## Comment

Consultee	Nigel Colman (1259984)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	* Upper Buckleury *
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	Nigel Colman (1259984)
Comment ID	PS74
Response Date	18/02/23 14:59
Consultation Point	Policy SP 17 North East Thatcham Strategic Site Allocation ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Bookmark	Colman, Nigel

### 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

Destroying an AONB cannot be legal!

### 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** . No

**is accommodated where practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development.**

**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 is completely unsound. It is not positively prepared, justified, effective and nor is it consistent with national policy.

It would not be a sustainable development for WBC nor the Thatcham area.

The grounds for impact and benefit assessment lack any credibility whatsoever and are simply not evidence-based. No realistic alternatives have been explored and there is no evidence to show that this is an appropriate strategy for WBC.

There is no evidence that such a ridiculously large development is deliverable within the timescale.

This development would destroy the landscape in an AONB.

The increased traffic, lack of access, junctions, car parks and insufficient safe and sustainable transport would increase the risk of accidents.

There is completely inadequate education and healthcare provision already and this development would exacerbate the problems significantly.

**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

**Please give reasons for your answer**

There is insufficient evidence that local residents views have been taken into account.

**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