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STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

i. The draft Market Street Urban Village Planning & Design Brief Supplementary Planning Document was released for consultation on 18th March 2005, for a four-week period expiring on 15th April 2005.

ii. 300 consultees were contacted directly. This included Newbury 2025 Vision partners and stakeholders, landowners and leaseholders of land and/or property within the Market Street site, local residents and other neighbouring occupiers, statutory and non-statutory consultees including neighbouring local authorities, Newbury Town Council, all parish councils, English Heritage, The Government Office for the South East and local MPs.

iii. Copies of the draft planning brief were also made available for inspection at all West Berkshire libraries and the Council’s offices at Market Street, Avonbank House and Faraday Road. The draft brief was also available to view on the Council’s web site.

iv. Thirty responses were received in response to the consultation.

v. West Berkshire Council’s Executive Committee approved the changes to the draft planning brief and adopted the revised Market Street Urban Village Planning & Design Brief as a Supplementary Planning Document on XX June 2005.
# LIST OF RESPONDENTS TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Colin Milsom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Merlin Dormer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sheila Bowyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Newbury Preparative Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Mrs D Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Newbury Healing &amp; Teaching Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Reading Monthly Meeting Managing Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Reading Monthly Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Newbury Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Mr Christopher Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>English Churches Housing Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Network Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Countryside Books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Cllr Roger Hunneman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Strategic Rail Authority (SRA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Ruth M Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Newbury Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Cllr Tony Vickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>People Like Us – The Mental Health Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Royal Berkshire Fire Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Anthony Pick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>West Berkshire SPOKES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>CABE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Bracknell Forest Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>The Baptist Union Corporation Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS (respondent ref in brackets)

- No comment (10), (28), (29), (30)

General content

- Very supportive of the brief. It is comprehensive and lays out a clear vision for the Market Street opportunity with plenty of open space (11)
- In general terms, support the redevelopment of the area (15, 27)
- Supportive of the Urban Village concept with a mix of housing, including affordable (18)
- Welcome the opportunity for improved linkages to the railway station (11, 19)
- It is critical to have a cycling/pedestrian interchange with the railway. Also the bus/railway interchange is critical. (11)
- Welcome the sustainable development features such as those for water conservation (SUDS), energy efficiency, BREEAM eco-homes standard and improved access between rail and bus links (12)
- Within the Regional Planning Policy section, the Draft South East Plan should be mentioned (2, 14)
- The SPD complies with current and evolving regional policies, suggest mention of other regional policies (such as RPG9 Policies H4, H5, T9, T12, Q5, INF2, INF4 and INF5) in Appendix E to further support the brief (2)
- For defining the site (para. 2.13), add text “The site also offers an opportunity to create a link between the town centre and the residential areas south of the station, and to locate most of the commuter car parking and access on the south side. The air space above the track west of the station buildings cries out to be used.” (22)
- Para 6.02 add to fourth bullet point “both north and south of the railway”, and to penultimate bullet point after “Design” add “fully accessible” (22)
- The brief proposes a pre-conceived idea of a straight north/south footpath between the railway station and Market Street, without looking at any alternatives or the physical constraints of these ideas (1)
- The artistic impressions are poor (1)
- Welcome the point in para. 5.08 regarding flexibility to meet changing market demand (21)
Early discussions with the Town Council and community by the applicants are encouraged (21)

(Para 1.02) Reference is made to the brief being prepared in accordance with the local plan though the local plan does not refer to elements such as a residential-led mixed use development, as indicated in the brief (23)

The site is outside the main retail area of Newbury, and the retail/commercial element of the proposed scheme should not compromise the role of the core retail areas to the north (2)

The development should fully meet the functional requirements of the Building Regulations 1991 and guidance given in Approved Document B should be taken into account. Recommend installing domestic sprinklers into the residential element of the development (25)

An unnecessary and unwanted development (3)

The development will ruin the market town (3, 4)

Concern with loss of sheltered accommodation at Thomas Merriman Court, would seek an alternative location for the scheme off site (15)

Consider alternative layout with a green wedge of land to the east of the site, retaining the Friends Meeting House and garden, with the station square adjacent to the green wedge. The square would have a series of steps, and a ramp would pass through a public garden. The north/south access would divide with a route to the north east and another branch to the north west, providing larger, less fragmented and more practicable blocks for new buildings. (1, 17, 21)

**Conservation Area, Listed Buildings and Archaeology**

Agree with para 2.24 on complementing and enhancing existing vistas, skylines and landmarks (11, 26). Especially agree with vista of Newbury town Hall (11)

Agree with preserving listed buildings (11)

The proposal does not give full consideration to the Conservation Area (1, 17)

It is not clear to what extent the development proposals will be sensitive to the potential for impacts upon the historic environment (17, 23)

Para 2.23 describes key views and vistas (shown on fig 6) but views from the site to St. Nicolas Church tower and the clock tower of the Town Hall are ignored in its conclusions (1)

Reference should be made to the emerging West Berkshire Council’s ‘Newbury Historic Character Study’ (21)

Reference should be made to the Newbury Town Design Statement (26)

Figure 7 fails to look beyond the immediate boundary of the site (23)
Para 3.03 should include policies on conservation areas, listed buildings and archaeology. (23)

**Access & Transport**

- The through route to the railway station needs careful consideration given to the change in levels (1, 6, 20), the distance and number of steps poses problems particularly for those with luggage, the elderly and the disabled (1, 6)
- Support interchange spine across the whole of the site from North to South, including Station Road (11)
- Consider electric buses to use the interchange spine (11)
- Consider creating a green corridor along the eastern side of the site with pedestrian access to Market Street opposite the new cinema and the entrance to the Kennet Centre (1, 13, 17, 18)
- The north/south path would end opposite the blank wall of the Kennet Centre (1, 21)
- The footpaths fragment the site, giving poor building blocks (1)
- The document fails to emphasise the potential to integrate the railway station with the town, both north and south of the railway line (22)
- Buses, taxis and cars should be able to access the station to the north (13, 22, 17, 18) to provide an interchange between modes of transport – potentially by creating a loop past the front of the station from Cheap Street round to Market Street. If the Cheap Street/Station Approach bend is too sharp for buses then some railway land could be taken (1, 13, 17, 18)
- The brief shows the railway station car park removed, and taxis prevented from passing the north of the station (1)
- Market Street and Station Road should be for access only to remove motorised through-journeys (27)
- Proper assessment is required of the transport around and through the area, including the interchange between modes (1, 17)
- Add text to explicitly state that any redevelopment proposals for Newbury Station will require there to be consultation with the Strategic Rail Authority, or any successors, to ensure compatibility with their objectives and requirements. (19)
- There is a lack of disabled access between platforms, para 2.16, add “There is however, no access between platforms for wheelchairs.” (22)
- Concern with the loss of the bus-rail interchange for bus stops along Market Street, with less facilities and with still a walk from the railway station (1, 17, 18)
- Limited turn area in front of station as indicated would be inadequate and subject to immediate congestion (18)
- Use the change in levels to accommodate a two storey underground car park beneath the new development (1)
- Concern with car parking provision for railway station (17, 20).
- Quantity of station car parking should be at least unchanged (16).
- Concern with lack of parking provision (17, 6, 26)
- Would prefer to see the multi-storey car park on the South side of the railway line (13, 21, 22), with better access from the A339 (11)
- Would like to see further interchange facilities and car parking to the South of the railway station (17, 18, 21, 22)
- Para. 5.13 add text “As much long-stay commuter parking as possible should be accommodated to the south side of the railway tracks” (22)
- Due to the location of the site, residential parking should be limited (6)
- The Council office generates a high demand for car parking, consider relocation of Council offices (17)
- Protection from the elements such as in the form of covered walkways and covered cycle storage would help make walking and cycling more attractive and convenient (11, 22, 27)
- There is almost no provision for cycling or cycling facilities (22, 27)
- More emphasis needs to be made for cycling provision, para 6.06 add text “the movement network should ensure that routes for all modes across the site and between the south of the town and the town centre are enhanced and where possible segregated. New opportunities to link the development with secondary retail areas along Bartholomew Street and Cheap Street should be taken.” (22)
- Would like to have an improved east-west cycle route between West Fields and the employment areas east of the A339 (22)
- Figure 14 should show cycle routes (22)
- Agree with better pedestrian/cycle access across station (21, 27)
- Would like to see a second crossing of the railway line in the short term (11).
- Support in principle the provision of a second crossing (11, 13, 16, 21, 22, 27)
- The brief appears to site a building close to the ideal alignment for a second crossing – that is, a north-south line from the junction of Link Road to the vehicular route on the north side which is currently the access road to the Council Office car park. The location of that block will need to be revised (27)
- Para 5.14 add text “By use of lifts and a new footbridge over the tracks, access for disabled persons to all parts of the site should be significantly improved if at all possible.” (22)
- Potential for residential development to the South of the railway station, possibly decking over the existing car park (16)
The maintenance compound to the south of the station must be retained somewhere in close proximity to the station (16)
Consider widening the railway bridge of Winchcombe Road to allow traffic to turn right into the railway station (16)
Include intelligent parking signs on the approach roads to the town (and station) (16)
Para. 7.06 lists possible Section 106 contributions towards, amongst other things, improved linkages and access to the station, but this is the main concept behind the scheme (21).
Transport and access arrangements are important in achieving overall accessibility. Permission should only be granted on the basis that the necessary legal agreements are put in place to secure the arrangements set out in the brief (2)

**Newbury Friends Meeting House**

- The garden of the meeting house provides open space and biodiversity (1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 17, 18, 21)
- The Meeting House is a place of worship and a community facility (1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 21, 24)
- Concern that the decision to lose the Quaker Meeting House has already been taken (5, 6, 8, 9)
- Concern for potential loss of the Chestnut tree to the front of the Meeting House (1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 17, 18)
- The house is valued for its proximity to the former Quaker burial ground (5, 8, 9)
- Loss of Friends Meeting House which has conference facilities, host to over 40 groups, and provides 2 low rent flats (1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 20, 24)

**Biodiversity / Environment**

- Agree with provision of open space (11)
- Strongly support the objectives for habitat creation, provision of adequate, accessible open space and for creative conservation measures such as planting native species and incorporating bird and bat boxes into buildings (12)
- Green space is essential for supporting biodiversity (21)
- Concern with the limited mention of flora and fauna (1)
- The brief allows for no retention of open green areas, trees or wildlife (1, 17)
- What about provision of play ground equipment on site, or off site as part of a S106? (11)
Consider the issue of green roofs (see http://www.english-nature.org.uk/news/news_photo/Greenroofs.pdf) (12)

Clarification on para 2.43 required, which must state that ‘site investigations will be required due to the proximity of other contaminated sites’. (14)

The biodiversity audit should also take account of Sand Martins nesting in the walls. (21)

Both sides of the station area flood after heavy rain, restricting access to the station (21)

The opportunity should be taken to ensure high standards of eco-efficiency, design and other renewable energy technologies (2)

Appendixes

Appendix D should also show Gas (21)

Appendix E, E.17 – include reference to Q5 ‘the physical capacity of existing centres and the scope for expansion whilst respecting historic character and cultural value’ (2, 23)

Sustainability Appraisal

The list of PPPs should include PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control (14)

Sustainability objective no.2 could have another indicator of percentage of trees of native provenance in area/tree lined roads (14)

Support sustainability objective no.3 which has excellent indicators for reducing contributions to climate change (14)

References to the local plan in para 9.1 and 16.5 suggest deviation from the ‘plan-led’ approach. Clearer justification is required. (23)

The brief makes a number of references to elements of the historic environment, the significance of these features of significance is not reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal (23)

Section 13 and table 1, and table 2 do not cover the historic environment (23)

The key objectives in para 9.2 are different to those in the brief (para 1.03). Protection and enhancement of the historic environment should feature in both lists. (23)

PPG16 should be included in para. 11.3 (23)
### COUNCIL’S RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Colin Milsom</td>
<td>Conclusions of brief allow for no retention of open green areas, trees or wildlife</td>
<td>No amendment proposed. The Council does not agree that the brief fails to allow retention of open space areas, trees or wildlife. Rather the brief expects any redevelopment within the site to provide high quality landscaping (para 6.02) and the avoidance of damage (where possible) and promotion of biodiversity (para 2.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief appears to be based around a pre-conceived idea of a straight North/South footpath between the railway station and Market Street, without reference to alternatives or physical site constraints.</td>
<td>No amendment proposed. The brief does not promote a specific north/south footpath. It does however, require a strong north-south pedestrian route that will provide a direct connection between the rail station and Market Street. The precise alignment of such a route is a matter to be addressed by detailed redevelopment proposals, having regard to all the objectives, expectations, requirements and constraints as set out within the planning brief. A fundamental intent of the planning brief is to promote a permeable and accessible area, with strengthened pedestrian routes and the provision of new areas of open space. Within this context the planning brief purposefully requires development blocks to be relatively small, in keeping with the historic urban grain to create a more ‘walkable’ and user-friendly public realm. (see para 6.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North/South footpath will end up opposite the blank wall of the Kennet Centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footpaths fragment the site too much resulting in poor building blocks</td>
<td>No amendment proposed. Highway conditions along Market Street resulting from a comprehensive redevelopment of the core of the planning brief site will be expected to be addressed through detailed redevelopment proposals and the Council will not permit proposals that result in unacceptable highways impact. The Council does not agree that bus shelters are necessarily unsightly and is satisfied that shelters can be designed and accommodated along Market Street without harm to the streetscene or surrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North / South route should be divided to allow easy access to/from north West (Bartholomew Street area,) and to/from north East (Cheap Street area) and allow larger less fragmented building blocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus shelters along Market Street will be unsightly and likely to cause congestion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bus access to railway station forecourt should be considered, via a circulation route involving Cheap Street and Council offices access road.

No amendment proposed. The provision of a circulation route for buses to the north of the rail station would significantly prejudice the potential of the area to provide an improvement to the setting of Newbury Rail Station as a key gateway to the town centre, to provide improvements to pedestrian access to the station and meet other objectives and environmental enhancements as set out within the Brief.

Station Plaza is a fundamental component of redevelopment expectations for the site. It will provide a strong positive image as one of the key gateways into the town centre, and has a key role in promoting pedestrian movement between the town centre and the rail station. A key objective of the planning brief is to promote a permeable and accessible area, with strengthened pedestrian routes and the provision of new areas of open space. The Council considers it fundamentally right therefore that the plaza is a sizeable, open, pedestrian friendly, high quality open space and considers these attributes would be lost if a vehicular circulation route bisected the site. In addition, there are also concerns regarding the ability of the site to accommodate both multi-storey car park provision (accessed from Market Street) and a through route suitable for buses, as well as achieving the other objectives for the site.

The Council recognises the benefits of enabling bus access to the north of the rail station in promoting public transport use and the integration of different modes of travel. This has been recognised in the Brief by creating an high quality, attractive and direct link to bus facilities on Market Street which can accommodate all sizes of vehicle and the turning head immediately outside the station which can accommodate smaller vehicles such as those used in the more rural parts of the district. In addition, in anticipating the redevelopment of the core area of the Market Street site, other land use considerations are also relevant. These include facilitating and fostering pedestrian movement particularly between the town centre and rail station, ensuring a development that enhances the gateway role of the station and providing for a high density, mixed use development of a layout area.
– Underground parking to be constructed under new development taking advantage of the site level change.

– Station plaza will be draughty unattractive place, it should be smaller scale more reminiscent of Inch’s Yard or Weavers Walk.

– Station square should have glazed roof

– East side of site should be retained as green wedge of open land with trees and gardens, to include Friends Meeting House

– Station square should be located at eastern end of station at southern end of green wedge, aligning with ticket office and extended railway footbridge. Existing ramp from Station Approach also incorporate to provide disable access between levels

– No expert assessment of flora and fauna on the site.

– Future shape of area should be informed by proper assessments of flora and fauna around and through the site

and design that enhances the conservation area status of the site. It is considered that an appropriate balance has been achieved in the Brief.

– The Council recognises the layout and topography of the site may present opportunity for innovative solutions to the expectations for new development set out within the brief. Para 6.16 suggests car parking ideas, including the use of undercroft parking.

– No amendment proposed. The precise layout, design and finish of the plaza area is a matter to be addressed by detailed redevelopment proposals. However, Station Plaza is a fundamental component of redevelopment expectations for the site. It will provide a strong positive image as one of the key gateways into the town centre, and has a key role in facilitating and fostering pedestrian movement between the town centre and the rail station. The Council considers it fundamentally right therefore that the plaza is a sizeable, open, pedestrian friendly, high quality open space.

– No amendment proposed. Retention of a green wedge and the provision of a north-south pedestrian route to the east of the site is unlikely to result in a development that meets all the requirements of the Brief, including providing a high density mixed use development that respects the historic context of the site and surrounding area, providing significantly improved pedestrian permeability through the site, with open spaces overlooked by active frontages providing passive surveillance, allowing appropriate vehicular access to the rail station and overall providing a development that engenders a strong sense of place.

– Because of extensive hardsurfacing the site is considered to have low biodiversity and it is therefore considered reasonable to prepare the brief ahead of a biodiversity audit for the site. A biodiversity audit of the core of the site is due to take place in May /June 2005 (to allow assessment at a time when both fauna and flora are likely to be particularly active, subject to appropriate weather conditions). The audit will subsequently be made publicly available. The Brief requires
potential applicants to both avoid damage to biodiversity and seek to promote it (through, for example, habitat creation and creative conservation measures). However, to clarify the expectations placed on developers, **para 2.41 is amended** to include specific reference that developers should take fully into account the biodiversity audit in preparing development proposals. **Para 2.41 is also amended** by replacing reference to April / May with “June / July 2005”.

- Future shape of area should be informed by proper assessment of transport around and through the site
- No amendment proposed. The Brief has been prepared with regard to transport and movement issues, in and around the site and Appendix F provides an outline of the existing transport and movement characteristics of the site. The brief is also informed by the Movement Study for Newbury and the Strategic Bus and Coach Interchange Study as identified by para 3.35
- Lack of archaeological knowledge on area to north of railway station.
- The Council has undertaken an archaeological appraisal of the core area of site (see Appendix B) and is scheduled to undertake field evaluation within the Highfield Avenue area. The appraisal has highlighted that much of the site is of low value archaeologically, although it does recognise that further research is needed to clarify the nature of the Friends Meeting House and burials that might exist at this location. The Council will welcome any further information on the archaeology of the site that may be made available.
- The “Beaux-arts” style of the diagrams do not suit the site (1)
- The artistic impressions set out at pages 41 – 43 (as renumbered) are intended as a means of demonstrating visually how the principles of the brief could be interpreted. Developers are encouraged to be innovative in their approach.

2 SEERA
- Support for intention to include an element of affordable housing
- No amendment proposed. Para 5.13 of the brief recognises that developers will be expected to ensure that an effective and workable car parking solution is provided within any proposed development.
Planning policies (both national and local) and a highly sustainable location support the principle of reduced residential parking through the application of maximum parking standards as set out within the West Berkshire Local Plan (see Policy TRANS.1). The Council will expect all development proposals to conform with all levels of planning policy and guidance, including national and local car parking policy (see para 3.02).

- Support the principle of mixed use development.
- Scheme should be of a nature and scale that does not compromise the role of the core retail areas of the town.
- High densities promoted by the brief are appropriate
- Support the promotion of environmental technology and sustainability measures

3 Merlin Downer
- Object. Unnecessary and unwanted development that will radically change the station area and ruin this part of Newbury.

4 Sheila Bowyer
- General objection on planning & transport matters in Newbury.

5 Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) Newbury Preparative Meeting
- Brief fails to appreciate the role of the Friends Meeting House in religious life in Newbury.
- Existing premises already provides small conference facilities
- Existing Premises already provides affordable housing
- Existing premises meets environmental requirements of Brief
- Brief fails to ensure protection of horse chestnut tree to on Highfield Avenue

No amendment proposed. The preparation of the planning brief for the Market Street site reflects the aims of the Newbury 2025 Vision which sets out a strategic framework for Newbury for the next 20 years. The Vision has been subject to extensive consultation and is shared and supported by the community, business, voluntary groups and local and national agencies.

No amendment proposed. This consultation response does not refer to Market Street Planning Brief issues.

The purpose of the Planning Brief is to identify and indicate an approach to how development on the site may be taken forward. In doing so the Brief sets out the concepts, opportunities and constraints of the site, and planning principles and an urban design rationale to guide redevelopment proposals.
From a planning perspective, the Council considers that whilst it may be possible to retain the Friends Meeting House on the site, this could significantly impact on the overall quality of form, layout and design of proposed redevelopment schemes and the ability of any redevelopment scheme to maximise the opportunity for high-quality, high-density, residential-led, mixed used sustainable development that achieves the aspirations of the Newbury 2025 Vision and all the expectations for the site as set out within the Brief.

Whilst the Planning Brief should not specifically identify the loss of the Friends Meeting House as a specific requirement of redevelopment, the Council considers the loss of the Meeting House to be a likely scenario in view of the expectations for the site as a whole and it is appropriate therefore for the Brief to recognise this probability. However, to properly reflect that the loss of the Meeting House is likely rather than assured, **para 5.06 is amended to read “any loss of the Quaker Meeting House”**.

The Council understands that the Meeting House serves as a facility for numerous groups as well as the Quakers, and considers that this community use contributes to the diversity and vitality of the town centre. The Brief (para 5.06) recognises the importance of community use provision within any redevelopment. However, in response to representations received and in order to strengthen the expectations on developers further, **para 5.06 is amended to make more explicit the requirement for redevelopment proposals to include community facilities, including the re-provision of existing community uses.**

Some of the issues raised by the representations regarding the retention / reprovision of the Meeting House are not planning matters that should be considered or addressed within the planning brief. These will need to be considered by the Council (and its preferred developer partner) from a property perspective.
### Statement of Consultation

**Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2000**, which set a minimum period for consultation of 4 weeks. The consultation undertaken for the draft planning brief complied with the regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Mrs D Richmond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation period is a sham as brief already refers to loss of the Quaker Meeting House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing premises already provides small conference facilities and replacement facilities for hirers will be very difficult to find.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about distance between railway station and bus facilities for pedestrians, particularly in view of gradient of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of car parks will be disastrous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See response to Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Newbury Preparative Meeting (respondent no. 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Newbury Healing and Teaching Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object to the loss of the Quaker Meeting House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See response to Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Newbury Preparative Meeting (respondent no. 5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Religious Society of Friends Reading Monthly Meeting Managing Trustees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing premises already provides small conference facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing premises already provides affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing premises meets environmental requirements of Brief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief fails to ensure protection of horse chestnut tree to on Highfield Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Quaker site is valued due to proximity to former Quaker burial ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brief threatens Compulsory Purchase action without taking into account what the Meeting House offers the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See response to Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Newbury Preparative Meeting (respondent no. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9 | Religious Society of Friends Reading Monthly Meeting | - Retention of existing premises could be incorporated into a redevelopment plan  
- Brief fails to appreciate the role of the friends meeting house in religious life in Newbury.  
- Existing premises already provides small conference facilities unavailable elsewhere in Newbury.  
- Existing premises already provides affordable housing.  
- Existing premises meets environmental requirements of Brief.  
- Brief fails to ensure protection of horse chestnut tree to on Highfield Avenue.  
- Retention of existing premises could be incorporated into a redevelopment plan.  
- Height of existing premises is in line with design brief for east side of redevelopment site.  
- See response to Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Newbury Preparative Meeting (respondent no. 5) |
| 10 | Highways Agency | - No comments. |
| 11 | Newbury Town Council | - Overall support for the brief. Brief is comprehensive and lays out a clear vision for the Market Street opportunity with plenty of open space.  
- Support for preserving vista of Town Hall, preserving listed buildings, provision of open space, provision of interchange spine.  
- Preference for multi-storey car park on south side of railway line & better access from A339.  
- Noted  
- Noted  
- The Council recognises the layout and topography of the site may present opportunity for innovative solutions to the expectations for new development set out within the brief. The Council has no objections in principle to the provision of additional multi-storey car parking to the south of the site. Such car parking provision would be insufficient to fully provide the parking requirements of the site but could reduce the overall level of provision on the north side which could provide some design benefits. If parking is provided on the south side it is considered that an additional pedestrian / cycle crossing of the railway would be required to ensure appropriate inks to the town centre are provided. It should be noted however, that due to the physical constraints of the southern site which would limit the |
resultant level of car parking that could be provided, this approach may not be viable.

− Seek reference to Play Ground provision (including equipment) including in S106 requirements.

− Cycle and pedestrian interchange with railway and bus / railway interchange should be weather protected if possible (covered walkways etc).

No amendment proposed. The provision of children’s play space within new developments is addressed by Policies RL1 and RL2 of the Local Plan and the Brief is clear that all relevant policy and guidance needs to be considered by developers in proposing redevelopment on the site (see para 3.02). Additionally, the brief specifically refers to SPG 04/4 (Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development) which sets out the Council’s approach for securing developer contributions from development. Topic paper 7 of SPG 04/4 deals with open space and includes specific reference to contributions towards children’s play space.

− Generally concurs with comments of Colin Milsom but no objection to block layout and pedestrian routes.

− One-way road access route proposed, via a circulation route involving Cheap Street and Council offices access road. Road should be at lower level than pedestrian to north of rail station, to prevent pedestrian vehicle conflict.

− Consider multi-storey car park to south side of railway with linking bridge over railway.

No amendment proposed. The detail of the design and finish of public spaces within the site is a matter to be addressed by detailed redevelopment proposals.

− The Brief has been amended by the addition of new paras 4.12 – 4.14. The Council recognises the layout and topography of the site may present opportunity for innovative solutions to the expectations for new development set out within the brief. The Council has no objections in principle to the provision of additional multi-storey car parking to the south of the site. Such car parking provision would be insufficient to fully provide the parking requirements of the site but could reduce the overall level of provision on the north side which could provide some design benefits. If parking is provided on the south side it is considered that an additional pedestrian / cycle crossing of the railway would be required to ensure appropriate inks to
Brief could promote higher rise development - up to 8/9 storeys.

No amendment proposed. The Brief supports in principle the high density use of the site, but 8 - 9 storeys is considered inappropriate in regard to the conservation area status of the site, potential impact on neighbouring buildings, including listed buildings and other factors as set out within the brief (see paras 6.21 – 6.26).

English Nature

Welcome the sustainable development features within the brief including. Water conservation (SUDS), energy efficiency, BREEAM eco-homes standard and improved access between rail and bus links.

Strongly support objectives for habitat creation, open space provision and creative conservation measures.

Consider scope for green roof as part of design expectations.

Noted

Environment Agency

Within the SA Report the list of PPSs should contain PPS23.(para 11.3)

The “Policy and Practice for the Protection of Groundwater” Environment Agency Guidance should be referred to in the SA Report

Add “percentage of trees of native provenance in area / tree lined roads” as additional indicator to sustainability objectives No.2 in the SA Report

Agreed. Reference to PPS23, Planning and Pollution Control has been included (see para 11.3 of SA Report).

Agreed. Paragraph 11.3 of SA Report has been amended to include the Environment Agency guidance.

No amendment proposed. The Council recognises the role of native trees as contributing to sustainability but considers it unnecessary in this case to include a specific indicator because there is limited likelihood of redevelopment occurring on the site which will have the potential to include the provision of trees. The only significant development foreseen is the comprehensive redevelopment of the core area site where landscaping issues will be covered by the
For clarity paragraphs 2.10 and 2.11 are amended to reflect the role of the brief as regards both the areas within and outside the core area of the site.

15 English Churches Housing Group — General support for the brief but concern over potential implications for possible demolition / CPO of Thomas Merriman Court.

— Support point 2.43 with inclusion of reference that site investigations will be required due to the proximity of other commercial sites, between Cheap Street and Winchcombe Road (A339) and west of Bartholomew Street and the railway.

— References to national policy guidance should be corrected with updated references.

— Draft South East Plan should be referred to.

— Agreed. The relevant wording has been added to para 2.43.

— Agreed appropriate amendments have been made to Section 3 (para. 3.05) to update and correctly reference national policy, including adding reference to PPS23.

— Agreed. A new paragraph has been added to Section 3 (para 3.08) referring to the Draft South East Plan. Appropriate additional text is also added to Appendix E, Planning Policy Analysis.

16 Network Rail — General support for brief.

— Noted.
− A339 railway bridge should be widened to allow right turn into railway station to improve access to interchange.

− Intelligent parking signs on approach roads to town centre should be required.

− Car park to south side of railway should be decked and high density residential development to south side of railway should be encouraged. Fig 11 be amended appropriately.

− Maintenance compound must be retained in close proximity to station, although may be relocated to allow enhanced space around southern station entrance.
− Access to rail track at western end of car parks must be retained.

− No amendment proposed. The A339 lies outside of the planning brief area and it would be inappropriate for the Brief to provide guidance or set out expectations for the use of land outside of its boundary. This matter would be more appropriately considered as part of a comprehensive review of movement issues within the Town Centre, informed by the Newbury Movement Study and the LTP process.

− The Council will welcome the provision of intelligent parking signs, or other such facilities that assist in improving access to and around the town centre. This is however, a detailed point that is more appropriately addressed through the planning application process. Notwithstanding the above the brief includes reference to infrastructure provision (paras 7.05 – 7.07) which refers to the potential for S106 contributions including towards transport infrastructure and services.

− The Brief has been amended by the addition of new paras 4.12 – 4.14. The Council recognises the layout and topography of the site may present opportunity for innovative solutions to the expectations for new development set out within the brief. The Council has no objections in principle to the provision of additional multi-storey car parking to the south of the site or to high density residential development. Such car parking provision would be insufficient to fully provide the parking requirements of the site but could reduce the overall level of provision on the north side which could provide some design benefits. If parking is provided on the south side it is considered that an additional pedestrian/cycle crossing of the railway would be required to ensure appropriate inks to the town centre are provided. It should be noted however, that due to the physical constraints of the southern site which would limit the resultant level of car parking that could be provided, this approach may not be viable.

− Agreed. The Brief is amended (see new para. 2.45) to include specific reference to both the need to retain a maintenance compound in close proximity to the station and the retention of access to the rail track at the western end of the existing car parks.
— Support for principle of pedestrian / cycle link over railway to south of station.

— Quantity of car parking to be at least unchanged and journey times from car parking space to station should not be increased.

— The brief includes reference to the re-provision of existing car parking spaces within a multi-storey car park, and notes that a more detailed parking study will be required to confirm the exact scale and form of the car parking facilities (see para 4.11). As regards distance of the car parking from the rail station, the precise layout, and design of car parking is a matter to be addressed by detailed redevelopment proposals. However, a key objective of the brief is better integration of and access to the rail station, together with environmental enhancements, so as to foster and facilitate rail transport use and the Council will expect development proposals to meet the objective.

17 Countryside Books

— Generally concurs with comments of Colin Milsom except considers bus station should be retained.

— Illogical to remove the bus station. Brief should seek improvements to environment of bus station and improvements to ticketing and waiting facilities and setting down point for arriving and departing passengers.

— No amendment proposed. Continued operation of the bus station at its present site would unacceptably impair the ability of the site to meet the objectives and expectations for the site as set out in the planning brief and established by the Newbury 2025 Vision. Improvements and enhancement to public transport services, including better integration of bus services with rail station and facilities for passengers are key components of the brief, as is the promotion of more sustainable use of land.

— Removal of surface car parking is essential

— Consider scope for relocation of Council operations from site and removal of council offices and car parking.

— Agreed. The reprovision of existing car parking to multi-storey car parking is a key component of the Brief.

— No amendment proposed. The Council’s expectation is for the core area of the site to be subject to comprehensive redevelopment, and has prepared the planning brief in order to provide planning guidance and layout and design parameters which any development proposals that subsequently come forward on the site should comply with. Paragraphs 2.10 and 2.11 are amended to reflect the role of...
– Character of the conservation area will not be retained if development proceeds.

– Concern over lack of proper bus rail interchange.
– Row of bus stops in Market Street, separated from rail station by appreciable walk with negligible facilities will not encourage ridership

– Supports comments of Colin Milsom regarding circular vehicular access (bus, taxi, cars) route to front of station.
– Supports Colin Milsom’s comments regarding green corridor at eastern side of site

– Potential inadequate bus access at Cheap Street/Station Approach junction can be overcome by use of some railway land to ease the severity of the corner.

The Brief proposes the continued provision of bus services to the southern station entrance and access for mini and midi buses via Station Approach. Additionally bus services accessed from Market Street are supported by the provision of high quality bus shelters and active frontages including cafes, bars and restaurants, linked to the rail station via a direct, high quality pedestrian access.

See response to Colin Milsom’s comments

No amendment proposed. The Council recognises the benefits of enabling bus access to the north of the rail station in promoting public transport use and the integration of different modes of travel. This has been recognised in the Brief by creating an high quality, attractive and direct link to bus facilities on Market Street which can accommodate all sizes of vehicle and the turning head immediately outside the station which can accommodate smaller vehicles such as those used in the more rural parts of the district.
In addition due to physical constraints of the site, provide a turning head suitable for double-decker sized buses would likely prejudice the brief as regards both the areas within and outside the core area of the site. The Council offices are located outside of the core area.

No amendment proposed. It is accepted that redevelopment will affect the existing character and appearance of the area, however, the Council is satisfied that the Brief gives appropriate consideration to the conservation area concerns. In particular paras 6.04 and 6.05 require new development to respect and complement the historic environment of the town centre in terms of scale, style, form and materials. Additionally, para. 3.03 includes reference to Policy ENV.33 of the Local Plan which states that the Council will not permit development which would harm or prejudice the special character or appearance of a conservation area.
ability of redevelopment of the site to satisfy all the objectives of the Brief. It is considered that an appropriate balance has been achieved in the Brief.

- Car parking should be promoted to south side, along with further interchange facilities.

- The Brief has been amended by the addition of new paras 4.12 – 4.14. The Council recognises the layout and topography of the site may present opportunity for innovative solutions to the expectations for new development set out within the brief. The Council has no objections in principle to the provision of additional multi-storey car parking to the south of the site. Such car parking provision would be insufficient to fully provide the parking requirements of the site but could reduce the overall level of provision on the north side which could provide some design benefits. If parking is provided on the south side it is considered that an additional pedestrian / cycle crossing of the railway would be required to ensure appropriate inks to the town centre are provided. It should be noted however, that due to the physical constraints of the southern site which would limit the resultant level of car parking that could be provided, this approach may not be viable.

- Limited turning area to front of rail station is inadequate.

- No amendment proposed. The diagrams and sketches within the brief are for illustrative purposes to suggest possible interpretations of the brief. All proposals will be expected to comply with all relevant highway standards and the Council will not permit proposals that result in unacceptable highways impact

- Newbury Quakers should be able to retain their presence on the site

- See response to Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Newbury Preparative Meeting (respondent no. 5)

- Additional text to be included to explicitly state that any redevelopment proposals for Newbury Station will require there to be consultation with the Strategic Rail Authority, or any successors, to ensure compatibility with their objectives and requirements.

- Welcomes the opportunity for improved linkages to the station

- Agreed. Additional text included at new para 2.46

- Noted
20 Ruth Saunders

- Brief fails to appreciate the role of the friends meeting house.
- Existing premises already provides small conference facilities.
- Existing premises already provides affordable housing.
- Concern about distance between railway station and bus facilities for pedestrians, particularly in view of gradient of land.

- Replacement car parking for rail station users required.

- See response to Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), Newbury Preparative Meeting (respondent no. 5)
- The Council recognises the benefits of enabling bus access to the north of the rail station in promoting public transport use and the integration of different modes of travel. This has been recognised in the Brief by creating a high quality, attractive and direct pedestrian link to bus facilities on Market Street. Additionally the brief provides for a turning head immediately outside the station which can accommodate smaller buses such as those used in the more rural parts of the district.

- No amendment proposed. Para 4.11 (as renumbered) addresses anticipated number of parking spaces required and establishes the need for a more detailed parking study to confirm the exact scale and form of the car parking facilities.

21 Newbury Society

- Developers should be encouraged to bring forward ideas and not be rigidly constrained by planning brief.

- Support Colin Milsom’s comments regarding the retention of trees and open spaces, the bus station and the way from the rail station to the Kennet Centre.

- Preference for multi-storey car park on south side of railway line.

- The Brief has been amended by the addition of new paras 4.12 – 4.14. The Council recognises the layout and topography of the site may present opportunity for innovative solutions to the expectations for new development set out within the brief. The Council has no objections in principle to the provision of additional multi-storey car parking to the south of the site. Such car parking provision would be insufficient to fully provide the parking requirements of the site but could reduce the overall level of provision on the north side which could provide some design benefits. If parking is provided on the
south side it is considered that an additional pedestrian / cycle crossing of the railway would be required to ensure appropriate inks to the town centre are provided. It should be noted however, that due to the physical constraints of the southern site which would limit the resultant level of car parking that could be provided, this approach may not be viable.

- Brief should refer to Newbury Historic Character Study”.

- Support provision of green areas.

- Include reference to “pepper potting” of affordable housing (para 5.12)

- Potential for reference to S106 contributions for community building on Wharf.

- Support better pedestrian / cycle access across station.

- Support principle that development should be designed to be flexible to meet changing market demands (para 5.08).

- Numerous minor clarification additions to paragraphs.

- Brief makes minimal provision for cycling

---

Cllr Tony Vickers

- Brief makes minimal provision for cycling

- Agreed. The Newbury Historic Character Study is in preparation and due to be available from June 2005. **Reference to the study is included as a revision to the brief in Section 3 (para 3.41).**

- Noted.

- No amendment proposed. Para 5.12 refers to “effective integration of affordable units”. Para 3.22 also refers to affordable housing policy HSG.9 and guidance given within SPG 04/4 which details the Council’s expectation for affordable housing to be ‘pepper potted’.

- No amendment proposed. The Brief refers to SPG 04/4 (Delivering Investment from Sustainable Development) which sets out the Council’s approach for securing developer contributions. The Council will expect all development on the site to comply with Policy OVS.3 and the guidance given in SPG04/4. This may include contributions towards community facilities. It would be inappropriate, however, for the planning brief to include specific reference to such facilities in the absence of a specific development proposal.

- Noted.

- Noted.

- Agreed. Appropriate corrections and amendments have been made to the text where relevant.

- No amendment proposed. The brief contains numerous references to
Cycling including cycle parking and access (including amendments set out within this document) and the potential provision of a pedestrian / cycle bridge.

The Brief has been amended by the addition of new paras 4.12 – 4.14. The Council recognises the layout and topography of the site may present opportunity for innovative solutions to the expectations for new development set out within the brief. The Council has no objections in principle to the provision of additional multi-storey car parking to the south of the site. Such car parking provision would be insufficient to fully provide the parking requirements of the site but could reduce the overall level of provision on the north side which could provide some design benefits. If parking is provided on the south side it is considered that an additional pedestrian / cycle crossing of the railway would be required to ensure appropriate links to the town centre are provided. It should be noted however, that due to the physical constraints of the southern site which would limit the resultant level of car parking that could be provided, this approach may not be viable.

Add additional paragraph to promote link between the town centre and residential areas south of the rail station, including reference to commuter car parking on south side of station, and potential use of space above rail tracks.

Preference for multi-storey car park on south side of railway line.

Explore potential for Council car parking (or part thereof) to be accommodated south of railway to allow additional residential development to north of railway.

The Brief has been amended by the addition of new paras 4.12 – 4.14. The Council recognises the layout and topography of the site may present opportunity for innovative solutions to the expectations for new development set out within the brief. The Council has no objections in principle to the provision of additional multi-storey car parking to the south of the site. Such car parking provision would be insufficient to fully provide the parking requirements of the site but could reduce the overall level of provision on the north side which could provide some design benefits. If parking is provided on the south side it is considered that an additional pedestrian / cycle crossing of the railway would be required to ensure appropriate links to the town centre are provided. It should be noted however, that due to the physical constraints of the southern site which would limit the resultant level of car parking that could be provided, this approach may not be viable.

Agreed. Para. 6.07 (bullet point 5) refers to the importance of a link between the south and north of the rail station and the town centre beyond and promotes the provision of a pedestrian / cycle bridge. The para. is amended to place greater emphasis on enhancing the connections between the areas north and south of the railway, including the opportunity to provide disabled access between rail platforms.

The Council is satisfied that the brief appropriately recognises cycle access and parking issues. Para 6.07 (as renumbered) supports the reinforcement of all routes. However, for clarity it is amended to ensure proper recognition of pedestrian and cycle movements across the site, including between the south of the town and the town centre.

Proposed land uses (residential-led mixed use, car parking, leisure uses)
are not allocated on the site within the adopted local plan and proposals should therefore be the subject of an AAP or other DPD and not SPD.

- References to the local plan in SA Report para 9.1 and 16.5 suggest deviation from the 'plan-led' approach. Clearer justification is required.

- Brief is inconsistent in the weight given to the significance of the historic environment.

- Fig 7 should look beyond the immediate boundary of the site to take full account of para 2.22 and the opportunities and constraints of the site including archaeology and impact on listed buildings and the conservation area.

- Para. 3.03 should include policies on conservation areas, listed buildings and archaeology.

- The Brief does not introduce new policy and the Council is satisfied that the uses identified for the site are entirely in line with adopted planning policy including SHOP.1A, HSG.1 and ECON.5.

- The Council does not agree. Paragraphs 9.1 and 16.5 provide clear explanation of the role of the SPD in relation to the West Berkshire Local Plan, the anticipated West Berkshire LDF and the Newbury 2025 Vision for Newbury Town Centre, and an explanation of where the SPD sits in the hierarchy of plans and how the plan-led system is being followed in the context of preparing the SPD. The Council is satisfied that rather than deviating from a plan-led approach the preparation of the Brief is wholly consistent with government expectations and good planning practice.

- No amendment proposed. The brief includes clear references to listed buildings, the conservation area and the historic environment of Newbury Town Centre. The Brief has been prepared in order to facilitate and guide redevelopment on the site, specifically the core area, in line with policies and objectives set out principally within the West Berks. Local Plan and Newbury 2025 Vision. The weight given to the historic environment is balanced alongside other significant objectives for the site as detailed within the Brief and the Council is satisfied that the Brief (with the amendments outlined in this document) gives appropriate weight to the significance of the historic environment.

- No amendment proposed. Fig 7 includes recognition of the Conservation Area beyond the boundary of the planning brief site and other constraints that have particular implications for redevelopment at the site. Fig 7 should not be seen as providing a definitive list of all constraints and should not be considered in isolation to the rest of the planning brief document.

- No amendment proposed. Para. 3.03 includes reference to Policy ENV.33 which refers to development in Conservation Areas. Policy
ENV.32 (Alterations and Extensions to Listed buildings) is not listed under para. 3.03 as it is not considered a “most relevant” policy in the context of the site having regard to likely redevelopment proposals. In any event, para 3.02 states that all relevant policy and guidance needs to be considered by developers for proposals in the Market Street site, and Policy ENV.32 is specifically referred to by the brief at para 2.36 and within Appendix E. Appendix C also provides a schedule of listed buildings within the site.

An archaeological appraisal of the site has been carried out to inform the brief and is included at Appendix B. This concludes that much of the core area of the site is of low value archaeologically. Archaeology is not therefore considered a “most relevant” policy in the context of the site having regard to the likely redevelopment proposals.

The contribution of listed buildings and others of local importance should be respected (para 6.04).

No amendment proposed. The Para 6.04 concerns new development on the site, and the para 6.05 sets out that such new development should respect and complement the historic environment of the town centre in terms of scale, style, form and materials. Listed buildings and others of local importance form part of the historic environment of the town centre.

Amend Appendix E to include reference to the guidance at Q5.d.ii of RPG9 and Local Plan policies ENV.32, ENV.39 and ENV.40.

Agreed. Appropriate text has been added where relevant to Appendix E.

The two sets of objectives are purposefully different as they address two separate matters. Para 1.03 of the Brief provides the objectives of the Brief as a planning document. Para 9.2 of the SA Report details the objectives which the Council expects development on the site to achieve. For clarity the key objectives of the SPD as set out within the SA Report have been added to the text of the Brief at para 1.04 (as renumbered)

The Council considers that the protection and enhancement of the site as part of a conservation area is extensively addressed by the Brief and accommodated through specific references including para

Key objectives within SA Report are different to those in the Brief.

Unacceptable that protection and enhancement of conservation area status of the site does not feature explicitly as a key objective of the site.
SA should recognise the impact on upon the historic environment as a significant effect of the SPD. Sections 10, 13 and table 4 should be amended to reflect the comprehensive redevelopment (of the conservation area, with listed buildings within and nearby the site, and potential wider impacts on townscape) is a significant issue with likely significant effects.

SA report should include reference to the historic environment within the baseline information (section 13 & Table 1) and sustainability objectives (table 2).

Historic environment is not reflected in the SA report.

PPG16 should be included within the list of PPPs.

The SA Report is amended by reference to the impact on the conservation area / historic environment within sections 12 and Tables 1, 2 and 4. New para 6.06 is added to the Planning Brief. It should be noted that there is no current Conservation Area appraisal. However, the Brief does require redevelopment proposals have regard to the Newbury Historic Character Study, and comprehensive redevelopment on the site to be informed by a conservation area appraisal to ensure redevelopment protects the special character or appearance of the Conservation Area as required by local plan policy (see new para 6.06).

No amendment proposed. The SA Scoping report was clear that in assessing the PPPs it had regard to sustainability objectives established in the development plan. This is because the development plan provides the policy context for the requirements set out within the brief. Other PPPs are reviewed only where they are more up to date than the development plan. PPG16 predates the local plan.

The core of the site is a significant and underused brownfield site in a highly sustainable location, and one that has been identified through the Newbury 2025 Vision as offering considerable potential for development. The Council is committed to the principle of redevelopment of the site, and has prepared the planning brief in order that such redevelopment is taken forward in an appropriate and sustainable manner.

No amendment proposed. This is a detailed matter that falls outside the scope of the planning brief. The matter is more appropriately addressed through the planning application process and/or through building regulation requirements.
residential developments.

26 Anthony Pick

− All housing should be adequately provided with integral car parking.

− Support for adequate vista to landmark buildings.

27 West Berkshire Spokes

− Welcomes redevelopment of the Quarter. “The design brief contains many elements which are meritorious”.

− Support the inclusion of a cycle / footbridge railway crossing (para 4.07).

− Improvements should be made to the aesthetic, function and quantity of cycle parking to the north side of the rail station.

− Brief should require improved cycle parking to north and south of rail station and around Market Street.

− Significant areas for cycle parking should be created at both ends of Market Street.

− New areas of high quality, visually pleasing covered cycle parking should be introduced to the south side of the railway station.

− There is no indication of what is to be done to improve, relocate or increase cycle parking at the proposed Station Plaza.

− Support for provision of pedestrian and cycle links (para 6.07).

− Location of multi-storey car park block (Fig 14) needs revising in order to accommodate ideal alignment for pedestrian / cycle bridge over railway.

− Active street frontage should be promoted in Market Street.

− No amendment proposed. Para 4.11 (as renumbered) addresses anticipated number of parking spaces required and establishes the need for a more detailed parking study to confirm the exact scale and form of the car parking facilities.

− Noted

− Noted

− Noted

− Noted

− Para 6.30 ensures the provision of appropriate and adequate cycle parking, Para 6.132 requires an enhanced southern entrance to the rail station to incorporate cycle stands / parking provision. The Council will expect suitable cycle parking provision in appropriate locations (to suit cyclists requirements) For additional clarity new para 4.08 is added that specifically addresses expectations for cycle provision from new development.

− Noted

− Fig 14 is an indicative plan the purpose of which is to give diagrammatic form to the layout and design principles expressed in the text. As such it should not be seen as a definitive requirement and should not be taken as showing precisely where new buildings should be located.

− No amendment proposed. The Brief requires new buildings to present active frontages to the proposed network of street and spaces (para 6.11), with the Market Street frontage in particular being considered.
appropriate for a mix of uses at ground floor level to including an extension of existing leisure and retail units with flats and offices on upper levels. (para 6.14). Whilst the Council would welcome the creation of a more active frontage to the north side of Market Street this lies outside of the planning brief area and so is not addressed by the Brief.

- There is no indication of how cyclist access Station plaza. In particular a western cycle approach to the plaza and station entrance must be provided.

- Brief should include dedicated section containing Area Design Guidance for station road and south side of railway station. A design similar to the north side proposals is would be supported

- The brief is amended by the inclusion of appropriate text at para 6.07 referring to cycle access from Bartholomew Street

- Brief should include dedicated section containing Area Design Guidance for station road and south side of railway station. A design similar to the north side proposals is would be supported

- The area design guidance at pages 41 – 43 (as renumbered) are intended as a means of demonstrating visually how the principles of the brief could be interpreted. The guidance pages should not be considered as separate from the rest of the Brief. The principles set out within the area design guidance pages re-emphasise the principles detailed throughout the brief and have been produced for the area to the north side of the railway due to its key role in the comprehensive redevelopment of the core area of the site. A separate specific area design guidance for the south side of the railway is not considered necessary.

28  CABE  —  Pleased that an SPD is being prepared but no detailed comments on content of the document.

29  Bracknell Forest Borough Council  —  No comment.

30  The Baptist Union Corporation Ltd  —  No comment.

—  Noted
### Minor Amendments and Typing Corrections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagrams</td>
<td>Ensure they show where North is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 2, figure 1 and Appendix F, figure F3.</td>
<td>Reference is made to Oxford which should be shown on the map with the A34 and railway line going through it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4, figure 3 and para 2.14</td>
<td>Replace ‘Vodaphone’ with ‘Vodafone’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5, para 2.18</td>
<td>Can we update with the current status of the cinema site beyond planning permission granted as construction is expected soon, e.g. Construction start and end dates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 11, para 2.34</td>
<td>At least No.1 Highfield Avenue was built about 1925, the brief refers to the houses of Highfield Avenue being built in the 1930’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14, para 3.05</td>
<td>PPG1 should be removed as it is not longer relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 19, para 3.39</td>
<td>Refer to the proposed enhancement of the Market Place as the café/bar/restaurant Quarter and for the development of the evening economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 23, para 5.03</td>
<td>Remove “Swindon” as it is unlikely that anyone commutes by rail from Newbury to Swindon, commuting would be by car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 27, figure 9</td>
<td>Consider labelling Station Road, Market Street and other places highlighted in para 6.06 and 6.07 to tie in with the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 27, para 6.07</td>
<td>Change ‘Six Bells’ to ‘Eight Bells’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 29, para 6.13, 2nd bullet point</td>
<td>Replace ‘offices’ with ‘office’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 29, para 6.13, 6th bullet point</td>
<td>Clarification required for ‘community accommodation’ – is this residential or community facilities such as those which will be lost from the Quakers Meeting House?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 31, figure 12</td>
<td>Consider labelling street names so that it ties in with the explanatory text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages following on from para 6.32</td>
<td>‘Market Street Frontage’: Insert comma in first line – ‘A wide, light-controlled…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second para - insert the words ‘is to be’ between ‘development’ and ‘defined’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth para – change the word ‘to’ to ‘will’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>A number of sites are identified which are outside the site boundary. Delete reference to these in Appendix A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A, map ref no. 40</td>
<td>Lease is held by English Churches Housing Group (ECHG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F, Figure F5</td>
<td>Change ‘Principle’ for ‘Principal’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F, page 5, F.27</td>
<td>Is 2500 people one third of the ‘people of Newbury’?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>