

## **APPENDIX A**

**WEST BERKSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**  
**AMENDED SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) – SANDLEFORD PARK**  
**STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION – FEBRUARY 2015**

### **Introduction**

Consultation and stakeholder engagement is a vital part of the production of any planning document and a Statement of Consultation has been prepared alongside the amendments to the Sandleford Park SPD in accordance with the 2012 Regulations. The Statement of Consultation sets out:

- Who has been consulted during the preparation of the SPD;
- A summary of the main issues raised; and
- How these issues have been addressed in the SPD.

### **Background**

Land at Sandleford Park, on the southern edge of Newbury is identified in the West Berkshire Core Strategy which was adopted in July 2012 as a Strategic Site Allocation for up to 2000 dwellings with associated infrastructure. The site will help to meet West Berkshire's housing requirement to 2026 of 10,500 dwellings and will also provide education, community uses and public open space including Country Parkland.

The principle for developing the site was established through the Core Strategy, and a Supplementary Planning Document was then prepared and adopted in September 2013 in order to form a framework for the future development of the allocated site and to set out in more detail how Sandleford Park should be delivered to bring forward a comprehensive and well planned sustainable urban extension to Newbury.

The adopted SPD was subject to a formal 6 week period of consultation, from 22 March to 3 May 2013, in accordance with Regulations 12 and 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Full details of the consultation held during the preparation of the adopted SPD are set out in the Statement of Consultation which is available at [www.westberks.gov.uk/sandleford](http://www.westberks.gov.uk/sandleford).

The SPD was then updated in December 2014 to reflect the need for a single planning application for the site. This will ensure that the site is comprehensively delivered, with timely and well planned provision of infrastructure. This requirement is set out as a new development principle for the site (principle S1) and reflected through other amendments throughout the SPD.

### **Details of Consultation on Amended SPD**

The draft amended SPD for the Sandleford Park strategic site was published for consultation on Friday 12<sup>th</sup> December 2014, following approval at a meeting of Council on 11<sup>th</sup> December. The amendments were shown as tracked changes in the SPD that was published for consultation, for ease of reference. The consultation process ran for 7 weeks and closed on Friday 30<sup>th</sup> January 2015.

Details of the consultation were sent to all those who are registered on the consultation database. This includes individuals, developers, planning agents and other planning professionals, public bodies, government organisations, our Parish and Town Councils, and our neighbouring authorities.

A total of 32 comments were received from 26 contributing consultees. Of these, 2 comments were not directly related to the Sandleford Park site, but referred to development more generally. These comments have been included in the statement below for completeness. The remaining comments have been considered, and amendments made to the draft SPD as appropriate. The table below sets out the comments received in full together with the Council's response.

**STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION**

**Amended Supplementary Planning Document: Sandleford Park Strategic Site**

**Public Consultation from 12<sup>th</sup> December 2014 to 30<sup>th</sup> January 2015**

**Total of 32 comments from 26 contributing consultees**

**Table 1: Schedule of consultation responses to the Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014**

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
Mr Christopher Moore		Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p><b>Highways:</b> The site should not be accessed off Warren Road, which is a quiet residential area. The junction with Andover Road could create traffic queues at busy times, and could raise safety issues with proximity to Park House school. Traffic from the west of the site wanting to travel east, south or north would either have to pass through the development (if the layout permits and if public open space permits) or pass along Andover Road and Monks Lane. I can foresee both the Andover Road/Monks Lane and Monks Lane/Newtown Road/A339 junctions becoming very congested. Some traffic from the development wanting to travel north to the M4 will still pass through the town rather than use the bypass, particularly if dropping off children etc. Traffic going to Thatcham or beyond will use the A339 or Bury's Bank Road, which is not suitable for heavy traffic. If the destination is Basingstoke there will be more pressure on the A339, already one of the worst A roads in the region.</p> <p><b>Education:</b> The provision of a new primary school is paramount, and before houses are occupied. Similarly secondary education needs extending, and not just Park House. Some parents may choose, for example, St Bartholomews or Kennet (putting more pressure on roads). Also the nursery or pre-school should be open before houses are occupied.</p> <p><b>Affordable Housing:</b> 40% provision is good, providing it is enforced and the debacle at Parkway is not repeated. The houses/flats should be built in the same timescale as the private housing, a provider should be appointed before construction commences.</p> <p><b>Environment:</b> The development should prioritise retention of valuable natural features and wildlife - there is only one chance. In addition the developer must contribute towards construction and future maintenance of footpaths, dog-walking areas, wildlife habitats, streams etc. The area is currently a valuable natural environment, and residential development must not be allowed to override this.</p> <p><b>House types:</b> The design should include a mixture of styles, but with the emphasis on 1/2/3 bedroom houses and flats. The affordable housing should be designed in conjunction with the appointed provider to ensure there is the right mix for the location. I am willing to accept 3 storey houses and 4 storey flats, but not high rise development.</p> <p><b>Developer contributions:</b> The developer should pay for, or at least contribute a high proportion, of any on-site facilities required for the development, eg schools,</p>	<p>The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>Additional access points would also maximise the opportunities for permeability through the site. Any access will be designed with paramount regard to safety.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>Phasing of the development is a matter for the planning application. The timing of delivering facilities generally relates to the numbers of houses on the site (as in the implementation plan for the Racecourse site). However, if there's a particular requirement for facilities (such as primary provision) then this will need to be agreed as part of the pre-application process. Paragraph 96 of the SPD does state that due to insufficient capacity on the local area, the impact of primary provision will have to be met from the occupation of the first dwelling.</p> <p>The affordable housing will be delivered in accordance with the policy within the Core Strategy. The delivery the affordable units will be a matter to be agreed through the planning application / pre-application process.</p> <p>The SPD sets out development principles under Section F to ensure the landscape, heritage, ecology and wildlife are properly managed. The development principles set out a number of requirements to be assessed through the planning application process.</p> <p>The SPD outlines that the development will provide a range of house types and sizes, with predominantly family homes. The provision should respond to evidence on housing need and demand.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements arising as a result of the development are set out within the SPD. The Council's adopted Planning Obligations SPD sets out the approach for securing contributions and</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>surgeries, play areas, footpaths, wildlife habitats, in addition to his direct responsibility of roads, drainage etc. In addition he should pay for any off-site costs arising from the additional population, eg schools, highways, doctors, emergence services, environmental enhancement, social services. He must not be allowed to sign up to contributions, only to later plead poverty. All extra or improved provision as a result of the development must be paid for "up-front" and not related to occupation of a certain number of houses.</p>	<p>requiring obligations from development.</p>
Miss Ann K Sutton	The Hollies Care Home	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>Having had close links with Burghfield Common since 1966, I feel I am in a position to express my opinion on the suggestion of further expansion to the village.</p> <p>I feel that further housing on any large scale would be a disadvantage to Burghfield Common as well as to Mortimer, Burghfield village, Sulhamstead and surrounding villages.</p> <p>It could mean that the whole of Reading, to Thatcham, with the small villages in between become continuous housing, putting an extra strain on roads (already in poor repair), outdated sewage systems (a real weakness in village areas) schools and medical facilities (both already stretched to and in some cases beyond capacity).</p> <p>If the local authority is finding it difficult to serve our area in these essential services with current levels of population it is foolish to contemplate greater strains on our infra-structure.</p> <p>If authorities allow this extent of expansion the amount of green areas essential for balancing the proportion of CO2 in the atmosphere would be unacceptably compromised.</p> <p>Please ensure that we preserve the ecology of the area and keep sufficient areas of natural environment, for recreational, leisure and sporting activities.</p>	<p>Comments noted, however this response is not related to the Sandleford Park SPD; Proposed Amendments December 2014.</p>
Emma Pattison	Fisher German LLP	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>Thank you for your letter to GPSS, Government Pipelines and Storage Systems dated 12<sup>th</sup> December 2014 regarding the above. Please find attached a plan of our clients apparatus. We would ask that you contact us if any works are in the vicinity of the GPSS pipeline or alternatively go to <a href="http://www.linerearchbeforeudig.co.uk">www.linerearchbeforeudig.co.uk</a> our free online enquiry service.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Pipeline is not present at this site.</p>
Mr. Simon Musgrave		Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>After reading through all the relevant documents, clearly there are some major flaws which need to be addressed before the site is deemed realistically viable.</p> <p>The fact the developers have tried to place multiple planning applications questions their suitability and obvious differing agendas. Certainly the good of Newbury comes very low on the list whilst capital gain by pushing through an unrealistic plan remains high.</p> <p>Within the SPD the traffic distribution analysis into Hampshire is far too simplistic and the traffic density numbers are unrealistic and extremely conservative. Likewise, there are no solutions to the bottle neck at the Monks Lane &amp; A339 roundabout.</p> <p>If the traffic document reflects the sub standard level of analysis into the required infrastructure to support the Sandleford development; then the whole issues of schooling, healthcare, utilities and traffic needs to be reconsidered as I (&amp; many</p>	<p>The principle of development on the site has been established through the Core Strategy process and the site has been accepted as the location to provide a long term urban extension which will deliver up to 2000 homes over at least a 20 year period. The principle of development on the site is not being reassessed.</p> <p>Through the proposed amendments the Council are seeking to ensure that a single planning application is submitted to allow the site to be developed in a comprehensive manner with the coordinated and timely delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The allocation of the site has been informed by four phases of Transport Assessment work, which has fed into the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There has been additional Transport Assessment work carried out since the site was allocated and more is being undertaken by the Council to provide the necessary detail to assess any planning application.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			others) have no confidence in the current plan. It's up to West Berks to take ownership of this & now be more proactive in reassessing the suitability of the site. Clearly there is a critical requirement for more realistic data to be utilised for comprehensive analysis. The proposed amendments do not go far enough and will be a false economy in the long run – the liability burden will be left with West Berks, not the developers.	as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.  Infrastructure requirements do change over time (for example the child yield figures which inform school, provision have increased) and it is important to take revised information into account. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is carried out in conjunction with service providers is therefore a live document.
Office of Rail Regulation	Office of Rail Regulation	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>Thanks for your e-mail dated 12.12.14 in regard to the West Berkshire Local Plan Update December 2014, consulting on a supplementary planning document. We have reviewed your proposals and supporting documents &amp; note that your proposals do not affect the current or (future) operation of the mainline network in Great Britain.</p> <p>It might be helpful if I explain that the office has a number of key functions and duties in our role as the independent regulator of Britain's Railways. If your plans relate to the development of the current railway network including the operation of passenger and freight services, stations, stabling and freight sites (including the granting of track and station access rights and safety approvals) within your administrative area, we would be happy to discuss these with you once they become more developed so we can explain any regulatory and statutory issues that may arise. May I also draw your attention to our e-mail address contact '<a href="mailto:DutyToCooperate@orr.gsi.gov.uk">DutyToCooperate@orr.gsi.gov.uk</a>.'</p> <p>I have attached a copy of our localism guidance for reference, which can be found at: <a href="http://www.rail-reg.gov.uk/upload/pdf/localism-guidance.pdf">http://www.rail-reg.gov.uk/upload/pdf/localism-guidance.pdf</a></p>	Comments noted.
Ms Noreen McCarrick	Network Rail	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	The proposed site is located 1.4 Kilometres approximately from the Railway Line, therefore Network Rail have no comments to make on the above proposal. Many thanks for informing us of your proposal.	Comments noted.
Mr Roger Penfold	Mid & West Berks Local Access Forum	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>This paper constitutes formal advice from the Mid and West Berkshire Local Access Forum. West Berkshire District Council is required, in accordance, with section 94(5) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, to have regard to relevant advice from this forum in carrying out its functions.</p> <p>The Forum's role is to 'advise as to the improvement of public access to land in the area for the purposes of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the area, and as to such other matters as may be prescribed' [1]. Other matters include access for 'functional' and 'utility' purposes.</p> <p>This advice is relevant to sections S (Single Planning application), A (Access and Movement) and P (public open space and recreation).</p> <p>The Forum supports the requirement for a single planning application to be submitted for the Sandleford Park development. The Forum believes this is the best way of achieving (i) the delivery of facilities for effective non-motorised travel within the site and to links outside the site, for both utility and recreational purposes, (ii) the delivery of public open spaces which are connected to each other and to existing public open spaces, especially to Greenham Common.</p> <p>[1] 'Guidance on Local Access Forums in England', paragraph 3. <a href="http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/177870/laf-guidance.pdf">http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/177870/laf-guidance.pdf</a></p>	Support noted.
Mr		Sandleford Park Supplementary	With reference to the planning application at Sandleford I object to these plans not only on the grounds already given but also because the infrastructure cannot cope.	A planning application has not yet been submitted to the Council for the Sandleford Park site. The consultation was focused on the Sandleford Park SPD; Proposed Amendments December 2014.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
P Webb		Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	for example two doctors surgeries, Circuit Lane and Western Elms have closed their books to new patients, and The Royal berks hospital is struggling with the present influx of people as are a lot of other hospitals. I hope and trust that the council will see sense and not proceed with this development.	The consultation response does not appear to relate to the Sandlesford Park site.
Mr Pete Errington	Hampshire County Council	Sandlesford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014  Sandlesford Infrastructure Requirements Identified in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Appendix 3	<p>Hampshire County Council as a neighbouring Minerals &amp; Waste Planning Authority welcome the chance to comment on this latest version of the Sandlesford Park SPD and would like to take this opportunity to flag up to West Berkshire Council that there is a significant, unsterilised sharp sand and gravel resource located on the West Berkshire and Hampshire border. Although it is unlikely that the potential area for development area identified within the SPD will pose any serious hindrance to mineral development within the Hampshire border, HCC as a mineral planning authority would wish to be consulted on any aspects of development which would have potential to impact mineral resources within Hampshire and their potential for workings in the future.</p> <p>Hampshire County Council note that our previously submitted comments on the draft SPD in May 2013 regarding improving cross-border walking and cycling links between West Berkshire and Hampshire have not been adopted into the latest draft document as proposed amendments so take this opportunity to make the following key points:</p> <p>The County Council notes that the draft SPD mentions the need to ensure that internal walking and cycling links connect with existing routes to services and facilities around Newbury and within West Berkshire. Hampshire County Council suggest that there would also be benefit, in terms of both sustainable transport and green infrastructure provision, in making provision for the following connections to the wider countryside across the county boundary to the south of the site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a footpath/pedestrian link from the southern boundary of the site to Newtown Footpath 3 at GR 446923 163585. This would provide pedestrian access from the proposed country park to the wider countryside and the rights of way network around Newtown Common and into the Hampshire Downs.</li> <li>2. Connect cycling routes within the site to the minor road network to the south and south-east of the site through Newtown to provide wider recreational cycling opportunities, avoiding use of the A339.</li> </ol> <p>Both of these proposals would improve the coherence of the walking and cycling network across the county boundary between Hampshire and Berkshire, and meet the following priorities identified in the Countryside Access Plan (ROWIP) for the Hampshire Downs area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing dependency on the car for transport between main conurbations, rural settlements and the countryside</li> <li>• Reducing the need to use or cross busy roads to link up rights of way and other off-road access</li> <li>• Providing additional links in the network, to give access to a range of off-road, circular routes</li> </ul> <p>Appendix 3: Sandlesford Infrastructure Requirements identified in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Development Plan</p> <p>Hampshire County Council as a neighbouring Highway Authority note that under</p>	<p>Comments noted. Paragraph 98 of the SPD states that any future application on the site will need to give full consideration to the issues surrounding mineral safeguarding in accordance with planning policy.</p> <p>Discussion will take place regarding proposed links to the surrounding footpath and cycle network as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Development Principle A2 seeks to integrate the development with the existing surrounding development to ensure connections to the wider area.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>ROAD NETWORK of the critical infrastructure table (page 90) of Appendix 3: Sandleford Infrastructure Requirements identified in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Development Plan the current critical infrastructure text states under Sandleford Park: 'Junction Improvement: A34 / A343 South'</p> <p>It is not clear from this text what the current use of the word South actually refers to. Some clarity is therefore required from West Berkshire Council as to the exact meaning of the text so that the actual junction or part of junction or link that the text is referring to is made absolutely clear.</p> <p>Supporting Document: Sandleford park Traffic Distribution into Hampshire</p> <p>Hampshire County Council as a neighbouring Highway Authority would like to see the newly included schematic diagrams relating to traffic flows on the A339, B4640 and Monks Lane include the predicted impacts on the A343 as this road runs crosses the Hampshire border and so there will be potential impacts on Hampshire roads.</p>	<p>The text in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be updated to provide clarity (Junction Improvement: A34 / A343 junction to North boundary carriageway)</p>
<p>Ms Vicky Aston</p>	<p>Sport England</p>	<p>Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014</p> <p>Sandleford Infrastructure Requirements Identified in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Appendix 3</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above named document. Please find below our formal comments for your consideration.</p> <p>It is Sport England's policy to resist proposals which will result in the loss of a playing field, unless it meets one of five exceptions as defined in A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England, see: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/facilities/planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/">https://www.sportengland.org/facilities/planning/planning-for-sport/development-management/planning-applications/playing-field-land/</a></p> <p>Sport England's policy is supported by paragraph 74 of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Both Sport England's policy and paragraph 74 also support the protection and retention of other sports facilities.</p> <p>In light of this, Sport England's main consideration, in reviewing the draft SPD, is to seek to protect existing playing field stock and sports facilities being lost to development. Sport England also has an important role in ensuring that new developments have the right sports infrastructure to support the new development</p> <p><b>Impact on existing playing fields – Figures 1 and 2</b></p> <p>Sport England is concerned that the development may impact upon existing playing field land. Newbury Rugby Football Club is located adjacent to the development. Figure 1 and Figure 2 show the boundary of the site but it is not clear from either the plan or the photograph if this will impact on the existing playing fields at the rugby club.</p> <p>If playing field land will be lost then Council should ensure that any playing field land affected by the development is reprovided elsewhere.</p> <p>Sport England therefore objects to the inclusion of any playing fields and sports facilities within the document unless the affected facilities are replaced in an appropriate location and are of the same quantity, quality and accessibility of the existing facility.</p> <p>Section 3 – Infrastructure requirements</p>	<p>The principal of the allocation (and the area covered by it) was established through the work on the Core Strategy including the independent Examination process. It is unfortunate that Sport England did not engage during this process despite being consulted on every occasion.</p> <p>Information submitted by Newbury Rugby Club during the Core Strategy Examination confirmed that the land which forms part of the allocation will not adversely affect the operations of the Rugby Club and that there will be no loss of pitches. This will be reviewed during the planning application process and if there is a requirement for additional pitches, this will be explored at the time.</p> <p>The SPD outlines in Section F that there is no identified formal recreation provision (sports pitches) on the site in lieu of significant areas of formal open space as set out under Public Open Space and Recreation sub-section. The open space and recreation provision includes country parkland, a NEAP, two LEAPs, a number of LAPs and areas for growing food, as well as areas of informal open space throughout the site.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>Sport England is disappointed that the development site does not include any new on-site sports provision, in particular new playing fields. The occupiers of any new development, especially residential, will generate demand for sporting provision. The existing provision within an area may not be able to accommodate this increased demand without exacerbating existing and/or predicted future deficiencies.</p> <p>Consequently, Sport England considers that new developments should be required to contribute towards meeting the demand they generate through the provision of on-site facilities and/or providing additional capacity off-site.</p> <p>It is noted that in Section 3 the Council has required 'improvements to Sports Pitch Provision in step with new development' but there are no further details. If no new pitches are provided then how can the Council be certain that the new development will not exacerbate any existing deficiencies?</p> <p>Sport England considers that the level and nature of any provision for new development should be informed by a robust evidence base such as an up to date Sports Facility Strategy, Playing Pitch Strategy or other relevant needs assessment.</p> <p>Sport England is aware that the Council does not have a Playing Pitch Strategy or indoor or outdoor sports facilities strategy . It is crucial that the Council has an up-to-date and robust evidence base in order to plan for the provision of sport both playing fields and built facilities. Sport England would highly recommend that the Council undertake a playing pitch strategy (PPS) as well as assessing the needs and opportunities for sporting provision. Sport England provides comprehensive guidance on how to undertake both pieces of work.</p> <p>Playing Pitch Strategy</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/playing-pitch-strategy-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/playing-pitch-strategy-guidance/</a></p> <p>This guidance document provides a recommended step by step approach to developing and delivering a playing pitch strategy (PPS). It covers both natural and artificial grass pitches. Sport England believes that to ensure there is a good supply of high quality playing pitches and playing fields to meet the sporting needs of local communities, all local authorities should have an up to date PPS. By providing valuable evidence and direction a PPS can be of significant benefit to a wide variety of parties and agendas.</p> <p>Assessing needs and opportunity for sports provision (Indoor and Outdoor)</p> <p><a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/assessing-needs-and-opportunities-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/assessing-needs-and-opportunities-guidance/</a></p> <p>This guide is complimentary with the PPS guidance providing the recommended approach for assessing the need for pitch provision. Sport England believes that providing the right facilities in the right place is central to enabling people to play sport and maintain and grow participation. An assessment of need will provide a clear understanding of what is required in an area, providing a sound basis on which to develop policy, and make informed decisions for sports development and investment in facilities.</p>	



Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Sport England therefore objects to the SPD as it does not make any provision for on-site playing pitches nor any provision on or off site for new leisure facilities to meet the needs of the new development.</p> <p>Sport England would welcome the opportunity to discuss the benefits of undertaking a Playing Pitch Strategy and Assessment of the needs and opportunities for sport provision.</p> <p>I trust that you have found the above comments of assistance in developing this document.</p>	
Mr Gary Soloman	Borges Salmon LLP (on behalf of the Sandleford Farm Partnership)	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>We are writing to formally respond to the current consultation on Sandleford Park SPD on behalf of Sandleford Farm Partnership.</p> <p>Sandleford Farm Partnership are working to prepare and submit an outline planning application for a residential led mixed use development on land at Sandleford Park.</p> <p>We are aware that the Council no longer propose amendments to Core Policy CS3. We agree that this decision is a sound one, for the reasons set out in previous correspondence from Boyer Planning.</p> <p>Our response to the current consultation relates to the principle of amending the SPD and issues surrounding the Council's requirement for a single planning application in relation to land control and ultimately the delivery of the development in a timely manner.</p> <p><b>The Role of Supplementary Planning Documents</b></p> <p>The Council wish to amend the SPD to include a requirement for a single planning application to be submitted for the Sandleford Park development. References to a single application are included throughout the amended SPD, but the key new paragraph is S1 in Section F, which states: "<i>The Council requires proposals for the site to be brought forward by means of a single planning application for the site...</i>" <i>This is reinforced in the amended paragraph 133, Section G, which now states: "In order to secure the infrastructure requirements of the development as a whole there is a requirement for a single planning application for the entire site (either outline or full...)"</i></p> <p>We consider this approach to be fundamentally wrong. Such a requirement should be more properly included in a Development Plan policy such that it is capable of proper scrutiny and subject to independent examination.</p> <p>Our comments are framed by legislation and national planning policy and guidance. Regulation 8(3) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 clearly states that <i>'Any policies contained in a supplementary planning document must not conflict with the adopted development plan.'</i> Furthermore, Regulation 8(4) states "...the policies contained in a local plan must be consistent with the adopted development plan." The Development Plan, Policy CS3, does not make any reference to the requirement for a single planning application for the entire strategic allocation; this is a new requirement which is not consistent with the Development Plan.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) plainly sets out the role of SPDs as</p>	<p>We note the comments made on behalf of Sandleford Farm Partnership in response to the consultation on proposed changes to the Sandleford SPD.</p> <p>Having reviewed the comments put forward in response to this consultation we are satisfied that the approach taken by the Council is sound.</p> <p>Contrary to the consultation response, we do not consider that the requirement for a single planning application for the whole site should have been included within the detail of CS3. The principle that this site should be developed as a whole site has been established since this site was promoted and subsequently allocated for development during the examination of the Core Strategy. The Inspector's Report on the Core Strategy (dated July 2012) notes (see para. 88) that the proposed allocation for 2,000 dwellings rather than some smaller quantum of development "<i>has the benefit of ensuring that the optimum approach to development in the area is achieved, rather than development taking place over time in a series of smaller proposals resulting in a more piecemeal approach</i>". The Inspector was thus recognising the benefits of a comprehensive approach to the development of Sandleford Park.</p> <p>The consultation comments by the Sandleford Farm Partnership suggest that the requirement for a single application should have been included within CS3 so that they were the subject of proper scrutiny and independent examination. Clearly however the principle of developing the site as a whole was the subject of consideration by the Inspector during the examination of the Core Strategy, which then prompted the comments in paragraph 88 of his report, as set out above.</p> <p>We also disagree that there is any breach of Regulation 8(3) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The changes proposed to the SPD do not "<i>conflict</i>" with adopted Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy. To the contrary, our view is that the proposed changes to the SPD support the principles set out in CS3 and are consistent with the requirements detailed therein. A single planning application will enable the development of the site to be properly assessed as a whole in order to ensure the vision and aims set out in the core policy are achieved.</p> <p>This Council is not unique in requiring the submission of a single planning application for a large strategic site of this importance. The Council is aware of at least two other authorities which have taken a similar approach in requiring the submission of a single planning application within their SPDs. The requirement for a single planning application will assist in avoiding what the Core Strategy Inspector was concerned about, namely "<i>piecemeal development</i>" of the site.</p> <p>The consultation response also suggests that the changes to the SPD would be inconsistent with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As highlighted by the consultation response, the NPPF requires SPDs to "<i>build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on the policies in the Local Plan</i>". It is the Council's belief that this is exactly what the proposed changes to the SPD achieve.</p> <p>Policy CS3 requires the site to deliver "<i>a sustainable and high quality mixed used development</i>". The Council does not consider that high quality development can be achieved by piecemeal development</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p><i>"Documents which add further detail to the policies in the Local Plan. They can be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues, such as design. Supplementary planning documents are capable of being a material planning consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the development plan."</i> (Annex 2, page 56). Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that SPDs <i>"...should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on the policies in the Local Plan."</i> (Paragraph: 028Reference ID: 12-028- 20140306). It is clear that an SPD should provide further detailed guidance and not additional requirements which should form part of the development plan, which is subject to independent examination.</p> <p>SPDs must be consistent with the development plan. This position has been confirmed by case law. In <i>Westminster City Council v Great Portland Estates plc (1985)</i> and <i>R (on the application of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd) v Oxford City Council (2002)</i>, it was made clear that Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) may be used to supplement existing policies in the development plan, but not change them or introduce new policies. More recently, in <i>R (on the application of RWE Npower Renewables Ltd) v Milton Keynes Borough Council (15 April 2013)</i>, the claim succeeded on a single ground, that the SPD was in conflict with the local plan, breaching regulation 8(3) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Notwithstanding our in principle objection to amending the SPD, in relation to the role of the document within the development policy framework, we comment on the proposed amendments under the following headings.</p> <p><b>Single Planning Application</b></p> <p>The Council state that a single planning application is required in order to achieve a comprehensive development and to ensure the timely provision of infrastructure, services, open space and other facilities in a properly coordinated fashion.</p> <p>Sandleford Farm Partnership are deeply concerned that the amendments are being made without good reason or proper justification. The NPPF at paragraph 153 states that <i>" Supplementary planning documents should be used where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery, and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development"</i> . The Council are wrong to impose additional policy burdens that risk the strategic allocation, upon which the Development Plan's housing strategy is heavily dependent.</p> <p>The requirement for a single planning application could increase the risk to the Core Strategy, with further delay to the scheme on the basis of a need to enter into an agreement with the remaining landowner.</p> <p>Our experience is that, despite discussions and correspondence with the remaining landowner, an agreement is unlikely to yield itself in the short term, thus protracting the process of submitting a single planning application with all landowners in agreement.</p> <p><b>Comprehensive Masterplan</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments to the SPD require a planning application to be accompanied by a comprehensive masterplan for the whole site, produced and agreed by all of the landowners and developers prior to the submission of the</p>	<p>of the site. Therefore the proposed changes to the SPD provide the necessary <i>"advice or guidance"</i> on how this can be done (i.e. by the submission of a single planning application).</p> <p>The proposed changes are certainly consistent with paragraph 153 of the NPPF, as the requirement for a single planning application will aid the successful delivery of infrastructure on the site. The submission of a single planning application may also relieve, as opposed to add to, the financial burdens of the relevant landowners as some matters can be addressed and submitted once, rather than duplicated by neighbouring development proposals.</p> <p>Finally, the SPD has been prepared by the local planning authority to set out an overall framework to steer the delivery of the site. It has become evident over the last year that there are now two separate landowner approaches to the delivery of the site. To ensure that the site comes forward as a whole, in the manner envisaged by the policy, a comprehensive Masterplan is required to deliver the SPD. This will show how any developer of the site proposes to implement the policy and the SPD and to enable a more complete understanding of how the development is planned holistically across the site.</p> <p>In summary, the Council considers that the requirement for a single planning application to be entirely justified. The proposed changes to the SPD are not contrary to either Regulation 8(3) of the TCP (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 or the NPPF. As there has always been an intention to deliver the site as a whole the Council does not consider there to be any additional burden imposed as a result of these changes.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>planning application. New paragraph 148 in Section G states: " <i>The Local Planning Authority will expect the planning application to be accompanied by a comprehensive Masterplan for the whole site. This should be produced and agreed by all of the landowners and developers of Sandleford Park prior to submission of the planning application.</i>"</p> <p>Again, this does not accord with the Core Strategy, which refers to either an SPD or masterplan being prepared. The Council's SPD already provides a vision, development objectives and a framework masterplan. It is clearly sufficient for any planning application to adhere to such considerations and there is no justification for a further masterplanning exercise prior to the submission of any such application. Accordingly, this additional requirement is not justified.</p> <p>We would also point out that the requirement for all landowners to agree the masterplan could again delay the delivery of the scheme (as outlined in previous paragraphs).</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>The proposed changes to the SPD are fundamentally wrong. The intention to amend the SPD to require a single planning application is at odds with the basis for such documents as supplementary to the Development Plan. Such a requirement should be included in a Development Plan policy such that it is capable of proper scrutiny and subject to independent examination.</p> <p>The need for a single planning application for the entire site and an additional masterplanning task in advance of its submission are neither justified nor required. The Council are wrong to impose additional policy burdens that risk the strategic allocation upon which the Development Plan's housing strategy is heavily dependent.</p>	
Ms Fiona Hope	Berkshire Gardens Trust	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the amendment of the Supplementary Planning Document to include a requirement for a single planning application to be submitted for the Sandleford Park development. BGT is in agreement with this approach, which we hope will ensure that the affected parts of the Grade II registered 'Capability Brown' designed Sandleford Priory and its setting are treated appropriately.</p> <p>West Berkshire should be congratulated on ensuring that the area over which the school looks will be a country park rather than built upon. However, guidance provided in parts of the SPD does not seem to be a coherent statement/master plan about how this area will actually be transformed to parkland. In our view the Country Park should be laid out in a manner which respects the heritage and historic landscape value of the parkland. In this context we do not think that the proposed allotments are located or designed in a sympathetic manner.</p> <p>We hope these comments are helpful at this stage.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Development principles set out in Section F of the SPD seek to ensure the landscape and heritage impact of the development is minimised.</p> <p>The SPD does not provide an exact location for allotments on the site. The supporting text to development principle P1 states that there will be opportunities within the site to provide growing areas for the local community, such as allotments and community orchards. These features can potentially be incorporated within the Country Parkland although there may be scope for this type of provision in other areas of the site.</p> <p>Additionally, the SPD sets the framework for the planning application to be accompanied by a Strategic Landscape and Green Infrastructure plan for the site which will set out the detail. Other documents will inform this (development principle L1) and development principles L2 and L3 give further information about the requirements including a detailed Country Parkland Design and Management Plan.</p>
Gemma Care	Barton Willmore (on behalf of Donnington New Homes)	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>We write on behalf of, Donnington New Homes., in respect of the above planning consultation, which seeks to amend the adopted Sandleford Park SPD (September 2013) to the effect that a single planning application will be required for the site in order "...to ensure that the site is comprehensively delivered with timely and well planned provision of infrastructure." The Council will be fully aware that the owners of Donnington New Homes (DNH) are landowners of part of the Sandleford Park site and thus have a vested interest in the contents of the amended SPD and the</p>	Support noted.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>manner in which the planning application process is managed moving forwards.</p> <p><b>Context of the Representations</b></p> <p>Paragraph 133 of the SPD has been amended to state that ‘ <i>In order to secure the infrastructure requirements of the development as a whole there is a requirement for a single planning application for the entire site (either outline or full) which is to be accompanied by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). This will ensure the site is developed in a comprehensive manner and the infrastructure provided in a timely fashion to serve the development. This submitted IDP will be specific to the development and cover the whole of the site. Planning applications for only part of the site or planning applications which are not accompanied by such an IDP are likely to be unacceptable as they would not ensure the comprehensive development of the site.</i>’</p> <p>Furthermore, paragraphs 148 - 150 are clear that the Council expects the planning application to be accompanied by a comprehensive masterplan for the whole site, which should ‘<i>...be produced and agreed by all of the landowners and developers of Sandleford Park prior to the submission of the planning application....</i>’</p> <p>The decision to amend the adopted SPD marks a change in direction from that proposed in the draft Housing Site Allocations DPD (HSA) in July 2014, wherein the Council proposed to amend policy CS3 of the adopted Core Strategy. The key change to the policy, as shown in the draft HSA, was the requirement for masterplans for the whole site (i.e. the entirety of the Sandleford Park) to be prepared prior to the submission of planning applications for any specific part of the site.</p> <p>We understand that the Council now considers that the objectives of delivering a holistic development are better served through amendments to the SPD wording.</p> <p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>DNH have no objection in principle to the proposed amendment to the SPD wording, and the intention of the Council to require a single planning application and masterplan for the site as a whole.</p> <p>DNH fully support the Council's efforts to facilitate collaborative working across all parties, on the basis that such an approach is considered conducive to delivering a comprehensive and coherent development, supported by the appropriate infrastructure at the appropriate time.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, DNH consider that the proposed rewording of the SPD could be strengthened by emphasising the need for collaborative working and input between the parties. DNH also consider that the proposed rewording currently fails to provide any flexibility to accommodate a future scenario whereby the Council and the parties agree that the objectives of securing a comprehensive form of development, which delivers the requirements of the SPD, can be achieved through the submission of more than one planning application, and suggest that this flexibility should be facilitated through any rewording.</p> <p>We trust these observations are helpful and would welcome the opportunity to discuss the matters raised in greater detail, possibly with the other Sandleford Park landowners and their representatives if this would assist.</p>	<p>This is correct. The aims of the Council regarding the delivery of the site can be achieved by amending the SPD.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD sets out that the Council require a single planning application for the entire site either outline or full in order to achieve a comprehensive development for the entire site, with the coordinated and timely delivery of infrastructure.</p> <p>The wording in the amended SPD forms a framework for this collaborative working and input to take place, and no changes are proposed in this regard.</p> <p>The SPD is a material consideration to the decision-making process. Should additional material considerations come to light throughout the process they too can be considered.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
Mr Peter Norman	Say No to Sandleford	Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document - Proposed Amendments December 2014	<p>Background: snts is a campaign group set up to oppose the development of Sandleford, has over 150 members on its distribution list, handed in a petition of over 1,500 written signatures expressing local opposition to the development of Sandleford as well as an online petition of over 12,000 signatures through <a href="http://www.change.org.uk">www.change.org.uk</a></p> <p>snts wishes to be kept informed of the development of the SPD.</p> <p><b>PART B</b></p> <p>In responding to this Consultation snts wishes to make clear its continued opposition to the selection of Sandleford as a site for the development of 2,000 homes. At the time of its original selection as a strategic site, and before the Planning Inspector hearings snts made clear that it felt the infrastructure required for a development of this site as laid out in the then IPD was understated and therefore gave a false indication as to the appropriateness of the site compared to other potential sites around Newbury.</p> <p>In addition snts felt that with the development of 2,000 homes already to the South of Newbury through the Racecourse development and additional infill developments that the weighting was too heavily biased towards South Newbury with all the implications this had on an already stretched road infrastructure, where the critical North/South route long the A339 was regularly snarled and was already responsible for pollution levels in excess of EU statute levels, and that the claim that this site could be delivered with just two all vehicular access points to Monks Lane was false.</p> <p>As the process has rolled forward all the concerns we raised are being realised with a modification being heavily recommended for all vehicular access to the site from both the A339 and A343. Two two form entry primary schools are now being recommended, with the attendant expansion of Park House School where it is unclear whether they can expand sufficiently on their current site to accommodate the increase in enrolment. The potential to expand Falkland Surgery is limited with 17,000 patients already on their books as a practice they are already stretched. Parking is already over capacity with patients frequently having to overspill to the nearby NRFC parking.</p> <p>With the infill developments that have already occurred Falkland Primary School has been forced to increase their intake to a level that is leaving many parents uncomfortable. In addition this has already led to an increase in travel levels with congestion along Monks Lane/Andover Road/Essex Street becoming far more pronounced at peak times.</p> <p>Added to this other developments are a cause of concern:</p> <p>The provision of a Local Sainsbury has led to a noticeable increase of traffic to the Falkland Garage, and contrary to the statement supporting the planning application it has become a destination in its own right but with inadequate parking slots for the level of use. Whilst the presence of a Local Sainsbury is welcome to many residents its location near two schools is a major concern with the increased traffic levels.</p> <p>The denigration of South Newbury Town Centre. Bartholomew Street and surrounding area use to be a vibrant area for independent shops supported by the presence of the Kennet Centre. However the Kennet Centre has suffered from the opening of Parkway and lost its key store Debenhams. The promise of restaurants opening around the cinema has not materialised with only Nandos so far opening</p>	<p>The principle of development on the site has been established through the Core Strategy process and the site has been accepted as the location to provide a long term urban extension which will deliver up to 2000 homes over at least a 20 year period. The principle of development on the site is not being reassessed.</p> <p>The allocation of Sandleford Park as a strategic site was rigorously tested at an Examination in Public by an Independent Inspector and was shown to be deliverable with the access arrangements set out in the policy. The allocation of the site has been informed by comprehensive evidence, including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which demonstrated the site is deliverable.</p> <p>The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>Additional access points would also maximise the opportunities for permeability through the site. Any access will be designed with paramount regard to safety.</p> <p>Any new development in the surrounding area will be assessed with the knowledge that Sandleford Park is a strategic site allocation within the Core Strategy for up to 2,000 dwellings and will also take into account updated committed development.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>adding to the impression that the Kennet Centre is a bit of a wasteland. Most of the Estate Agents have now moved to the north side of town. The result of this is that there for people visiting Newbury now want to get to the North side of town which puts further pressure on the only route to get to the north side being the A339. The increased congestion on this route is no coincidence.</p> <p>The alternative to take the A34 to get to the North side of town involves negotiating a dangerously short slip road from the A343 (and likewise to get off at this junction) and the A34 itself is suffering from congestion issues and putting local traffic on to this road is inadvisable.</p> <p>The Council has obtained funding to put a new junction onto the A339 to support the regeneration of the London Road Industrial Estate. This junction is being put in before the configuration of the Estate is known and therefore what the likely traffic flows will be. We also believe that modelling on this junction has not taken into account the additional traffic emanating from South Newbury as a result of developments that are already underway or for that matter the development of Sandleford. This will only increase the congestion from the south side of town and will force more local traffic onto a strategic Highways route (A34).</p> <p>The provision of sports facilities in South Newbury have also been compromised by the move of Greenacres Sports and Leisure to a David Lloyd Sports Centre to be built on 5 acres of sports field land at the Rugby Club. This net loss of Sports land is not being made up elsewhere as far as we can tell and will put further pressure on traffic along Monks Lane as people drive to access this exclusive club.</p> <p>As such we believe there is a strong case for reconsideration of the original decision to name Sandleford as a strategic site for the development of 2,000 homes. It is looking increasingly out of kilter with the ability of the area to cope with requirements that such a development will impose on the surrounding area.</p> <p>That stated on the principle amendment to the SDP to ensure that the development of Sandleford is governed by one planning application snts is broadly supportive of, however as a result of earlier consultations snts would have expected to have seen additional amendments to the SDP namely:</p> <p>1] Section A Para 6: subsequent paras should be renumbered to reflect deletion of this para.</p> <p>2] Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment</p> <p>snts remains uncomfortable that the SAE has relied on the findings of a consultancy employed by the Sandleford Partnership as opposed to a completely independent agency. We are also surprised that this section has not been updated to reflect the changed demographics of the development where far more children are anticipated to live in the area compared with the original draft where two two form entry primary schools are now anticipated.</p> <p>Para 17: whilst the proposed amendments to the SDP might be "minor modifications" the change in school and traffic projections are not minor modifications and the impact on the SEA should be re-visited in light of the increased numbers.</p> <p>3] Section B: Vision for Sandleford Park:</p>	<p>All modelling carried out for the regeneration of London Road Industrial Estate did take the development at Sandleford into account, as well as all other committed development.</p> <p>As set out above the principle of development on the site is not being reassessed.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. Paragraph numbers will be updated for the final version.</p> <p>A SA/SEA was not required for the SPD as it has been demonstrated through the SA/SEA for the Core Strategy that there will be no significant environmental effects as a result of the SPD. The SA/SEA for the Core Strategy was carried out by the Council, subject to public consultation and independently examined by an Inspector.</p> <p>All evidence / information submitted by landowners in promotion of a site is assessed and verified by the council.</p> <p>The role of the SPD is to supplement the existing policy set out within the Core Strategy. It is therefore not appropriate to make the changes suggested. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been updated and will be updated periodically over the plan period to reflect changes in circumstances which result in a change in infrastructure requirements. The IDP is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>“Residents will have a high quality of life, with good access to education, jobs, services, shops and public transport – many of which are within walking and cycling distance. There will be timely and coordinated provision of the social, physical and green infrastructure required for the site.”</p> <p>The cycling provision once out of the site is totally inadequate. The shared cycling lane along Monks Lane is dangerous especially at School arrival and departure times. There is no dedicated cycling lane through most of the north section of Andover Road, and when you do arrive at a cycling lane there is no protection resulting in cars often being parked across the dedicated lane requiring cyclists to swerve out into a narrowed carriageway. As such the statements on cycling are incorrect until the cycling infrastructure north into town and East/West along Monks Lane are radically improved.</p> <p>4] Strategic Objectives</p> <p>“2. ...Other accesses will be explored and should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An all vehicle access link through Warren Road and</li> <li>• An access onto the A339 close to the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC)”</li> </ul> <p>The overwhelming response to consultations on additional access points into the site was that whilst access to the A339 was broadly welcomed (although some feel it does further move the boundary of the town southwards) and certainly a roundabout at the recycling centre is justified in its own right, there was very little support to making Warren Road all vehicular access. Traffic in this area around two schools and a nursery has already been increased by allowing a Local Sainsbury to be developed, increasing traffic by opening up a major access point to the A343 will make an already risky area positively dangerous. It is therefore very disappointing that the Council has not listened to the consultation and removed this option. It again raises doubts in many peoples minds as to what the purpose of these consultations are?</p> <p>We were told that Sandleford was deliverable on two access roads to Monks Lane and a bus route to Warren Road. No-one believed it at the time and it was extraordinary that alternative access points were not explored in the original consideration of the site. But at a Master Planning meeting in March 2010 access to the A339 was deliberately excluded from consideration as it might raise doubt in the Planning Inspectors mind that the site was deliverable. We are now told that at least one of the additional access points is essential and both are desirable with the route that would have biggest impact for all vehicular access being Warren Road. The fact that these routes are still in the SDP looks like a cynical exploitation of the planning process and we hope that when the Planning Inspector reviews the amended SDP he/she will take this into account.</p> <p>5 “To manage access to the ancient woodlands”, again it would appear that the opportunity to update the SDP in response to consultation has been ignored. Many environmentalists were unhappy with access being granted to ancient woodland with walkways up precious wetlands. There are two woodlands that are not ancient for which access could easily be given. It is also regrettable that access to the River Enborne is not provided along controlled walkways. Given the volume of children it is likely that uncontrolled access to the river will be made to the detriment of the surrounding area and wildlife.</p>	<p>The wider impacts of the site will be dealt with through a planning application and the issues raised are noted.</p> <p>The allocation of the site has been informed by four phases of Transport Assessment work, which has fed into the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>There has been additional Transport Assessment work carried out since the site was allocated and more is being undertaken by the Council to provide the necessary detail to assess any planning application.</p> <p>It is not possible to fence off woodlands for access. None of the woodlands are proposed to be closed to access, but the emphasis will be on managing access. In terms of opening up the woodland at the southern perimeter of the site, this is a matter to be explored further through the Country Park Management Plan.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>14 Given the strain on the existing infrastructure before the first house is delivered in Sandleford it is vital that infrastructure needs are addressed before the first houses are built, this includes cycleways, road enhancements, surgery places and most importantly the provision of primary school places. As such “in a timely and coordinated manner which keeps pace with the development” should be amended to read “in a timely and coordinated manner that keeps pace with the development or in certain named instances in advance of the development”</p> <p>5] Section C Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>6] Section D The Site Context</p> <p>78 This section gives a misleading impression on existing cycleways. If Sandleford is to be developed sustainably then there will need to be significant investment in cycleways both east-west and north-south.</p> <p>87 It seems unfortunate that views from a private school should set the development of the site. Whilst snts opposes the development of Sandleford at all, the position of a Grade 1 building should not determine where it is best to develop the site. Building the northern and eastern sides would have advantages in that it takes traffic away from sensitive and congested areas. St Gabriels would still enjoy the rolling landscape leading up to the school.</p> <p>89 The report rightly acknowledges the presence of some fine tree specimens in the local landscape. What is less clear is what protection can be provided from ‘accidental’ knock downs?</p> <p>96 This statement on education provision should be echoed in 14 above.</p> <p>102 Should there not be a statement that where possible the design of houses and streetscape should maximise the availability of south facing roofs to house solar panels?</p> <p>111 We would contest this statement - the development requires more than simple upgrading of local infrastructure to accommodate the number of houses planned. Significant investment is required in road, cycleways, education and health care if the local infrastructure is to stand a chance of accommodating a development of this scale.</p> <p>116 - 125 Whilst it is true that there have been a number of consultations and engagements with stakeholders and the general public, it is not evident that the Council has taken note of any of the feedback to inform the development. In particular the widespread opposition to developing Warren Road as an all vehicle access route to the site in spite of concerns of schools, local community centres and the general public of the heightened risk to young persons that such a development would entail. If the Council was genuine about using consultation to inform the development then this option would have been removed from the SDP.</p> <p>6] Section F Development Principles</p> <p>S Single Planning Application - snts concurs that a single planning application is the best way to ensure that the site is developed as a cohesive whole and that the</p>	<p>It is essential that the provision of infrastructure is in a timely and coordinated manner that keeps pace with development to ensure the viability of the site is not compromised. There are cases when the infrastructure will be required in advance of houses being occupied and these phasing arrangements will be agreed as part of the pre-application / planning application process.</p> <p>The information set out in paragraph 78 is factually correct.</p> <p>The developable areas of the site reflect the opportunities and constraints of the site including topography and landscape.</p> <p>In accordance with policy CS19 of the Core Strategy particular regard needs to be given to the conservation and, where appropriate, enhancement of heritage assets and their settings, including listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens, such as Sandleford Priory. This is also clearly set out in development principle L8 of the SPD.</p> <p>Trees covered by a TPO would be subject to a fine should they be removed without consent.</p> <p>The Renewable Energy development principles within the SPD seek to minimise the use of resources and maximise energy efficiency. In addition, the development would be expected to comply with policy CS15 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) acknowledges the level of infrastructure requirement to support the development of up to 2,000 dwellings at Sandleford Park.</p> <p>Comment noted and responded to above.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>



Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>required infrastructure is delivered alongside it.</p> <p>L3 It is unclear how the upkeep of the Parkland is to be maintained. Will a dowry be provided that will allow the finance of a park ranger in perpetuity or at some stage will the park ranger have to be financed from other sources. Who will own the park? snts favours the development of a new borough of Wash Common that incorporates Sandelford and from which the upkeep of the Parkland can be maintained. In this regard a ten year outlook seems too short.</p> <p>L4d snts would want to see access to ancient woodlands strictly limited other than for an access route to the river Enborne. There are non ancient woodlands through which access can be provided which do not require access through or along wetlands and valley floors.</p> <p>L4g rather than being preferable run outs should be prohibited from causing disruption to RPAs. The sentence should be amended to read "All such runs must be kept out of RPAs except where explicit consent is given in exceptional circumstances"</p> <p>L7 It is difficult to see how dark routes can be provided that preserve the habitats of wildlife is compatible with making the development safe and secure for walking around at night-time.</p> <p>Figure 6 Access to ancient woodlands should be avoided as far as possible with the option instead of making access available to other woodlands. The country park should have access to the river. Walks along the wetland valley floors should be avoided.</p> <p>A Access and Movement</p> <p>A1 The Council should listen to the Consultation and remove all vehicular access along Warren Road as an option.</p> <p>Cycle and Pedestrian Access</p> <p>There is no cycle network to speak of in South Newbury dedicated cycleways need to be created along Monks Lane, Andover Road and Newtown Road to make cycling a viable option from the development.</p> <p>A4 and A5 Parking needs to be sufficient to allow two cars per household otherwise the streets will be congested by cars parked on pavements which will negate the potential for safe cycle routes.</p> <p>A6 The design of the buildings should also seek to minimise expenditure on lighting and heating and so make homes affordable for the young and old alike.</p> <p>Figure 7 If access is to be provided to the A339 then there will need to be a bridge across the valley floor and wetlands running north south. This should have the same protection as the East West valley. H2 The SDP needs to ensure that the site does not use the Enborne as a drainage route for Exceptional weather events.</p> <p>R Renewable Energy - there should be a statement to maximise the areas of south facing roofs for the placement of PVs</p>	<p>An SPD cannot be so specific and include this level of detail. Instead it sets the framework for the planning application and its supporting documentation such as the Country Park Design and Management Plan which will provide the detail as set out under development principle L3 of the SPD. This will take into account all of the evidence available.</p> <p>Noted. As set out above it is not possible to fence off woodlands for access. None of the woodlands are proposed to be closed to access, but the emphasis will be on managing access. In terms of opening up the woodland at the southern perimeter of the site, this is a matter to be explored further through the Country Park Management Plan.</p> <p>It is accepted that this sentence could be amended to make the ensure damage to RPAs is minimised. Amendments to the text will be made to final draft of SPD and the following is proposed: <u>All such runs must therefore be kept out of RPAs except where the Council has provided prior written approval.'</u> This above text is to replace the final sentence of para. L4 (g) – which currently reads; <i>'It is therefore preferable to keep all such runs out of RPAs.'</i></p> <p>The detailed design of the valley area will be determined through the planning application process, however as set out in the SPD lighting in this area is to be kept to a minimum, but an appropriate level to ensure the landscape character of the valley is maintained.</p> <p>Responded to above.</p> <p>Comments noted and responded to above.</p> <p>Additional cycle routes outside the site will be explored. This could be explored through the West Berkshire Cycle Forum.</p> <p>As set out within the SPD, the design and layout of buildings and spaces will be in accordance with current policy and guidance, including the Quality Design – West Berkshire SPD and Manual for Streets. The Council has consulted on new parking standards and these will be used as the starting point regarding parking provision.</p> <p>Development principle CA9: Valley Corridors sets out the key design principles for these areas. CA7 covers the valley crossing as depicted within Figure 14 of the SPD. It is not anticipated that a second valley crossing will be required within the site however this is detail to be addressed through the planning application process and with further exploratory work on the access points.</p> <p>Details of drainage routes will be determined through the planning application process. Comments responded to above.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>CA7 Valley Crossing, the same principles should be carried forward if a proposed access to the A339 requires a valley crossing of the North South running valley.</p> <p>CA9 the wetlands should be protected from pedestrian access to allow a number of ground nesting birds to continue to have a presence in the area.</p> <p>7] Section G Delivery and Implementation</p> <p>No Comment</p> <p>8] Appendix 1</p> <p>This section does not appear to have been updated to reflect that the infrastructure needs of the site has grown, for example 1.6 that the site now needs two primary schools of two form entries, and the knock on provision that will be required of Park House and of the Falkland Surgery.</p> <p>Note the sports provision available to south Newbury has been reduced because of the decision to locate a replacement of Greenacres Sports and Leisure Club onto land that was formerly rugby pitches with no replacement land being made available for the loss of sports provision.</p> <p>9] Appendix 2</p> <p>This is an area that is non specific and therefore in grave danger of being watered down when it comes to a planning application. The shopping list approach supports developers picking and choosing what they provide rather than having a coherent approach to alternative travel arrangements.</p> <p>10] Appendix 3</p> <p>This list woefully underplays the infrastructure requirements. There is no cycle network for the Sandleford development to hook into and therefore it should be a requirement to fund the creation of a comprehensive and safe cycle route(s) into and out of Newbury Town Centre. This is more important than cycle access to the Retail Park where most purchased items are unable to be transported on bicycles.</p> <p>The bus network and timetable should tie in with train times from Newbury station (both departures and arrivals).</p> <p>Education - need for two primary schools and substantial expansion of Park House.</p> <p>Health - it is difficult to see where Falkland Surgery can expand to having already got 17,000 patients on its books and struggling to handle those.</p> <p>Sports - WBC has approved a denigration of available sports pitches in the south of Newbury, it is difficult to see how Sandleford can contribute to righting this demise when the Council should have been planning for extra provision.</p> <p>11] Appendix 4</p> <p>No comment</p>	<p>Comment responded to above. If, through further work, it is determined that a second valley crossing is required then the principles set out in CA7 of the SPD will be applied to this crossing. An amendment to the final draft of the SPD will be made to say <u>Should additional valley crossings be required the above design principles will apply.</u></p> <p>This will be dealt with through the Country Parkland Management Plan and will be a matter for the planning application.</p> <p>Appendix 1 sets out policy CS3 of the Core Strategy along with its supporting text. The SPD cannot change or make amendments to the policy. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is a 'living document' and is updated periodically to reflect the most up to date position at that time. Any additional infrastructure required to support the development will be a matter for negotiation through the planning application process.</p> <p>Appendix 2 sets out that a Travel Plan will be required as part of any planning application for the site. The appendix also sets out elements of a Travel Plan that are required as a minimum. The implementation of a Travel Plan will be conditioned as part of any planning application for the site.</p> <p>This Appendix sets out the infrastructure required as set out in the January 2011 Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and as examined as part of the Core Strategy and policy CS3. The IDP has since been updated and, as a 'living document' will continue to be updated periodically to reflect the most up to date position. The IDP is a material consideration in the determination of any planning application.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
Mr Richard Page	Wash Common Community Group	Section A: Introduction	<p>We welcome the decision to ensure that the development is presented as a single planning application and resubmit our comments from the 2013 consultation round, as below.</p> <p>Response to West Berkshire Council's Draft Supplementary Planning Document – March 2013 Consultation</p> <p>Background: Wash Common Community Group has recently been formed to bring together various interested parties who live and work in the Wash Common area, with a view to enhancing the area for its residents. It is anticipated that the group will grow as its activities become more widely known.</p> <p>The response to WBC's consultation looks at the areas of primary concern to the Group that are likely to arise from the development of 2,000 homes on Sandleford.</p> <p>A Access and Movement</p> <p>The Group is pleased to note that the Council acknowledges that two access points to Monks Lane with a bus route along Warren Road are unlikely to be adequate for a development this size. This issue is made more acute by the change in demographics envisaged with the need to house two primary schools. However the Group has a number of reservations about the additional routes proposed, and given the potential issues relating to either of the proposals would wish for there to be further consultation before either route is finalised:</p> <p>All Vehicular Access to A339 close to Household Waste Recycling Centre.</p> <p>Introduction of a roundabout at this junction would be an improvement and would eliminate unnecessary car journeys to the Swan roundabout. However gaining access to Sandleford Estate from this junction has two potential issues:</p> <p>1] Creation of a rat run that people will use to avoid congestion on Monks Lane even with a 20mph restriction.</p> <p>2] Opening up swathes of Newbury College land to development which is likely to worsen rather than improve the traffic flows at peak times. Given the prime position of this land it is hard to see how this course would not lead to further development.</p> <p>All Vehicular Access to Warren Road</p> <p>Again whilst this would relieve the pressure on Monks Lane, in conjunction with the A339 it could create a rat run.</p> <p>The Council would need to ensure funding of any development of this road to provide:</p> <p>Adequate pedestrian and cycle access along this route especially given the close proximity of Park House School, pavements need to be sufficiently wide to handle school children at peak periods.</p> <p>Be cognizant of the single track access to St Francis and its community hall where cars currently queue along Warren Road and will cause major disruption if the road</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>As the rest of the consultation response is a repeat of that submitted for the March 2013 consultation on the draft SPD the Council Response to these comments will remain the same as before.</p> <p>Work carried out through the transport assessments which supported the Core Strategy show that the site can be delivered through 2 all vehicle accesses onto Monks Lane and a sustainable transport route onto Warren Road. However, additional access routes are being explored in response to issues raised through consultation.</p> <p>As the SPD can only elaborate on existing policy, any additional accesses will be a matter for negotiation through the planning application process. There will be further opportunities for comments to be made through the planning application process.</p> <p>The detailed internal design of the road layout will be used to make rat running an unattractive option.</p> <p>There is additional committed but not implemented development at Newbury College, the traffic impacts of which are included within the existing modelling. Any further development of the College site would have to be accompanied by further highways assessment work to gauge deliverability.</p> <p>Any road through the site will be designed in a way to make it unattractive for rat running.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address the issues raised. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements, with the solution dependent on the particular issue to be addressed. Any solution would take account of existing and committed development proposals.</p> <p>In terms of this potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>The solution will depend on the specific issue. For example 'green light on demand' could be designed in as part of a traffic signal junction</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>is upgraded beyond a bus route. Funding would be needed to improve this access</p> <p>Major junction improvement on to the A343, which needs not only to ensure the safe crossing of students from Park House and Falkland Schools, but also be aware of the increased traffic resulting from the nearby development of an enhanced petrol station and mini market at the Total Petrol Station, opposite Park House School.</p> <p>Monks Lane and the junction with Andover Road A343</p> <p>There is currently a significant safety issue with students exiting Park House School where the pavement width is inadequate for the number of students exiting on to Monks Lane and there is no adequate pedestrian crossing either at this point on Monks Lane or the nearby mini roundabout. At 3:30pm on a school day the pavement all the way along to the Rugby Club entrance is dangerously congested and Monks Lane often ceases to flow as coaches and parents stop to pick students up. The cycle lane at this time is unusable. This is all before adding a further 400 students to the mix.</p> <p>Funding will be required to:</p> <p>Enhance the pedestrian entrance to Park House School so that the numbers of students can be safely handled</p> <p>Widen the pavement along Monks Lane all the way to the access point of the Sandleford Estate and potentially delineate a separate cycle path from the pedestrian path.</p> <p>Introduce a pedestrian crossing near the entrance to Park House School on Monks Lane and near to the mini roundabout junction across Andover Road.</p> <p>Double Mini Roundabout Junction Monks Lane/Andover Road A343 and Essex Street.</p> <p>This junction is a major bottleneck in South Newbury that struggles to cope with existing traffic levels. The situation is made worse by the single entrance/exit to the parade of shops, where vehicle movements clash with peak hour traffic. The additional traffic created by Sandleford Park is likely to bring the current junction to a standstill.</p> <p>Funding will be required to improve this junction and as part of this enhancement should look to enable a separate entrance and exit from the shop parade.</p> <p>Falkland Surgery</p> <p>Any increase in the number of patients using Falkland Surgery will put pressure on parking spaces where the rugby club is already being used informally as an overspill parking facility. While it is true that most of the proposed development is in easy walking distance of the surgery, the Group is anxious that the Council is aware that if people are ill they are likely to travel by car and this will result in extra traffic on Monks Lane and extra demand for parking spaces. Funding needs to be available to deal with this as well as conversations started with the Rugby Club about how they may be able to assist in this area.</p>	<p>Park House School will be extended to accommodate the additional pupils arising from the Sandleford development. This is likely to lead to the school being substantially reconfigured, during which process the accesses to the school will be considered. Feasibility work on the most appropriate layouts is currently ongoing.</p> <p>Noted. These issues will be explored further through a detailed transport assessment to be prepared as part of any planning application.</p> <p>Junction improvements including improvements for pedestrians and cyclists would be required here as part of any planning application. The solution will ultimately depend on the design and location of the accesses to the site.</p> <p>Noted. Discussions with the Clinical Commissioning Groups have taken place to inform the infrastructure delivery plan for the site. They have stated that their preferred solution to accommodating the development from the Sandleford site would be for an extension to the current premises at Falkland Practice. The feasibility of this, including car parking requirements and the need for ancillary services being discussed direct with the Practice.</p> <p>For all of the local facilities that neighbour the site including Falkland Surgery, opportunities will be sought for direct pedestrian and cycle access from the development site to encourage people to walk and cycle to them.</p> <p>Noted. The Council is aware of the issues raised and key enhancements have already been identified</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>A3 Alternative Forms of Transport</p> <p>The SPD needs to be aware that the scheme needs to enhance provision outside of the red line of development. An example of this is where in describing Cycle and Pedestrian Access under A1 it states "internal pedestrian and cycle routes will link into Newbury's existing accesses onto the A339 Newtown Road and Monks Lane".</p> <p>As previously described the current width of Monks Lane pavement is inadequate for pedestrians at peak times let alone cyclists, a situation exacerbated when the hedges are fully out. There is a strong safety case to segregate cycle ways from pedestrian paths and dedicated cycle ways need to be created from Monks Lane to the town centre if this mode of traffic is to be encouraged. Current Cycle Ways along the North end of Andover Road near the St John's roundabout are inadequate as they frequently have cars parked on them causing cyclists to have to come out into the road. The Newtown Road pavement is far too narrow with too many junctions to be used safely as a dual cycle way / footpath. Cycling provision needs to be significantly enhanced beyond the Sandleford development if it is indeed to be a sustainable development and funding found to achieve this.</p> <p>F Community Facilities and Services</p> <p>The Group are particularly concerned to ensure that sufficient provision is made for community facilities, and indeed given the stretched resource of current facilities that these are phased in early to the development. It is noted that the Local Centre is located in the southern half of the development which would suggest that it will be delivered later in the project. In particular:</p> <p>Provision of primary school educational facilities. The Group notes that the projections now require two two entry form primary schools which will result in a significant increase to the secondary school intake of Park House. Whilst the Group are satisfied that conversations are ongoing with Park House and that Park House are comfortable with being able to extend to accommodate the numbers on their existing land, there is a great deal less certainty about the location of the two primary schools or when they will be built. The phasing of these schools will be crucial and discussions need to be taking place with Falkland School if they are likely to have to accommodate early residents to the estate (and the fact that such students are unlikely to want to move once the new schools are open if they are already embedded at Falkland). Given the fact that Falkland have just introduced a third entry form for the first time any such phasing plans need to be discussed with them at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Extension of Park House School – whilst Park House are comfortable with the student projections and their ability to accommodate them through extension, the increase in student projections will result in significantly more vehicle movements from the estate as a result of after school activities and steps need to be taken to mitigate this.</p> <p>Early Years and Children's Centre provision for the new population. Again when is this going to be phased in as existing provision at Falkland School is at capacity.</p> <p>A space for indoor community use. The Group is very concerned that a single hall will be inadequate for a development of this size. Both St George's Community Hall and St Francis' are near capacity and the Wash Common and Greenham Scout Groups are oversubscribed. Given youth activities are in the evening they often conflict with other hall uses. At a minimum there needs to be a good size community</p>	<p>as part of the IDP. More will be considered as part of any Transport Assessment carried out to inform a planning application.</p> <p>Noted. However, the phasing of these will be dependent on the site, rather than phased to help address any wider deficiencies in the area. The final locations of facilities and services will be agreed through the planning application process. The phasing of the site will also be agreed through the planning application and is likely to be dependent on the final arrangements regarding accesses.</p> <p>Feasibility work is ongoing to discuss and agree the locations and format of primary school provision on site. The SPD sets out that the impact will need to be met from the occupation of the first dwelling; however discussions are underway with Falkland Primary School in case an interim solution is necessary.</p> <p>The traffic movements from Park House School will continue to be included in all transport assessment work for the site. Travel planning work will continue to help encourage walking and cycling to be seen as the normal mode of travel to school. There will need to be an access for walking and cycling direct from Sandleford into Park House. The phasing of this provision will be agreed through the planning application – education planning work is well progressed and has been carried out alongside the progression of the SPD. The Education team are fully engaged in the process.</p> <p>In terms of community use, the size of the provision will be appropriate for the size of the Sandleford scheme and is not expected to address existing deficiencies in the surrounding area.</p> <p>See response above. The expansion of Falkland Surgery is a requirement identified within the infrastructure plan for the site and discussions are underway regarding the best way to accommodate</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>hall with a separate building for youth activities.</p> <p>Health Care Facilities – Falkland Surgery as is could not accommodate the increase in patient numbers resulting from the Sandleford development. Whilst the current premises could be expanded this is likely to be at the expense of parking which is already an issue at the surgery (surgery stated that expansion needn't be at expense of parking space, but car park could not be expanded so pressure of parking would increase due to higher numbers). The alternative is for a split site which could be managed by the surgery however funding and land would be required to achieve this. Again we would urge planners to speak with the Surgery before completing the requirements of the SPD so that adequate funding is put in place out of the scheme.</p> <p>Post Office – the size of Sandleford and Wash Common combined would justify the presence of a new Post Office either within Sandleford or in the Wash Common Parade. This would again reduce the need for car journeys either to St John's Post Office or the main town PO. Whilst the PO is now an independent commercial organisation we would expect the Council/Developers to facilitate discussions with respect to opening a new facility in the vicinity.</p> <p>P Public Open Space and Recreation versus E Ecology and Wildlife</p> <p>The Group is very concerned to ensure that adequate facilities are provided to keep all ages of young entertained whilst also reducing the need for car journeys for after school activities and also preserving the ecology of the area. The SPD is very vague on all these areas.</p> <p>The location of the NEAP and the north LEAP would seem at odds with the ecological goals and should be located within the residential areas where there is likely to be better control over anti social behaviour, littering and destruction of the sensitive wetland valleys.</p> <p>Within the design there seems no provision for older children to go out and kick a ball around, and there would seem enormous scope to enhance sport provision at the Rugby Club to encompass all sports including a running track. This would have the dual benefit of providing facilities for older children whilst reducing the need for car journeys for after school activities. It will also reduce pressure on the country park and ecologically sensitive areas.</p> <p>Adequate provision in the park needs to be made for bins at regular intervals and their emptying.</p> <p>The Group supports the idea of community orchards and see the provision of allotments as essential given the likely limited size of individual gardens. However the SPD again is very vague on these matters as to size (how many allotments) and location. We would want the SPD to be much more definitive on these points.</p> <p>The Group also welcomes opening access to the Country Park but notes that bizarrely access points are given to most of the ancient woodlands whilst younger woodlands appear closed to access. Whilst clearly access to woodland is an essential part of the park it would seem sensible for some of the woodlands to be cordoned off in their entirety whilst other woodlands are "sacrificed" for communal use. As such it would seem logical that Crooks Copse to the north and Barn Copse to the west are made open access whilst measures are taken to preserve Stockett's Copse, High Wood and Dirty Ground Copse as non accessible woods for example.</p>	<p>the increase in patients and the additional requirements arising from this.</p> <p>There are no current plans for a post office on site; however this could be an option to be explored further through the planning application.</p> <p>The recreational requirements of the development have been assessed and their draft location agreed with the Council's ecologist, taking account of the best practice guidance provided by Fields in Trust (FIT). The outcome of this is set out within the SPD.</p> <p>There will be a Public Open Space strategy for the site, provided as part of any planning application. The final locations of the NEAP, LEAPs and LAPs will be discussed and agreed through the process of preparation of this strategy and the planning application process, taking these comments into account</p> <p>There is large potential for informal recreation of all kinds at the site as 60% of it will be undeveloped. This will be managed to ensure that it can be accommodated within the ecological and landscape capacity of the site.</p> <p>An SPD cannot be so specific and include this level of detail. Instead it sets the framework for the planning application and its supporting documentation such as the Country Park Management Plan which will provide the detail. This will take into account all of the evidence available.</p> <p>Noted. It is not possible to fence off woodlands for access. None of the woodlands are proposed to be closed to access, but the emphasis will be on managing access. In terms of opening up the woodland at the southern perimeter of the site, this is a matter to be explored further through the Country Park Management Plan. However, this woodland is not intended to be closed off in any way.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>We would also suggest the opening of the woodland at the southern perimeter of the site to give access to the River Enborne.</p> <p>It is also understood that part of the motivation for the Park is to take pressure off Greenham Common for recreational use and as such what provision if any is being made for parking so that residential areas are not used for parking for visitors?</p> <p>R Renewable Energy</p> <p>This section of the SPD appears very weak. We would like to see a strong commitment to renewable energy that street design and roof layout will seek to maximise potential of use of photo voltaic panels, there should also be a commitment for the use of heat source pumps. In paragraph R3 we would prefer the wording to be changed to:</p> <p>“Design Coding/Design Principles will embody sustainable design and construction principles including the Code for Sustainable Homes in any future planning application as these evolve over the years.”</p>	<p>The matter of whether or not parking should be provided at the Country park is being discussed and depends on agreement over the role and function of this area of public open space.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Dr Patrick Flynn		Section B: Vision and Strategic Objectives	<p>Single Comprehensive Planning Application</p> <p>A single planning application should be enforced. If developers are able to submit piecemeal plans for their own road systems and building developments, comprehensive planning for the whole site would be lost.</p> <p>Strategic Overview</p> <p>A strategic overview looking sufficiently far ahead is missing. The requirement for a single planning application for the entire Sandleford site should be strictly maintained, but planning must consider the whole Sandleford development from the northern boundary along Monks Lane down to the southern boundary along the River Enborne.</p> <p>An essential initial requirement is a plan for a circular main road entirely on the Sandleford development with a major all vehicle access to the large roundabout at the junction of A339 and B4640: this should be in place before any building starts. Two accesses to Monks Lane have been judged as sufficient to deliver the development, but a further access to A339 near the waste disposal site and a major access at the A339/B4640 roundabout would deliver all the access required for the whole development for the future.</p> <p>Warren Road</p> <p>A way through Warren Road as a main access for all traffic and buses is totally unacceptable. A pedestrian and cycle route from Sandleford along the existing public footpath would accord with the policy of West Berkshire for the provision of such routes and provide a safe route for children and parents walking to and from school.</p> <p>Newbury Town Council and the governing bodies of Park House School and Falkland Primary School oppose making Warren Road a principal access to Sandleford.</p> <p>All the pressure for developing Warren Road comes from Mr Norgate. A back door</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The SPD provides this long term framework for the development of the whole of the site throughout its build, and also includes linkages beyond the site.</p> <p>An access linking to the A339/B4640 roundabout is not proposed, and would have a landscape impact on the area designated as Country Parkland, which would be against Core Strategy Policy CS3.</p> <p>The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>Additional access points would also maximise the opportunities for permeability through the site. Any access will be designed with paramount regard to safety.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address the issues raised. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements, with the solution dependent on the particular issue to be</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>addition to his planning proposal to demolish part of Park Cottage, proposed as an 'improvement' to Warren Road, would allow him to escape the single planning application requirement and build his own development. The suggestion that the road needs to be 'improved' to allow use by large vehicles is purely for his own benefit, and would encourage use by large vehicles to access the illegal industrial estate with no planning permission at Warren Farm (it is not a farm), which the West Berkshire Council has ordered to be shut down by 2017. Warren Road is fully satisfactory for use by residents as it is. No planning consent should be given for widening and opening out Warren Road.</p> <p>Detrimental Effects of Proposed All Vehicle and Bus Route along Warren Road</p> <p>The detrimental effects of widening and opening out of Warren Road and making it a principal access to Sandleford would be considerable for residents of the Warren Road / Andover Road locality.</p> <p>These effects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible forced purchase of residents' gardens.</li> <li>• Destruction of trees on Park House School boundary that should be protected.</li> <li>• Removal of valuable Park House School cricket field.</li> <li>• Creation of vehicular traffic dangerous to the safety of very young children, school pupils, parents and teachers. Large numbers of young children use scooters and small bicycles on their way to and from school and accompanying parents frequently have small toddlers below school age with them as they push prams with babies.</li> <li>• Creation of noise and pollution to residents of Warren Road and Sunley Close and to the school children at Park House.</li> <li>• Creation of a dangerous exit onto a busy road with an unacceptable increase in traffic. The junction of Warren Road with Andover Road does not meet the sight line requirements and one pedestrian has been knocked down by a vehicle turning left from Andover road into Warren Road.</li> <li>• Addition of extra traffic to a busy road that has two schools, a petrol station and small supermarket on it within a short distance with many people crossing.</li> <li>• Reduction of parking space for parents taking and collecting their children from school.</li> <li>• Danger and inconvenience from increase in vehicle traffic and noise to worshippers and social groups that use the facilities of two local churches. The Catholic church has a narrow entrance that would be dangerous with an increase in vehicle traffic.</li> <li>• A similar threat has been made to Kendrick Road.</li> </ul> <p>Construction Traffic</p> <p>There is a very large area of land available for the Sandleford development that can easily absorb all the construction traffic by a main site entrance at the A339/B4640 roundabout. It is important that the surrounding residential areas should be protected from the detrimental effects of the construction traffic that will be required over the whole course of the development by banning the use of any other accesses to construction traffic.</p>	<p>addressed.</p> <p>In terms of potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>The landowner has submitted a planning application to the council to improve access to New Warren Farm. This application has been approved, but there are no links between this application and Sandleford Park. The Council is required to assess each planning application on its own merits. (application 14/02416/FUL)</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>There are no plans currently for any changes to Kendrick Road to enable access to the site.</p> <p>Details relating to construction traffic would be agreed, and conditioned, during the consideration of a planning application.</p>



Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>Bus Route on Warren Road</p> <p>There is no requirement or justification for a bus route along Warren Road. The suggestion that buses from Warren Road need to turn left on to Andover Road to provide a service to Andover is ridiculous as an argument for making Warren Road a principal access to Sandleford. Buses from the Sandleford development would leave via the planned accesses to Monks Lane and go to the bus and rail stations and the retail park via Newtown Road, Andover Road or Elizabeth Avenue. Pedestrians from Sandleford wishing to go to Andover could walk through to Andover Road to the bus stop outside Park House School and catch a bus to Andover, although it should be noted that local residents never see any passengers waiting there so the demand is negligible.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>It is totally unacceptable to propose an all vehicle and bus route through Warren Road. The access from Sandleford should be restricted to a pedestrian and cycle route in accord with the planning precedent created by the large development at Wash Common which permitted only a pedestrian and cycle exit route through to Battery Road and Essex Street.</p> <p>This proposal is solely driven by Donnington Homes by the back door method of linking it to a proposed part demolition of Park Cottage and 'improvement' of Warren Road to allow them to proceed with a development separately from Sandleford and a road system not linked to Sandleford in direct contradiction of the single proposal requirement.</p> <p>All the statements from Donnington Homes regarding problems from large vehicles in Warren Road are without foundation. The few instances of passing problems concern large vehicles (sometimes with trailers) going to the illegal industrial estate at Warren Farm set up by Donnington Homes themselves. Their industrial development was set up without planning permission and West Berkshire Council has ordered its removal by 2017. There is no problem with passing in Warren Road except on rare occasions. Any difficulty can be resolved by one vehicle waiting momentarily for the other vehicle to pass.</p> <p>Warren Road is completely satisfactory as it is for the cars and other vehicles that serve the requirements of the existing residents. The proposed 'improvements' put forward by Donnington Homes have nothing to do with improving Warren Road. It is a plan to allow them to propose a housing development in the future not connected to Sandleford, which would change a quiet residential area into a full time busy road. At present Warren Road is chaotic at school starting and finishing times and any suggestion to add further traffic is unacceptable.</p> <p>Final comment</p> <p>Planners have a large area of land available at Sandleford, more than necessary to contain within the development all the necessary roads, buildings and facilities. The requirement for a single planning application should be enforced and not allow one developer to do things outside the confines of the development for his own advantage to the detriment of the existing residents of Warren Road, Andover Road and the local community.</p>	
Mr		Section D: The Site Context	Section D - Access - Sections 74 and 75	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
Alastair Jarman			<p>Great emphasis has been made of the Andover bus needing to use Warren road and turn left into the A343. But in Section D - Access - Sections 74 and 75, there is NO mention of stage coach Buses 20 or X20 which leaves from the memorial by the gun at 7:10, 8:35, 10:40,12:50. 15:45,17:45 .</p> <p>The number 7 bus is also not listed and leaves at 0845 1045 1245 1545 1800 from outside Park house. It would seem logical that the bus approaching up the Andover road would turn left at the Gun / Bell roundabout, proceed into the furthest of the new monks lane access roundabouts into the Sandleford estate, proceed back out through the other Monks lane access roundabout and turn left back to the Gun roundabout for a left turn into the bus layby opposite the memorial. This would mean all the junctions and turning to be used would already be bus "friendly" and avoid ANY need to create a "technically challenging junction" when one is NOT required at the Warren road A343 junction, especially when one considers that only a handful of buses will be on this route during times of high traffic volume.</p>	<p>The text of the SPD will be updated to be more general in terms of bus provision, as there is potential for a number of changes to bus numbers/ routes to take place prior to the completion of the site. Paragraphs 74/75 change to say <u>A number of local buses run close to the site providing links to Newbury Town Centre and further afield, including a regular service to Basingstoke and Greenham Business Park.</u></p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address the issues raised. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements, with the solution dependent on the particular issue to be addressed.</p> <p>In terms of potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p>
K Summers		Section D: The Site Context	<p>In section 44 under Location and context, the Tesco superstore is mentioned and Newbury retail park. However car parking congestion in the superstore and retail park is already quite severe at peak times with traffic queuing on the A339 and blocking the roundabout in order to access these facilities. Improving the roundabout will not help matters as the problem is the size and layout of the retail park car park and weight of traffic. 2,000 new homes will make this problem significantly worse.</p> <p>Again at peak times there is traffic queuing on the A339 in order to access the household waste recycling centre (HWRC). The impact of 2000 homes with very likely between 2000 and 3000 cars will greatly exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>In section 58 under Landscape the views from the B4640 (Newtown Straight) are mentioned and the visual assessment has concluded that the development will be obscured by mature trees. However the infrastructure to support 2000 new homes will obviously require night time street lighting. What action is being taken to reduce the impact of the light pollution which will be generated by this development and which will be visible from Newtown?</p> <p>In section 71 under "Access" and "The Highway Network" reference is made to the fact that the western end of Monks Lane leads to the Andover Road which gives access north east to Newbury town centre and gives access south west to the A34 and Andover. However when discussing the eastern end of Monks Lane which connects to the A339 it mentions that this gives access to the north to the town centre and south to Basingstoke and the M3. What it neglects to mention is that heading south on the A339 also gives you access to the A34. In fact from both of the proposed Monks Lane access points to the A34 junction at Tot Hill it is a shorter distance to travel via the A339 and B4640 than it is to travel on the A343 and one junction of the A34. For traffic heading south on the A34 it makes little sense to travel via the Andover road particularly as the speed limit is mainly 30mph and 40mph, whereas the A339 and B4640 are 50mph. This will be further compounded if, as is mentioned in the draft, a further access point to the development is created on the A339 itself. Nowhere in the document is there any analysis of the additional traffic projected to pass along the B4640.</p>	<p>The allocation of the site has been informed by four phases of Transport Assessment work, which has fed into the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>There has been additional Transport Assessment work carried out since the site was allocated and more is being undertaken by the Council to provide the necessary detail to assess any planning application.</p> <p>Street lighting will need to comply with the guidance in the Quality Design SPD</p> <p>An assessment of the Traffic distribution into Hampshire has been carried out and is available on the Council's website (<a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/sandleford">www.westberks.gov.uk/sandleford</a>)</p>
Mr Alastair Jarman		Section E: Community Engagement	<p>Since the Community Engagement consultation in 2009 there have been a number of changes and the link <a href="http://www.westberks.gov.uk/sandleford">www.westberks.gov.uk/sandleford</a> . appears to be broken so unable to reference</p>	<p>The link was tested prior to, and during, the consultation and was active each time it was tested.</p>
Mr Alastair		Section F: Development Principles	<p>Objection to Section F- A. Access and movement.</p>	<p>The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
Jarman			<p>By requesting Donnington New Homes to investigate an "All Vehicular Access" to Warren road, WBC have created an environment where this developer who has been purchasing property and land over time, to be in a position where he may believe he can have his "own" access to the "Sandleford Development", and may have "inadvertently" facilitated the fallout between the 2 groups of land Owners. Why would a land owner spend so much of his own money unless he was confident of the outcome? This could raise concerns as to whether this process has any truly democratic or independent credibility, and lead to a loss of confidence in the development as a whole before it even starts.</p> <p>I have seen no vehicle emission studies carried out into the effects of queuing traffic adjacent to the schools bordering this development. The permanent monitoring station by the "Burger King" roundabout has failed to meet emission regulations a number of times. What will be the predicted amount of emissions based on the increased traffic volume and movement (or queuing)?</p> <p>With a predominate SW wind direction the emissions from additional traffic along Warren road and Andover road will be carried across the school grounds and ALL traffic emissions may add to the pooling in the natural lower ground around the burger king and St Johns road area.</p> <p>The Saturn Traffic flow modelling does not include sufficient detail to cover the effect of "Rat runs", I have seen this Modelling carried out by other councils where "Rat runs" have been included in the modelling. Rupert road, Falkland road, Battery end, Elizabeth Avenue, Conifer crest, Wash water and Foxs lane could all be used by this additional traffic but have not been modelled. Traffic heading south may impact on roads for which Hampshire hold responsibility, I would have thought they would want to be assured of the greatest possible precision in the data.</p> <p>By making Warren Road All vehicular access Sandleford will have NO "Sustainable transport" credibility, and NO truly segregated transport routes. Even the current "cycle and foot paths" suffer from protruding hedgerows, leaf litter and pedestrians with no awareness, usually due to earphone use, of the presence of cyclists. One member of our cycle club (Newbury RC) was knocked off in Newbury just before Christmas and is still recovering. I cannot believe that the local authority would be prepared to allow the interests of developers take priority over the safety and wellbeing of a neighbourhood and community.</p> <p>There is NO reason for a bus link to exit Warren road and turn left to Andover, I have seen a letter stating that such a route would be desirable, but there was a comment on the edge of the letter saying "is this what you wanted", at least 2 other people have seen this letter. I do not believe this was for any other purpose but to "add weight" to the creation of an "All vehicular access". I have made an additional comment about the "required bus route" in the relevant section.</p> <p>I will once again restate: There is NO VALID REASON to make Warren road a vehicle access point for the Sandleford development, it is a junction with a high footfall of vulnerable "Non car" users at a time when traffic levels will be at their maximum.</p> <p>The original Adopted plan with 2 accesses on Monks lane can fully support the development. This would of course require the land owners to work together and deliver a Single application, as materials would require transporting across each owners land</p>	<p>A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>The allocation of the site has been informed by four phases of Transport Assessment work, which has fed into the development of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>There has been additional Transport Assessment work carried out since the site was allocated and more is being undertaken by the Council to provide the necessary detail to assess any planning application.</p> <p>The Council has an Air Quality Management Area Action Plan (AQMP AP) for the Burger King roundabout to work to improve air quality at the roundabout. Implementation of the Action Plan will continue to improve air quality at this roundabout.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address the issues raised. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements, with the solution dependent on the particular issue to be addressed.</p> <p>In terms of potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>Additional comments and concerns</p> <p>The Sainsbury's petrol station and shop has been a major concern of pedestrian safety since opening, several near misses and hits have occurred already. It has created an area of sensory overload for car drivers, cyclists and pedestrians alike, even at current traffic levels. In particular Vehicles travelling north on the A343, or exiting from Falkland lane and indicating left; pedestrians are unsure if the turn is to be made into the Petrol station, Falkland road or onto the A343.</p> <p>By placing a junction by the Waste Recycling Centre (WRC) and moving cars south toward the Tothill intersection, commuters would have the option of taking on fuel at the station service area junction. This may reduce the number of fuel trips made by the new Sandeford residents to the Andover road facility.</p> <p>If the proposed "No Right Turn" from Warren road was enforced then traffic from Warren road would have to turn left, cut around Conifer crest and either come up Falkland drive, before making the dangerous (for pedestrians) swing left into Sainsbury's, or come back down Andover road and have to turn across oncoming traffic (while watching for pedestrian's, hopefully).</p> <p>The 50mph limit around the Wash water junction should be reduced to 30mph, it makes little sense to allow traffic to increase to this speed approaching a near blind junction, even more so at increased traffic levels.</p> <p>I hope Sainsbury's will be consulted with regard to the safety implications of the increased traffic before more accidents occur.</p> <p>Yet again this "consultation" has taken place over a time period when interest AND time is limited.</p>	<p>Once the Council receives the planning application for the site all neighbours of the site will be consulted (within 100m) and site notices put up, in line with national guidance.</p> <p>The consultation period on the updated SPD lasted seven weeks, one week more than the required statutory consultation period. All consultees who had previously expressed an interest in the site were notified by email or letter of the start of the consultation period.</p>
Mr Alastair Jarman		Section F: Development Principles	<p>I agree that ONLY a single planning application be acceptable.</p> <p>Separate applications will see developers trying to "cut the cake" in their own financial interest.</p>	Support noted
Mr Alastair Jarman		Section F: Development Principles	<p>Agree Single planning application</p> <p>Council Document REF SG/ns/HP07098 was an objection from the owners of Sandeford Park to the race course development and the last paragraph reads.</p> <p>"Accordingly the planning application should be refused planning permission and the Newbury Racecourse site considered through the correct vehicle of the Core Strategy, which will allow this site to be considered in the context of its strategic impact alongside the competing sites to ensure the Core Strategy delivers a cohesive spatial strategy for West Berkshire and all issues including direction of growth, infrastructure and community provision are considered in a comprehensive rather than piecemeal approach."</p> <p>If Sandeford Park owners objected to the planning application of Newbury race course being piecemeal then they should be prepared to work to the same principles on their own site. No piecemeal applications.</p>	Support noted
Mrs Lynne		Section F: Development Principles	<p>A. Access and Movement.</p> <p>I have no objection to a further access for all vehicles onto A339. Close to the</p>	The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
Widdop			<p>HWRC as this road was supposed to be the main route in and out of Newbury from the bypass, once it was built, not the Andover road.</p> <p>I do not think there should be an all vehicle access onto the Andover Road via Warren Road (a dead end at present) runs alongside Park House and joins the Andover Road opposite Falkland Primary School and St Georges Church. It is already Chaotic at school starting and finishing times and the idea of cars from a further 2,000 houses joining the melee is unimaginable.</p> <p>By all means have pedestrian and cycle access to the site and if absolutely necessary bus access - all of which encourages people away from car use but this will only happen if cars cannot use this access route. Car access via Warren Road is unnecessary as facilities are within cycle and walking distance and cars will cause pollutions and endanger pedestrians and cyclists and the stated plan is to create a bike and pedestrian friendly site.</p>	<p>A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>There has been additional Transport Assessment work carried out since the site was allocated and more is being undertaken by the Council to provide the necessary detail to assess any planning application.</p>
Dr John Stather		Section F: Development Principles	<p>Site Development</p> <p>The September 2013 Planning Document was intended as a framework for the future development of the whole of the Sandleford Park Site and to set out planning and design principles and requirements for the land and buildings. Ultimately this will be a very substantial site with up to 2000 homes and clearly great care needs to be given by WBC to ensure proper control of how the site is developed.</p> <p>What now concerns WBC is that the developers and landowners are moving to put in separate plans for various parts of the Sandleford Park Site rather than an integrated proposal. The strategic plan given in the present (December 2014) consultation document shows how the council wish to have a single comprehensive planning application for the whole site. In addition to housing this will include roads, local infrastructure and services, play areas for all ages, a new primary school, open spaces and extensive green areas and linkages across the site. In addition management of existing woodland areas and planting of new woodland areas is addressed. In my view, if the developers are able to submit piecemeal plans many of the sensible, well considered and far sighted development proposals prepared by WBC could be diluted, or just lost, and the whole area simply become carpeted with ever more houses. This would be to the detriment of both those living or working at the Sandleford Park Site and to the wider community of Newbury. Of paramount importance in the early stages of this development will be the provision of a proper road structure on the Sandleford Site with suitable access to local roads.</p> <p>I strongly support the need for a single comprehensive planning application for the whole of the Sandleford Park Site.</p> <p>Warren Road</p> <p>The December 2014 consultation document also considers access to the Sandleford Park Site. This may not have been thought through sufficiently when the September 2013 planning document was prepared. Originally the principle access for vehicles was planned from Monks Lane although other options were considered possible. The Council has asked for all vehicle access from Warren Road onto the A343 (Andover Road) and for access on to the A339 close to the Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) to be examined. The main access to the site should clearly be from Monks Lane and some access from near the HWRC may also be possible.</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address the issues raised. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements, with the solution dependent on the particular issue to be addressed.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>An all vehicle access point onto the Andover Road from Warren Road would, however, result in substantially more cars, heavy lorries and other vehicles joining an already very busy road. Clearly the present road could not support this type of traffic flow and major alterations would need to be made either to the grounds of Park House School and its trees or to the gardens of houses in Warren Road, or both. How such an access point, directly opposite the entrance to Falkland School as well as being near to Park House School, can even be considered is alarming and would be a fundamental mistake. Consideration of this access option would seem to reflect the aspirations of just one developer to have a separate access point for his own building site. Warren Road, as it is at present, serves local needs well and should be left as it is.</p> <p>I understand that Newbury Town Council, as well as the governing bodies of Park House School and Falkland Primary School oppose making Warren Road an all vehicle access to the site. I also oppose such a plan. It would be just plain folly to consider allowing such all vehicle access on to Andover Road from the Sandleford Development. The area around the two schools is very busy with traffic in the morning and evening and changes to the road system that would endanger children going to and leaving school, should not be considered further.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>I support the WBC proposal for a single integrated and comprehensive scheme for Sandleford Park to be submitted by all the developers together. This is the only way that the structure plan envisaged for those living and working on the Sandleford Site and for the wider Newbury community can be effectively delivered in its entirety. Piecemeal development plans put forward by individual developers must be resisted.</p> <p>The proposal for an all vehicle access to the Sandleford Site by way of Warren Road from the A343 would cause considerable disruption to Park House School grounds and to local properties. It would put much more traffic onto an already busy road and put school children at a greatly increased risk of harm. It is quite unnecessary and should not be pursued further.</p>	<p>In terms of potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>Additional transport assessment work carried out by the Council has indicated that additional all vehicle accesses to Warren Road and the A339 would reduce the overall traffic impact of the site and improve circulation and permeability of the site.</p> <p>There has been additional Transport Assessment work carried out since the site was allocated and more is being undertaken by the Council to provide the necessary detail to assess any planning application.</p>
Miss Airlie Dyson		Section F: Development Principles	<p>Landscape and visual assessment</p> <p>Properties in Wash Common have views into the westernmost part of the Sandleford site. Development close to the site boundary should be avoided. Please ensure that the mature trees and overgrown hedgerows along Kendrick Road are retained.</p> <p>Vehicular access</p> <p>There is a proposal to upgrade the access to Sandleford Park through Warren Road to all vehicles. For this to be achieved, land would have to be taken from Park House School (which is expected to accommodate extra students from the development), Andover Road is already over capacity at peak times due to two schools and a petrol station/grocery store. Additional traffic from Sandleford Park will increase the congestion.</p>	<p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address the issues raised. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements, with the solution dependent on the particular issue to be addressed.</p> <p>In terms of potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan (see Appendix 2 of SPD) which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p>
Ms Lisa Bullock	Network Rail	Section G: Delivery and Implementation	<p>Network Rail has been consulted by West Berkshire Council on the amendments made to Sandleford Park draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Thank you for providing us with this opportunity to comment on this Planning Policy document. This email forms the basis of our response to this consultation request.</p> <p>Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the country's railway infrastructure and associated estate. Network Rail owns, operates,</p>	Comments are noted.

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>maintains and develops the main rail network. This includes the railway tracks, stations, signalling systems, bridges, tunnels, level crossings and viaducts. The preparation of development plan policy is important in relation to the protection and enhancement of Network Rail's infrastructure. In this regard, please find our comments below.</p> <p>Following our previous comments made on 3/5/13 by Barbara Morgan the council published their response to them via Section G; Appendix 3; and general comments on the whole document. This response concluded that the SPD would set out the requirement for funding for rail improvements in particular the comments implied that the SPD would be amended to make clear that a Transport Assessment will be required to accompany the application. There is no alteration to this and therefore we are happy to accept the proposed amendments. I would however like to reiterate the following additional comments already provided by Network Rail.</p> <p>Level Crossings</p> <p>Development proposals' affecting the safety of level crossings is an extremely important consideration for emerging planning policy to address. The impact from development can result in a significant increase in the vehicular and/or pedestrian traffic utilising a crossing which in turn impacts upon safety and service provision.</p> <p>As a result of increased patronage, Network Rail could be forced to reduce train line speed in direct correlation to the increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic using a crossing. This would have severe consequences for the timetabling of trains and would also effectively frustrate any future train service improvements. This would be in direct conflict with strategic and government aims of improving rail services.</p> <p>In this regard, we would request that the potential impacts from development affecting Network Rail's level crossings, is specifically addressed through planning policy as there have been instances whereby Network Rail has not been consulted as statutory undertaker where a proposal has impacted on a level crossing. We request that a policy is provided confirming that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council have a statutory responsibility under planning legislation to consult the statutory rail undertaker where a proposal for development is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway:</li> </ul> <p>Schedule 5 (f)(ii) of the Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) order, 2010 requires that... "Where any proposed development is likely to result in a material increase in volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (public footpath, public or private road) the Planning Authority's Highway Engineer must submit details to both Her Majesty's Railway Inspectorate and Network Rail for separate approval".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any planning application which may increase the level of pedestrian and/or vehicular usage at a level crossing should be supported by a full Transport Assessment assessing such impact: and</li> <li>The developer is required to fund any required qualitative improvements to the level crossing as a direct result of the development proposed.</li> </ul> <p>Planning Applications</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>We would appreciate the Council providing Network Rail with an opportunity to comment on any future planning applications should they be submitted for sites adjoining the railway, or within close proximity to the railway as we may have more specific comments to make (further to those above).</p> <p>We trust these comments will be considered in your amendment of the Supplementary Planning document.</p>	
Patrick Blake	Highways Agency	Sandleford Infrastructure Requirements Identified in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Appendix 3	<p>The HA is an executive agency of the Department for Transport (DfT). We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving England's strategic road network (SRN) on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. In the case of Sandleford Park this relates to the A34 and M4 Junction 13. We would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN as a result of planned growth without careful consideration of mitigation measures. It is important that the SPD provides the planning policy framework to ensure development cannot progress without the appropriate infrastructure in place.</p> <p>When considering proposals for growth, any impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible. The HA in general, will support proposals that consider sustainable measures which manage down demand and reduces the need to travel. Infrastructure improvements on the SRN should only be considered as a last resort.</p> <p>For background, you may be interested to read the Department for Transport Circular 2/2013 (The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development) which sets out the way the Highways Agency will engage with communities, local authorities, and the development industry to deliver development and, thus, economic growth, whilst safeguarding the primary function and purpose of the strategic road network. Please see the following link:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/strategic-road-network-and-the-delivery-of-sustainable-development">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/strategic-road-network-and-the-delivery-of-sustainable-development</a></p> <p>We have reviewed the consultation. It is noted that in Appendix 3, an improvement to the A34/A343 South junction is identified as critical infrastructure to enable development at Sandleford Park. We would welcome further discussion on the need for and impact of such an improvement. We welcome the requirements in Appendix 4, particularly the need for a transport assessment and travel plan to support proposals. In addition we would strongly recommend that a Construction Traffic Management Plan is included as a planning application requirement.</p> <p>I hope this is helpful and I look forward to continued involvement with the Sandleford Park SPD.</p>	<p>The allocation of the site has been informed by four phases of Transport Assessment work, which has fed into the development of an Infrastructure Development Plan.</p> <p>Comments relating to the A34 are noted, and discussions will take place as part of the pre application or planning application process.</p> <p>The requirement for a Construction Traffic Management Plan to be submitted as part of the planning application will be added to the list in Appendix 4.</p>
Mr David Wilson	Savills (on behalf of Thames Water)	Sandleford Infrastructure Requirements Identified in the Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Appendix 3	<p>Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames Water's appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water.</p> <p>As you will be aware, Thames Water are the statutory water and sewerage undertaker for the West Berkshire District and are hence a "specific consultation body" in accordance with the Town &amp; Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. In this context we have the following comments on the Amended Sandleford Park SPD on behalf of Thames Water:</p> <p>Thames Water support the reference to the need to upgrade wastewater infrastructure in Appendix 3 and the need to submit a 'foul sewage and utilities assessment' in Appendix 4. However, Thames Water consider that there needs to</p>	<p>The IDP is updated regularly and discussions will take place between the Council and Thames Water prior to the next IDP.</p> <p>Thames Water will be consulted at the pre application or application stage on the water/waste water proposals for the site. It is expected that the utilities assessment in Appendix 4 will include a water supply infrastructure assessment.</p>



Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>be clearer reference/guidance on the need for water supply infrastructure to serve the development..</p> <p>New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states: “Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater....”</p> <p>Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: “ Local planning authorities should works with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”</p> <p>The new web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that “Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development” (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).</p> <p>Thames Water therefore consider that the SPD should also include specific reference to the need for the provision of water infrastructure to service development, in addition to wastewater/sewerage infrastructure. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs).</p> <p>Such reference is required to ensure the infrastructure is provided in time to service development to avoid unacceptable impacts associated with water shortages with associated low pressure water supply problems.</p> <p>In order to ensure that the water supply and drainage requirements of development proposals are understood and that any upgrade requirements are identified, all developers should be encouraged to contact Thames Water Developer Services in advance of the submission of planning applications.</p> <p>Thames Water recommend that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity to establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developments demand for water supply infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met;</li> <li>• The developments demand for wastewater infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; and</li> <li>• The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met.</li> </ul> <p>In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water and wastewater infrastructure. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, then the developer needs to contact Thames Water to agree what improvements are</p>	

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.</p> <p>Information for Developers on water/wastewater infrastructure can be found on Thames Water's website at: <a href="http://www.thameswater.co.uk/home/11425.htm">http://www.thameswater.co.uk/home/11425.htm</a></p> <p>Or contact can be made with Thames Water Developer Services by:</p> <p>Post at: Thames Water Developer Services, Reading Mailroom, Rose Kiln Court, Rose Kiln Lane, Reading RG2 0BY; Telephone on: 0845 850 2777; Email: <a href="mailto:developer.services@thameswater.co.uk">developer.services@thameswater.co.uk</a></p> <p>Thames Water has limited powers under the Water Industry Act 1991 to prevent connection to its network ahead of infrastructure upgrades. Therefore, Thames Water relies heavily on the planning system to ensure infrastructure upgrades are provided ahead of development either through phasing and Local Plan policies, or the use of Grampian style conditions attached to planning permissions.</p> <p>Thames Water recommends that all new dwellings should meet the water usage targets set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes code 3 rating as a minimum.</p>	
David Kiff		Sandleford Park Supplementary Planning Document – Proposed amendments December 2014	<p><b><u>Section B – Strategic Objective</u></b></p> <p>Para 2 still only identifies the 2 principal vehicular access into the Monks Lane plus a bus route along Warren Road, with other accesses from the A339 and Warren Road to be explored. I note that figure 4 of Section D has now acquired Potential Access Arrows from the A339 and Warren Road but no attempt has been made to develop these accesses, as indicated in figure 7 of Section F showing the access and movement framework - the A339 'arrow' points towards the Ancient Woodlands with no link to the indicative Access Routes! The Text in Section F –A.1 still refers to principle vehicular accesses into the site will be from Monks Lane. My impression was that the Memo prepared by the Highways Development Control Team, dated May 2<sup>nd</sup> 2013 had 'explored' the potential accesses from the A339 and Warren Road in some detail with recommendations as to their inclusion in the overall Master plan. The comments in my submission of 12th September 2014 generally concurred with these findings and highlighted the challenges of connecting all four access into the local road network. Why has no further progress been made on this issue?</p> <p><b><u>Section B Vision and Strategic Objectives</u></b></p> <p>The Vision mission Statement talks about 'sustainable' design and construction techniques to mitigate against climate change and minimize Co2 emissions but makes no reference to reducing pollutions from vehicle emissions caused by traffic congestion. With 1500 homes at the Racecourse Development and now the Faraday Road Development, with its proposed signalized 'T' junction off the A339, traffic congestion and pollution is bound to increase and to add a further 2000 houses at Sandleford will make the situation intolerable. It is reported that the pollution monitoring station on the A339 at the St John's Road/ Queens Road junction in 2012 was measuring 55.9 mcg of No2, which is considerably higher than the 40mcg limit set by the World Health Organisation. This is in contravention of a European Court of</p>	<p>The maps and plans within the SPD are indicative only. The detailed site layout, including the location of roads, will be a matter to be determined through the planning application process.</p> <p>The consideration of alternative access points was largely in response to the earlier consultation when there was significant opposition to having only two main accesses onto Monks Lane. The Council wishes to explore the potential for an all vehicle access through Warren Road and access onto the A339 to assess the comparative effects of traffic flows from the site onto the surrounding highway network. The bus link would remain as part of any such option.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the technical challenges of the potential Warren Road access and would need to address the issues raised. If this access was to go ahead, it would be likely to be designed as a traffic signal junction which would enable a pedestrian crossing opportunity. There would need to be a wide range of highways improvements, with the solution dependent on the particular issue to be addressed.</p> <p>In terms of potential access, if it does go ahead, consideration will be given to only allowing general traffic to turn left when travelling out of the site. This would mean that traffic travelling north in the direction of Newbury Town Centre would not use this access and would not be adding to the traffic passing Falkland School and Park House School.</p> <p>There has been additional Transport Assessment work carried out since the site was allocated and more is being undertaken by the Council to provide the necessary detail to assess any planning application.</p> <p>The Council have declared an Air Quality Management Area around the Burger Kind roundabout. An Action Plan has been developed to reduce emissions at the roundabout, and implementation of this is ongoing.</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>Justice ruling that No2 levels must be reduced to levels below limits set out in the Air Quality Directive.</p> <p><b>Sections A</b> – Para II – Sustainability Appraisal states that the Sandleford Development has been subjected to a sustainability appraisal. The Council concluded that a Strategic Environmental Assessment was not needed because it has demonstrated that there will be <u>no significant environmental effects</u> as a result of the S.P.D. I fail to see how the traffic and pollution generated by the provision of an additional 2000 houses can be deemed to have no environmental effects in the light of the current pollution levels noted above</p> <p><b>Section F</b> – A3 – Sandleford Park will promote alternative forms of transport to the private car. This refers to Appendix 2 – Site Travel Plan Requirements for Sandleford Park which sets out the onus to be placed on the Developer to find alternative modes of travel to the car in the form of subsidies applicable during and beyond the total development period (10 – 20 years +!). For instance, at what point does the developer have to provide the bus service – 15minute interval at peak periods – after the construction of 10, 50,100 or 200 houses? – If it is not implemented at the <u>outset</u> travellers will have to revert to alternative transport i.e. <u>the car</u>. I do not see this happening! – It is unlikely to have any <u>major</u> impact on the number of private and commercial vehicle journeys generated by the development</p> <p><b>Section D</b> - Para 109 – Notes the additional traffic levels will <u>potentially</u> affect Monks Lane, Newtown Road, A339 and Andover Road – rather than potentially they will <u>certainly</u> affect these roads</p> <p><b>Appendix 3</b> – Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Critical and Necessary Infrastructure makes glib reference to numerous roads junction improvements to the road network that will be required to accommodate the proposed development but without any details of the scope or implementation, as noted in my previous submissions of 12<sup>th</sup> September 2014. <u>No</u> additional information has been included as to how this is to be achieved</p> <p><b>Appendix 4</b> – Planning Application Requirements – There are headings Design and Access Statement and Transport Assessment – will these cover the matters discussed above in terms of site access connections to the existing road network and further afield the necessary improvements to the road network around Newbury? If <u>not</u> these need to be added to the Planning Application Requirements.</p> <p><b>Appendix 1</b> – Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation – 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point – Only 2 vehicular accesses will be provided off Monks Lane – no mention of connections to the Andover Road (a343) and the A339?</p> <p><b>The Plus Points!</b></p> <p><b>Section F</b> – The inclusion of the Woodland Buffer Zones on Figure 13 Master Plan Framework and the emphasis on the Valley and Wetland corridors will help to provide an integrated wildlife habitat and is to be commended.</p> <p><b>Section G</b> – Delivery and Implementation Planning Application – Para 133. The emphasis on a <u>single</u> Planning Application for the <u>whole</u> site is to be commended. Piecemeal development leading to fragmented infrastructure is to be resisted at all costs! (local reports suggest that one landowner is attempting to go down this route already!)</p>	<p>A SA/SEA Screening Report was carried out to assess whether an SEA was required for the SPD. It was determined that a SA/SEA was not required for the SPD as it has been demonstrated through the SA/SEA for the Core Strategy that there will be no significant environmental effects as a result of the SPD. This decision was ratified by the three statutory consultees. The SA/SEA for the Core Strategy was subject to public consultation and independently examined by an Inspector.</p> <p>Any planning application would be accompanied by a full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan which would assess the impact of the development on the local highway network as well as measures for encouraging the use of non-car modes of transport.</p> <p>It is essential that the provision of infrastructure is in a timely and coordinated manner that keeps pace with development to ensure the viability of the site is not compromised. There are cases when the infrastructure will be required in advance of houses being occupied and these phasing arrangements will be agreed as part of the pre-application / planning application process.</p> <p>The paragraph states that ‘ Development of the site will result in additional traffic loads particularly affecting Monks Lane; the A339 and Andover Road (A343)’</p> <p>The IDP is a living document which is updated periodically throughout the plan period to reflect any changes in circumstances which may result in changes in infrastructure requirements. The detailed implementation of the infrastructure required to support the site will be a matter for the planning application process.</p> <p>There has been additional Transport Assessment work carried out since the site was allocated and more is being undertaken by the Council to provide the necessary detail to assess any planning application.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment will include details of site access connections to the existing road network.</p> <p>Appendix 1 sets out the Core Strategy Policy for the development of Sandleford Park. The SPD can only elaborate on existing policy, any additional accesses will be a matter for negotiation through the planning application process.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Support noted</p>

Full Name	Company / Organisation	Section	Consultation Response	Council Response
			<p>Para 144 now includes the detail of the phasing of the development, which is another ' <u>must</u> '! – Although it needs to include the strategy for implementation of the connection of the various road accesses to the local road network and the wider requirements of the improvements to the road network around Newbury.</p> <p><b>Note</b> There seems to be a problem on the KEY to all figures showing the Valley and Wetland Corridor – the symbol is 'missing'!</p> <p>I trust the above will be of assistance when considering the wisdom of building 2000 houses at Sandleford Park with all its attendant problems of impact on the environment of South Newbury.</p>	<p>Phasing of the development is a matter for the planning application.</p> <p>Noted – this will be amended.</p>

**Table 2 – Schedule of Proposed Amendments to Sandford Park SPD Proposed Amendments December 2014 following consultation in December 2014 – January 2015**

The table below sets out the proposed amendments in the conventional form of strikethrough for proposed deleted text and underlining for the proposed addition of any new text.

Please note the Sections referred to in the table below relate to the Sandford Park SPD Proposed Amendments December 2014 version of the document.

	<b>Section of amended SPD (Dec 2014)</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>	<b>Reason for amendment</b>
1.	Throughout document	Amend paragraph numbers to reflect any removal / addition of text	Formatting amendment.
2.	Section D; Paragraph 74	<p>Delete paragraph as follows:  <del>Bus services 3A, 3B and 3C are within 400 metres of the site running along the A339 Newtown Road approximately every 45 minutes. These services run between Newbury town centre and new Greenham Park; the 3A offers a route around western Newbury and runs along Monks Lane itself while the 3B and 3C offer a route around eastern Newbury including access to the Tesco superstore.</del></p> <p>Replace with:  <u>A number of local buses run close to the site providing links to Newbury Town Centre and further afield, including a regular service to Basingstoke and Greenham Business Park.</u></p>	Amendment made to remove reference to specific bus services to ensure longevity of the document as bus services can change over time.
3.	Section F; Principle L4, part (g)	<p>Delete the following text:  <del>'It is therefore preferable to keep all such runs out of RPAs.'</del></p> <p>Replace with:  <u>All such runs must therefore be kept out of RPAs except where the Council has provided prior written approval</u></p>	Amendment made to strengthen the protection for RPAs.
4.	Section F; Character Area CA7. Valley Crossing	<p>Insert text:  <u>Should additional valley crossings be required the above design principles will apply.</u></p>	Amendment made to ensure appropriate protection for all valley corridors within the site.
5.	Appendix 4: Planning Application Requirements	<p>Add the following text to the list of planning application requirements:  <u>Construction Traffic Management Plan</u>  <u>Superfast Broadband Strategy Statement</u></p>	Amendment made to ensure construction traffic is properly management from the outset and to properly reflect text set out at paragraph 95 of Section D regarding superfast broadband.
6.	All Figures	Ensure the symbol for the Valley Corridor is shown correctly on the Key for all Figures within the document	This is a technical formatting error to be corrected.