

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

APPENDIX A

Submission Core Strategy in light of revised Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Report

This table sets out a summary of each individual representation received in response to the consultation on the soundness of the Core Strategy in relation to the revised Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Report. It also sets out the officers' proposed recommendation as to how the Council should reply.

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
West Berkshire Submission Core Strategy Incorporating Further Examination Proposed Changes					
Mr D W Bending		Yes	Yes	The SA has been carried out with due diligence and is properly supportive of the detail of the Core Strategy in general and particularly as regards site selection including the Sandford site. The major concentration of development in urban areas is sensible and justifiable as is the high degree of protection afforded to parishes within the AONB.	Support noted. No response required.
Dr David Cooper		No	No	This consultation is an abuse of process. Specifically, it requires over 15 seconds to display each page, making it extremely difficult to view and comment on the document.	The responsiveness of the online consultation will vary depending on a number of factors including the respondent's internet connection, the computer hardware used and even the time of day the response is submitted. The consultation documents were also made available to view in hard copy at all of the District's libraries and at the Council Offices.

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Streatley Preservation Action Group		Yes	Yes	<p>Although complex and at times difficult to read, the methodology is clear.</p> <p>The explanation of the decision making process for the strategic sites selection is very comprehensive and clear.</p> <p>The evidence / conclusion is clear and obvious</p>	Support noted. No response required.
Cllr Alan Law		Yes	Yes	<p>Supports. The Strategic Site selection process, as explained in the Strategic Sites Document and associated appendices within the SA/SEA, is comprehensive and clear. The evidence presented clearly supports the recommendation for the RaceCourse and Sandford Park as the two Strategic site locations.</p>	Support noted. No response required.
Network Rail		Not specified	Not specified	No comment.	No response required.
The Theatres Trust		Not specified	Not specified	No comments to make	No response required.
Introduction					
West Berkshire Council Environmental Health		Yes	Yes	n/a	Noted. No response required.

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Relationship with Other Strategies					
HDDL and the TA Saunders Trust	Pegasus Planning Group	No	No	<p>The SA/SEA does not make clear what level of housing above the RSS target was assessed - fails to assess all reasonable alternatives. Requirement to conform to South East Plan has little consequence. Evidence of housing need is far in excess of the 11,000 dwellings assessed in the SA. Retro-fitting of SA/SEA to fit already unsound Core Strategy does not meet requirements of PPS12 which states that SA should provide a sound evidence base upon which to base policy.</p>	<p>The SA (Delivering New Homes and Retaining the Housing Stock SA Policy Paper) looked at having no policy and options for allocating less or more than the RSS requirement. Under-allocating would be contrary to government guidance so the three options considered were no policy; the delivery of 11,000 homes (10,500 from the RSS and 500 shortfall from the period 2001-2006); and the delivery of above the RSS requirement (the RSS encourages LPAs to test higher levels of provision). The latter was the least sustainable option so further investigation into the level of housing above the RSS figure was not necessary. The Council considers these to be reasonable alternatives to test.</p> <p>The Inspector has set out in his note why the submitted SA Report failed to meet the Regulations and he allowed the Council the opportunity to remedy the breach. A hearing session was held on 31 August 2011 to discuss procedural issues with the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>The question of the housing requirement was covered at the hearings into the Core Strategy on 3 November 2010 and 28 June 2011. The housing requirement of 10,500 homes, though challenging for a largely rural District, was supported by the Council through the preparation of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The South East Plan has grappled with the conflicting needs and pressures for housing and the constraints to delivery and the Core Strategy is in conformity with its requirements in</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>terms of housing provision.</p> <p>The Council maintains that a review of housing requirements is not something to undertake during the course of the Core Strategy Examination. In line with PPS3 and with paragraph 28 of the Draft NPPF any review should be based on a clear understanding of housing requirements in the District, with preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment involving working with neighbouring authorities in the housing market area. Ideally this review would be able to take account of the results of the 2011 Census and any population and household projections derived from those figures. Any review of the housing requirement would also necessitate a review of other critical elements of the evidence base.</p>
Evidence Base					
Gladman Care Homes Ltd		Not specified	No	<p>Evidence base should include:</p> <p>West Berkshire Supporting People Strategy 2005 - 2010, Supporting People Strategy Review 2008 - 2012, Housing Strategy 2010-2015, Putting People First 2011 - 2012 Refresh.</p> <p>Key findings of these documents, relating to older people and their needs for accommodation, should be considered.</p>	<p>Relevant local level plans/policies/programmes were reviewed in the SA (appendix 3), including Housing Strategy 2005-2010. In addition, the Core Strategy Core Document list lists CD10/14 West Berkshire Supporting People Strategy 2005-2010, and CD10/12 Housing Strategy 2005-2010.</p> <p>The Council's Housing department have been actively involved in the development of the Core Strategy. The Council therefore considers that the relevant approach has been taken in relation to older people and their needs within the Core Strategy; however more detail may be appropriate for the forthcoming Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document. No change to the SA</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					required.
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats					
Health and Safety Executive		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Page 17 Headed Background and Challenges - final bullet delete this part of the sentence 'Health and Safety Regulations'.....which is factually incorrect.</p> <p>If text is still required to alert readers to development constraints in E Kennet I suggest you reference out to policy CS9A and or use the wording in section 4.11d on page 26</p>	<p>Comment does not relate to the SA/SEA, however table 2 in the Schedule of Further Proposed Minor Changes version 7, lists superseded fpmc's. This bullet point is deleted in fpmc 152 in response to the Inspector's note of 13 July 2011. The change was omitted from the Core Strategy Incorporating Changes in error.</p>
Strategic Objectives					
Greenham Parish Council		Yes	No	<p>Timings and delivery is in the hands of developers, how can WBC say that homes will be delivered in an effective and timely manner? Brownfield sites cannot be maximised if 20% of future housing is on greenfield land.</p> <p>There is no evidence that South Newbury / Greenham needs the amount of affordable housing units that will be provided by both strategic sites being in one ward. Putting affordable housing where there is insufficient employment means that lower-paid jobs in the district will go unfilled because people will not be able to afford to get to them.</p>	<p>The SA for the Spatial Strategy is set out in Housing Distribution SA Policy Paper and the Spatial Strategy SA Policy Paper. The Core Strategy recognises that previously developed land (PDL) would not be sufficient to accommodate the level of housing development required and that some greenfield development will be inevitable.</p> <p>The Housing Need Assessment 2007 (part of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, DTZ, 2007) and the current Housing Register show that the need in the District is extremely high</p> <p>Both strategic sites are close to facilities and the town centre and so are ideally located for those on low incomes to access services.</p> <p>Policy CS4 outlines that business development will be provided on site along with retail facilities, both of</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					which will generate employment, as well as jobs from existing facilities in the south Newbury/Greenham area.
Section 4: The Spatial Strategy					
Pangbourne Parish Council		Yes	Yes	Pangbourne Parish Council are very supportive of the Strategic Site selection process and the AONB policy.	Noted. No response required.
Miss Lois Mason		Not specified	No	Road infrastructure would not be able to take increased volume of traffic produced by 2000 homes at Sandleford, site is too far and is uphill from Newbury town centre so people would have to use cars, already there are issues at Monument Close facilities. The use of Sandleford such a large percentage of the new housing proposed for the area is not in line with PPS3 as it is a greenfield site. Building more than 300 houses on the Sandleford site will mean worse lives for all who have to live and work and travel through the south side of Newbury and worse lives for future generations .This proposal for 2000 houses at the Sandleford site is NOT SUSTAINABLE, not justified, as there is potential nearer to the centre of Newbury, for mixed use developments which would deliver the housing required.	There have been four phases to the Core Strategy Transport Assessment which have been carried out through the development of the Core Strategy. Appendix Cii of the Core Strategy sets out the critical infrastructure required to deliver the strategy. The SA for the Spatial Strategy is set out in Housing Distribution SA Policy Paper and the Spatial Strategy SA Policy Paper. The Core Strategy recognises that previously developed land (PDL) would not be sufficient to accommodate the level of housing development required and that some greenfield development will be inevitable. The housing distribution and settlement hierarchy have been developed through the extensive consultation and evidence base. As set out in Policy CS1, new homes will be primarily developed on suitable previously developed land within settlement boundaries, other suitable land within settlement boundaries, strategic sites and broad locations identified on the Core Strategy Key Diagram, and land allocated for residential development in subsequent Development Plan Documents. The Council does not consider the Spatial Strategy to be

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					contrary to National Planning Policy. No changes are required to the SA.
Greenham Parish Council		Yes	No	Stated [in the SA] that 'The spatial strategy policies (ADPP SP 1 to 6)....' Later the same para says that 'The area policies of ADPP SP 2 to 6 explain further how the spatial strategy policy ADPP SP 1 will be delivered'. Are ADPP SP 2-6 spatial policies or area policies? Are ADPP 2-6 subservient to ADPP SP 1 or are all 6 on an equal footing? The EPFCs at page 41 state 'Some examination proposed focused changes have been proposed for the spatial policies. The spatial policies have been re-named Area Delivery Plan Policies but the numbers remain the same. The changes relate to ADPP1 to 6'. Does this mean that the continual reference to 'spatial policies ADPP SP 1-6' throughout the CS is incorrect?	<p>The policies within section 4: The Spatial Strategy of the Core Strategy have been renamed since submission. This is explained in the SA Report, the Spatial Strategy SA Policy Paper and shown throughout as tracked changes.</p> <p>Submission stage Spatial Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy is now called Area Delivery Plan Policy 1: Spatial Strategy. The spatial areas at Submission (which explain further how the Spatial Strategy will be delivered) SP2 – 6, are now called Area Delivery Plan Policies 2 – 6. The policies ADPP1 – 6 make up the Spatial Strategy section of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>The references to ADPP1 – 6 within the Core Strategy and the SA are correct, and where relevant are shown as tracked changes within the SA.</p>
Spatial Strategy (ADPP1)					
Mr Tony Hammond		Yes	No	There is no mention here of the contribution and identification\use of brownfield sites, despite the maximisation of this land being a strategic objective. Neither are there examples of brownfield site developments in the specific Spatial Strategies, whilst Core Policy CS1 goes further and says "Greenfield sites will need to be allocated adjoining settlements in all four of the spatial areas to accommodate the required housing" without any analysis or reference to an analysis that the brownfield strategic objective cannot be achieved.	<p>This representation does not relate to the SA and changes made in the SA. However, ADPP1 states "Most development will be within or adjacent to the settlements included in the settlement hierarchy" and will in part be dependent on the "availability of suitable sites for development". The policy also states that "The majority of development will take place on previously developed land".</p> <p>The Core Strategy strategic objective 2: Housing Growth talks about maximising the use of suitable brownfield land. Policies ADPP1 and CS1 provide the strategy for how this will be achieved. The</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				Suggested that one reason for choosing Sandleford as a strategic site was that it was easier to administer as a single block than have to deal with numerous smaller developments (which a brownfield strategy would imply).	Spatial Strategy and Housing Topic Paper September 2010 (CD08/06) provides a summary of the policy background and evidence which has led to the proposed policies for the Spatial Strategy and for the provision of new housing in the period to 2026. The SHLAA identifies potential sites for housing, including brownfield sites, and has been regularly updated through the development of the Core Strategy. Evidence shows that greenfield sites will be needed to accommodate the required housing. The Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document will identify specific sites to accommodate the broad distribution of housing set out in the Area Delivery Plan policies (as stated in Policy CS1).
Mrs Kim Whysall- Hammond		No	No	Document does not talk about the contribution and identification\use of brownfield sites, despite this land being on the list of strategic objective (no.2) for housing. In contrast, Section 4.11a mentions both the Racecourse and Sandleford sites, thus, the two strategic options go against one of the primary strategic objectives. No examples of brownfield site developments in the specific Spatial Strategies, whilst CS1 says "Greenfield sites will need to be allocated adjoining settlements in all four of the spatial areas to accommodate the required housing" with no reference to any analysis as to why the brownfield strategic objective cannot be achieved. The Spatial strategy fails to describe why the overall strategic objective of using brownfield sites cannot be met.	This representation does not relate to the SA and changes made in the SA. However, ADPP1 states "Most development will be within or adjacent to the settlements included in the settlement hierarchy" and will in part be dependent on the "availability of suitable sites for development". The policy also states that "The majority of development will take place on previously developed land". The Core Strategy strategic objective 2: Housing Growth talks about maximising the use of suitable brownfield land. Policies ADPP1 and CS1 provide the strategy for how this will be achieved. The Spatial Strategy and Housing Topic Paper September 2010 (CD08/06) provides a summary of the policy background and evidence which has led to the proposed policies for the Spatial Strategy and for the provision of new housing in the period to 2026. The SHLAA identifies potential sites for

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>housing, including brownfield sites, and has been regularly updated through the development of the Core Strategy. Evidence shows that greenfield sites will be needed to deliver the required housing. The Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document will identify specific sites to accommodate the broad distribution of housing set out in the Area Delivery Plan policies (as stated in Policy CS1).</p>
Croudace Strategic Ltd	Boyer Planning Ltd	Yes	No	<p>The SA does not justify why higher figure of 11,000 was not used as the baseline as not found to have significantly greater impact than the 10,500.</p> <p>A greater proportion of the housing allocation should be directed towards Thatcham in recognition of its status in the settlement hierarchy and relationship with Newbury in strategic terms.</p>	<p>The Strategic Sites SA Policy Paper sets out in section 11 the reasons for the reduction in 500 homes, to deliver 10,500. This section also explains how Sandleford could begin delivering development later on in the plan period (from 2016 onwards) but with capacity to continue, either after 2026 to provide long term flexibility, or before if land supply monitoring shows that it was necessary, or if the housing requirement increased.</p> <p>The Delivering New Homes and Retaining the Housing Stock SA Policy Paper includes the appraisal of options for housing numbers and the development of policy CS1. The paper shows that the provision of 11,000 dwellings and an option of above 11,000 dwellings would have predominantly neutral overall effects. It states "The Inspector, in his comments, concluded that there was evidence of a need and demand for an increase to the housing numbers...To this end, the wording has been amended to enable the housing target to be exceeded both annually and post the 2026 period." The Council has taken account of the effect of the delay in the likely adoption of the Core Strategy with the addition of FEPFC15, which proposes that the annual housing requirement is carried forward</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>beyond 2026.</p> <p>In relation to Thatcham, the word 'approximately' provides some flexibility for more homes than stated. Work on the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD will lead to more precise allocations to the spatial areas.</p>
HDDL and the TA Saunders Trust	Pegasus Planning Group	No	No	<p>The SA/SEA does not make clear what level of housing above the RSS target was assessed - fails to assess all reasonable alternatives. Evidence of housing need is far in excess of the 11,000 dwellings assessed in the SA.</p>	<p>The SA (Delivering New Homes and Retaining the Housing Stock SA Policy Paper) looked at having no policy and options for allocating less or more than the RSS requirement. Under-allocating would be contrary to government guidance so the three options considered were no policy; the delivery of 11,000 homes (10,500 from the RSS and 500 shortfall from the period 2001-2006); and the delivery of above the RSS requirement (the RSS encourages LPAs to test higher levels of provision). The latter was the least sustainable option so further investigation into the level of housing above the RSS figure was not necessary. The Council considers these to be reasonable alternatives to test.</p> <p>The Inspector has set out in his note why the submitted SA Report failed to meet the Regulations and he allowed the Council the opportunity to remedy the breach. A hearing session was held on 31 August 2011 to discuss procedural issues with the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>The question of the housing requirement was covered at the hearings into the Core Strategy on 3 November 2010 and 28 June 2011. The housing requirement of 10,500 homes, though challenging for a largely rural District, was supported by the</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>Council through the preparation of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The South East Plan has grappled with the conflicting needs and pressures for housing and the constraints to delivery and the Core Strategy is in conformity with its requirements in terms of housing provision.</p> <p>The Council maintains that a review of housing requirements is not something to undertake during the course of the Core Strategy Examination. In line with PPS3 and with paragraph 28 of the Draft NPPF any review should be based on a clear understanding of housing requirements in the District, with preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment involving working with neighbouring authorities in the housing market area. Ideally this review would be able to take account of the results of the 2011 Census and any population and household projections derived from those figures. Any review of the housing requirement would also necessitate a review of other critical elements of the evidence base.</p>
Bovis Homes Ltd (& J A Pye)	Bell Cornwell Partnership	No	No	<p>Council's approach to assessing sustainability was based on an informal and unstructured basis lacking in rigour, ignoring relevant guidance and relying very much on the officers' personal views. That, for example, the officers were content to accept further information from the promoters of the Sandleford site without also undertaking the same exercise with promoters of all the other sites results in the whole exercise lacking any credibility.</p>	<p>The reasons for the selection of the Sandleford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence base which were previously separate documents. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>The Council has consistently failed to take into proper consideration the potential for development to the north of Tadley. Request that the SA be rerun to properly assess the comparable merits of Silchester Road, Tadley as a suitable and sustainable strategic site.</p>	<p>service providers to inform the process. Council Members have been involved in the process throughout. All sites have been assessed on a consistent basis.</p> <p>The potential strategic sites have been through various stages of appraisal throughout the development of the Core Strategy. Paragraph 4.4 of the Strategic Sites SA Policy Paper explains why the Silchester Road, Tadley site was eliminated from the consideration of strategic sites.</p> <p>SEA practical guide (CD04/04) para 5.B.7 "It is not the purpose of the SEA to decide the alternative to be chosen for the plan or programme. This is the role of the decision-makers who have to make choices on the plan or programme to be adopted. The SEA simply provides information on the relative environmental performance of alternatives, and can make the decision-making process more transparent". The Strategic Sites SA Policy Paper sets out in detail the SA and decision-making process for the selection of the proposed strategic sites in the Core Strategy.</p>
Newbury and Thatcham (ADPP2&3)					
Ressance Limited		Yes	No	<p>In respect of the bullet point "Any new office development will be directed towards the town centre and existing office developments uses given protection protected as set out in Policy CS 10". The Council has misinterpreted the ELA in respect of the demand and need for B1 office accommodation. The average uptake value in the ELA excludes the peak caused by Vodafone's new HQ but includes premises</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.26 of the West Berkshire Employment Land Assessment (ELA, 2007) states that 'in reality plot ratios vary from site to site, this figure (40%) provides an indicative estimate of future requirements and is the recommended plot ratio according to ODPM/DCLG Guidance'. The ELA has considered this matter and concluded that the use of</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>built for Vodafone prior to its relocation. The average post Vodafone's relocation is far lower than the long term average. The effect of factoring this in dramatically reduces the amount of employment land required. Furthermore the Council appears to have ignored the Consultants comments about B1a (office) being built at higher density than B1c and/or B2. The land use ratio is therefore far more efficient in the case of offices, especially in or close to town centres.</p> <p>The bullet point should be less prescriptive and more flexible. In the interest of encouraging economic regeneration the Council should invite evidence to be submitted with each application which should take in to account particular location and other characteristics.</p>	<p>a standard plot ratio is appropriate.</p> <p>Policy CS10 does promote the intensification and redevelopment of existing employment sites and premises and allows for the loss of office floorspace within existing centres if it can be demonstrated that the proposal maintains the vitality of the existing centre and would not substantially prejudice the overall supply of office floorspace over the Core Strategy period in that centre.</p> <p>No change proposed to the bullet point.</p>
Cllr Jeff Beck		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Newbury/Thatcham Gap: this area provides an important amenity space for people from Cold Ash, Newbury and Thatcham.</p> <p>North Newbury: I endorse the disadvantages of this Strategic Site, in particular with respect to the potential increase in risk arising from flooding and the extensive alleviation measures that would be required to bring about a Sustainable Drainage Solution.</p>	Comments noted.
Sandtrend Ltd		No	No	Submission on behalf of owner of site NEW064 (to the west of Donnington Village) that the site should be classed as potentially developable along with NEW031 and NEW050 (the North Newbury site)	This site was not considered as a potential strategic site for a number of reasons including its location on the western side of Donnington village, not immediately adjacent to the Newbury settlement boundary. It would be likely to have significant

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					issues related to heritage assets - Donnington Castle, Conservation Area etc. and impact on the setting of Donnington village. It is has been assessed through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as not developable.
Mr Graeme Panting		Not specified	No	Newbury/Thatcham gap already not sufficiently protected. Bus services connecting with railway station and enhancement of High Street, Thatcham not covered.	The Newbury/Thatcham gap is protected in that it lies outside the settlement boundaries of Newbury and Thatcham, where policies for the countryside apply. Policy CS20 and para 5.116 make clear that landscape character assessment will provide the framework for informed decisions to be made about future development rather than through the use of local landscape designations. Policy ADPP3 does say that the town centre will be regenerated – the Thatcham Town Centre Design Appraisal forms part of the evidence base. It also states that opportunities will be maximised to provide better connections and maximise accessibility linkages between the town centre and Thatcham Railway Station.
Eastern Area (ADPP4)					
Capital Corporation Projects Ltd	Bell Cornwell	No	No	Whitehart Meadow site, Theale, scored highly in strategic site appraisal process and is suitable location for new development in the Eastern Urban Area. Site's advantages should be properly recognised by the Council by the inclusion of a higher housing target for the Eastern Urban Area.	The site at Whitehart Meadow was assessed through the SA/SEA and the Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents. It was not taken forward as a strategic site as it was considered that development of this scale would have a considerable impact on Theale and would negatively impact upon the role and function of Theale, identified as a Rural Service Centre. The

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>impact on the identity of Theale and the concern over the in-combination impact of the development with the already committed development of 350 units at Theale Lakeside were major considerations.</p> <p>The site will be further evaluated during the preparation of the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD but commitment to a higher allocation for the Eastern Area is not considered appropriate in light of the limited land availability in the spatial area and the decision that strategic scale development is not the preferred way forward in this area. The housing numbers and distribution for the Eastern Area was discussed at the hearings on 29 June 2011.</p>
North Wessex Downs AONB (ADPP5)					
Mr Keith Carter		Yes	Yes	<p>Support the changes which now give a clear maximum number of 2000 for the AONB. Support the confirmation that if adhering to the protection of the landscape priority causes a shortfall on this number then the balance will be allocated to sites outside of the AONB. The sites at Compton and Hermitage should be mentioned in the document and should be given priority over any greenfield sites in the AONB, both to meet the WBC brownfield ratio target, and to comply with national policy.</p>	<p>Support noted for the clear recognition that landscape protection of the AONB is an overarching objective.</p> <p>The Council's proposed wording is different from that proposed by the Inspector, in that it is designed to provide an element of flexibility in development management terms. The wording "provision will be made for the delivery of up to 2,000 dwellings" is not intended to prevent, for example, suitable windfall or rural exception proposals towards the end of the plan period if 2,000 homes had already been delivered.</p> <p>Support noted for any shortfall to be met in other spatial areas.</p> <p>The sites at Compton and Hermitage are mentioned in the document. Policy ADPP5 describes them as</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					opportunity sites which could potentially provide a greater level of growth than that normally expected in a service village. There is as yet no clarity about timescales for developing them or the appropriate scale of development.
Ms Liz Horne		Yes	Yes	Support the change that the number of houses will now only be up to 2000 in the AONB. Also support the confirmation that any shortfall in this number will be allocated outside of the AONB. The clear recognition that landscape protection of the AONB is an overarching objective is also welcomed.	Support noted for the clear recognition that landscape protection of the AONB is an overarching objective. The Council's proposed wording is different from that proposed by the Inspector, in that it is designed to provide an element of flexibility in development management terms. The wording "provision will be made for the delivery of up to 2,000 dwellings" is not intended to prevent, for example, suitable windfall or rural exception proposals towards the end of the plan period if 2,000 homes had already been delivered. Support noted for any shortfall to be met in other spatial areas.
Pangbourne Parish Council		Yes	Yes	Pangbourne Parish Council are very supportive of the Strategic Site selection process and the AONB policy.	Support noted
Hungerford Town Council		Not specified	Not specified	The Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (LSA) clearly states that major development should not take place in the AONB, except in exceptional circumstances, The inspector has requested that WBC clarify housing numbers proposed for development in the AONB. This is not currently clearly defined in the Core Strategy. We believe the number of houses	The proposed wording change clearly states that the overarching objective in the AONB is the conservation and enhancement of the special landscape qualities and the policy is clear that provision will be made for delivery of up to 2,000 dwellings. The Council does not accept that the level of development should be related to meeting

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>proposed will exceed the housing actual needs in the AONB which should be the proper measure rather than a level determined by developers.</p> <p>Increased traffic levels would have a permanent and extremely detrimental effect on trade and the economic viability of Hungerford High Street</p>	<p>affordable housing needs only. The Council contends that a policy constraining market housing would not meet the Council's objectives, set out in various policy statements, to foster sustainable rural communities. Market housing is an important means of providing for affordable housing to meet local needs and of supporting local services and facilities.</p> <p>Work on the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD will examine all aspects of the sustainability, including transport impacts, of the options under consideration.</p>
Croudace Strategic Ltd	Boyer Planning Ltd	Yes	No	<p>Pleased to see that the proposed changes to the ADPPs will have predominantly positive effects. We are however concerned that the assessment of the amended wording for the AONB Policy produces similar findings to those previously, as we do not understand how the development of 2,000 dwellings within this protected area could not have significant negative impacts. The housing target for the AONB is too high for the special status of the area. A greater proportion of the housing allocation should be directed towards Thatcham in recognition of its status in the settlement hierarchy and relationship with Newbury in strategic terms.</p>	<p>The proposed wording change clearly states that the overarching objective in the AONB is the conservation and enhancement of the special landscape qualities and that if there are insufficient developable sites to provide 2,000 homes over the plan period the shortfall will be provided elsewhere. Any allocation to other spatial areas would be in accordance with Policy CS1 and the Area Delivery Plan Policies, and would take account of the District settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The position with regard to completions and commitments within the AONB at March 2011 is that 788 additional homes have been delivered since 2006 and permission remains for a further 447 (See LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2011). Delivery of 2,000 homes up to 2016 would imply an annual average delivery of 80 units in the AONB from 2011 to 2016 compared to the 155 units per annum delivered from 2006 to 2011.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					The position regarding development at Thatcham and the Council's approach regarding consolidation has been discussed at the Examination hearing sessions and is set out in ADPP3.
Gerald Palmer Eling Trust	West Waddy ADP	Not specified	No	<p>As the proposed amendments would produce a policy that imposes a maximum but no minimum number of dwellings, the policy could be complied with by not permitting a single further dwelling over 74% of the Council's administrative area. Indeed once the 2,000 limit is reached it would prevent even development solely for affordable housing on rural exception sites from being approved.</p> <p>With high need for affordable housing and 2 large brownfield sites in AONB, the 900 dwellings still to be built/permitted looks a tight figure without imposing it as a cap, which does not need to be met and cannot be exceeded</p>	<p>Though no minimum number is set out in the policy it clearly states the objective of appropriate and sustainable growth, set within the limitations of the overarching objective to conserve and enhance the special landscape qualities of the AONB.</p> <p>The Council's proposed wording for this policy is different from that proposed by the Inspector, in that it is designed to provide an element of flexibility in development management terms. The wording "provision will be made for the delivery of up to 2,000 dwellings" is not intended to prevent, for example, suitable windfall or rural exception proposals towards the end of the plan period if 2,000 homes had already been delivered.</p> <p>The position with regard to completions and commitments within the AONB at March 2011 is that 788 additional homes have been delivered since 2006 and permission remains for a further 447 (See LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2011). Delivery of 2,000 homes up to 2016 would imply an annual average delivery of 80 units in the AONB from 2011 to 2016 compared to the 155 units per annum delivered from 2006 to 2011.</p>
The East Kennet Valley (ADPP6)					
Mr Paul Lyall		Yes	No	A change to this section indicates that Burghfield and Mortimer will be the focus for development in the East Kennet Valley.	FEPFC10 makes it clearer that the rural service centres are the most sustainable settlements in the East Kennet Valley spatial area and was requested

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Section 4.11 states what sort of development RSC might bear and what sort of development 'settlements below the Service Village level' might bear. Nowhere is there outlined a process for resolving the tensions that might arise when these two policies are in conflict. Concerned that any development adjacent to (or that leads to a geographical or population expansion of) Burghfield or Mortimer will have a disproportionate and unwarranted effect on the smaller rural settlements that surround them.</p>	<p>by the Inspector to avoid the impression that there is any other focus.</p> <p>Policy ADPP6 provides more detail to ADPP1 in relation to the East Kennet Valley. It sets out in the final Housing bullet point the approach to be taken to housing development in the East Kennet Valley.</p> <p>Work on the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD will examine all aspects of the sustainability, including transport impacts, of the options under consideration.</p>
<p>HDDL and the TA Saunders Trust</p>	<p>Pegasus Planning Group</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The SA/SEA does not make clear what level of housing above the RSS target was assessed - fails to assess all reasonable alternatives. Evidence of housing need is far in excess of the 11,000 dwellings assessed in the SA.</p>	<p>The SA (Delivering New Homes and Retaining the Housing Stock SA Policy Paper) looked at having no policy and options for allocating less or more than the RSS requirement. Under-allocating would be contrary to government guidance so the three options considered were no policy; the delivery of 11,000 homes (10,500 from the RSS and 500 shortfall from the period 2001-2006); and the delivery of above the RSS requirement (the RSS encourages LPAs to test higher levels of provision). The latter was the least sustainable option so further investigation into the level of housing above the RSS figure was not necessary. The Council considers these to be reasonable alternatives to test.</p> <p>The Inspector has set out in his note why the submitted SA Report failed to meet the Regulations and he allowed the Council the opportunity to remedy the breach. A hearing session was held on 31 August 2011 to discuss procedural issues with</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>The question of the housing requirement was covered at the hearings into the Core Strategy on 3 November 2010 and 28 June 2011. The housing requirement of 10,500 homes, though challenging for a largely rural District, was supported by the Council through the preparation of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The South East Plan has grappled with the conflicting needs and pressures for housing and the constraints to delivery and the Core Strategy is in conformity with its requirements in terms of housing provision.</p> <p>The Council maintains that a review of housing requirements is not something to undertake during the course of the Core Strategy Examination. In line with PPS3 and with paragraph 28 of the Draft NPPF any review should be based on a clear understanding of housing requirements in the District, with preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment involving working with neighbouring authorities in the housing market area. Ideally this review would be able to take account of the results of the 2011 Census and any population and household projections derived from those figures. Any review of the housing requirement would also necessitate a review of other critical elements of the evidence base.</p>
Mr Hew Jones		Not specified	Not specified	Site allocations outside the settlement area of Burghfield should give preference to those that do not create planning precedence for the joining of independent villages adjacent to	Comment does not relate to the SA consultation, however Policy ADPP1 sets out the Spatial Strategy and Policy CS1 sets out the approach to delivering new homes. Most development will be within or

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Burghfield. (i.e. the joining of Burghfield to Ufton Nervet through Sulhamstead). Preference should be given to those where access does not create overload or danger on roads</p>	<p>adjacent to settlements and related to the transport accessibility, their level of services and the availability of suitable sites for development, with the majority of development taking place on previously developed land. The number of dwellings proposed in the different spatial areas forms a basis for the allocation of sites in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD, allowing for the allocation of suitable sites. Work on the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD will examine all aspects of the sustainability, including transport impacts, of the options under consideration.</p>
Bovis Homes Ltd (& J A Pye)	Bell Cornwell Partnership	No	No	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal in respect of development of land at Tadley should be completely re-assessed in light of the evidence now submitted.</p> <p>Tadley should fall within the Rural Service Centre category.</p> <p>Given the restraints on development at Tadley arising from the nuclear issues, it is understandable that this location was not assessed further. However, that constraint has now disappeared and, given the sustainable merits of Tadley this should be reflected in the SA.</p>	<p>The potential strategic sites have been through various stages of appraisal throughout the development of the Core Strategy. Paragraph 4.4 of the Strategic Sites SA Policy Paper explains why the Silchester Road, Tadley site was eliminated from the consideration of strategic sites.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper (2010) sets out the background research and evidence to support the development of the settlement hierarchy for the LDF. The consideration of proximity to Tadley was a consideration in the settlement hierarchy methodology; however Tadley is located outside the District boundary.</p> <p>The Boundary Hall decision (CD10/96) paragraph 403 clearly states <i>“This is a finely balanced case, with one very significant but unlikely harm to be set against a range of more ‘conventional’ planning considerations. However the consequences of such an unlikely event would be so serious that it is considered that planning permission should not be granted”</i>. There is no need to re-assess the SA in</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					this regard. This was also debated at length at the hearing session on 27 th June 2011.
Cllr Royce Longton		Not specified	Not specified	Under Community Infrastructure and Services, suggest that the sentence ends "..... and opportunities for a more distinct centre offering shops and services within the existing settlement of Burghfield Common will be explored."	The appropriate location for any centre will be explored in the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.
Delivering New Homes and Retaining the Housing Stock (CS1)					
Mr Keith Carter		Yes	No	Statement that greenfield sites will need to be allocated should not include the AONB area. It does not comply with previous elements of the strategy which confirm that landscape priority will dictate whether developments are possible in the AONB.	The overall housing provision and that for the AONB was discussed at the hearings on 28 June 2011. In order to promote sustainable communities within the AONB and to meet local housing needs, some allocations of greenfield land will be required. The policy for the AONB is clear that any proposed provision is subject to the overarching objective for the AONB to conserve and enhance its special landscape qualities. The Inspector requested the change to CS1 to make clear that greenfield allocations would be required in each spatial area
Ms Liz Horne		Yes	No	There should not be any need for greenfield expansion within the AONB. There are large brownfield sites in the AONB at Compton and Hermitage which should be considered before any greenfield in the AONB, and should be mentioned in the strategy.	The overall housing provision and that for the AONB was discussed at the hearings on 28 June 2011. In order to promote sustainable communities within the AONB and to meet local housing needs, some allocations of greenfield land will be required. The policy for the AONB is clear that any proposed provision is subject to the overarching objective for the AONB to conserve and enhance its special landscape qualities. The Inspector requested the change to CS1 to make clear that greenfield

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>allocations would be required in each spatial area.</p> <p>The brownfield sites at Compton and Hermitage have been included within the Strategic Housing land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and are included as “opportunity sites” within Policy ADPP5.</p>
HDDL and the TA Saunders Trust	Pegasus Planning Group	No	No	<p>The SA/SEA does not make clear what level of housing above the RSS target was assessed - fails to assess all reasonable alternatives. Evidence of housing need is far in excess of the 11,000 dwellings assessed in the SA.</p>	<p>The SA (Delivering New Homes and Retaining the Housing Stock SA Policy Paper) looked at having no policy and options for allocating less or more than the RSS requirement. Under-allocating would be contrary to government guidance so the three options considered were no policy; the delivery of 11,000 homes (10,500 from the RSS and 500 shortfall from the period 2001-2006); and the delivery of above the RSS requirement (the RSS encourages LPAs to test higher levels of provision). The latter was the least sustainable option so further investigation into the level of housing above the RSS figure was not necessary. The Council considers these to be reasonable alternatives to test.</p> <p>The Inspector has set out in his note why the submitted SA Report failed to meet the Regulations and he allowed the Council the opportunity to remedy the breach. A hearing session was held on 31 August 2011 to discuss procedural issues with the sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>The question of the housing requirement was covered at the hearings into the Core Strategy on 3 November 2010 and 28 June 2011. The housing requirement of 10,500 homes, though challenging for a largely rural District, was supported by the Council through the preparation of the Regional</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>Spatial Strategy. The South East Plan has grappled with the conflicting needs and pressures for housing and the constraints to delivery and the Core Strategy is in conformity with its requirements in terms of housing provision.</p> <p>The Council maintains that a review of housing requirements is not something to undertake during the course of the Core Strategy Examination. In line with PPS3 and with paragraph 28 of the Draft NPPF any review should be based on a clear understanding of housing requirements in the District, with preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment involving working with neighbouring authorities in the housing market area. Ideally this review would be able to take account of the results of the 2011 Census and any population and household projections derived from those figures. Any review of the housing requirement would also necessitate a review of other critical elements of the evidence base.</p>
HDDL and the TA Saunders Trust	Pegasus Planning Group	No	No	<p>Paragraph 5.1a</p> <p>The SA/SEA does not make clear what level of housing above the RSS target was assessed - fails to assess all reasonable alternatives.</p>	Response as above
Sandtrend Ltd		No	No	<p>Submission on behalf of owner of site NEW064 (to the west of Donnington Village) that site should be classed as potentially developable along with NEW031 and NEW050 (the North Newbury site)</p>	<p>This site was not considered as a potential strategic site as it is on the western side of Donnington village, not immediately adjacent to the Newbury settlement boundary. It would be likely to have significant issues related to heritage assets - Donnington Castle, Conservation Area etc. and</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					impact on the setting of Donnington village.
Housing Distribution (CS2)					
Croudace Strategic Ltd	Boyer Planning Ltd	Yes	No	<p>Thatcham should be allocated a higher proportion of housing than its current 900 units, on the basis of its status within the District and settlement hierarchy. It should have an appropriate / proportionate amount of housing allocated. The comparative populations of Newbury and Thatcham are 32,000 (22%) and 25,000 (17%) respectively (Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper July 2010), out of a total of 144,000 in the District (2001 census data), yet Newbury is allocated 51% of the housing and Thatcham only 8.6%.</p> <p>The amended Sustainability Appraisal does not go back far enough to enable an objective reassessment of the strategic sites</p>	<p>The housing distribution was discussed at the hearings on 28 and 29 June 2011. The distribution was not based on a proportionate amount relative to population but on an analysis of the facilities, character and sustainability of the settlements in the District and on the assessment of potential sites within the SHLAA.</p> <p>The Inspector has set out in his note why the submitted SA Report failed to meet the Regulations and he allowed the Council the opportunity to remedy the breach. A hearing session was held on 31 August 2011 to discuss procedural issues with the sustainability appraisal.</p>
Newbury Racecourse Strategic Site Allocation (CCS3)					
David Wilson Homes		No	No	<p>The policy and text have been updated to reflect the granting of planning permission. However, greater clarification needed in relations to reference to 'replacement' nursery (Policy CP3), and Paragraph 5.8b would benefit from a distinction between 'new' applications and 'reserved matters' applications pursuant to the outline still subject to the 30% affordable Housing requirement as per the outline consent.</p>	<p>The reference to new application is not intended to refer to the "reserved matters" pursuant to the outline permission, but to any completely new permission which might be granted in future if the current scheme was not implemented.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Sandleford Strategic Site Allocation (CS4)					
Mr Les Cooper		No	No	<p>Other more sustainable sites than Sandleford were eliminated. the LDF lists substantial reasons why Sandleford is unsuitable for large scale development all of which are conveniently ignored on the basis that the objectors' views were a common theme against all sites. Objections dismissed or downgraded subjectively. No ranking mechanism for education. AONB and Greenbelt downgraded. Treating land around the urban area as brownfield instead of greenfield allowed council to avoid the AONB objection. Right of way needs to be given due weight to the AONB objection. Should compare density of housing in the proposed area and its impact on neighbourhood amenities.</p>	<p>The SA/SEA process and its role in site selection are fully explained in the SA policy paper on Strategic Sites which was revised and published for consultation in November 2011. The Site Selection Framework used weighting in the scoring tables. This stage of the SA process was a starting point for considering sites, a strategic level assessment to provide an initial broad comparison of the proposed sites. They were not intended to be a detailed project level assessment. This assessment informed the Core Strategy at the "Options for the Future" stage, the preferred options document.</p> <p>Criteria were developed for the Site Selection Framework to assess the sites against the SA sub-objectives and a weighting attached to them. Limitations of this approach have been set out within the SA, such as the impact of site size and the distance from the midpoint to the boundary of the site upon some of the criteria and therefore the scores achievable. The site selection framework was therefore the starting point and it did not necessarily mean that the highest scoring sites would be taken forward. The commentary on the sites were key for taking them forward in conjunction with the rest of the technical evidence base and the outcomes of public consultation.</p> <p>The assessment proved useful in highlighting potential sustainability issues with potential sites and potential mitigation, infrastructure and development requirements should the sites progress further. The selection of sites progressed beyond the Site</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>Selection Framework assessments and these were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process. The process therefore used the site selection framework scoring (with the weighting) and built on this to progress the potential sites through the process of the SA.</p> <p>Objections have not been dismissed or downgraded – responses to objections are set out in the Council’s Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publically available from the Council’s website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p> <p>Sandleford Park is neither Green Belt nor AONB.</p> <p>The Council’s Education Department did rank the strategic sites in 2009, and this ranking has been published on the Council’s website as part of the Examination Core Document library (CD09/46).</p>
Mr. David Stubbs		No	No	SA in relation to Sandleford seems to have changed without justification and in contravention to the evidence. Earlier appraisals and inspectors decisions supported and required the use of the numerous other brownfield and infill sites around the town and wider West Berks.	The SA/SEA process and its role in site selection are fully explained in the SA policy paper on Strategic Sites which was revised and published for consultation in November 2011. The Site Selection Framework used weighting in the scoring tables. This stage of the SA process was a starting point for considering sites, a strategic level assessment to provide an initial broad comparison of the proposed

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Earlier decisions in relation to identified hierarchy of land use should be adhered to before opening up greenfield sites.</p>	<p>sites. They were not intended to be a detailed project level assessment. This assessment informed the Core Strategy at the “Options for the Future” stage, the preferred options document.</p> <p>Criteria were developed for the Site Selection Framework to assess the sites against the SA sub-objectives and a weighting attached to them. Limitations of this approach have been set out within the SA, such as the impact of site size and the distance from the midpoint to the boundary of the site upon some of the criteria and therefore the scores achievable. The site selection framework was therefore the starting point and it did not necessarily mean that the highest scoring sites would be taken forward. The commentary on the sites were key for taking them forward in conjunction with the rest of the technical evidence base and the outcomes of public consultation.</p> <p>The assessment proved useful in highlighting potential sustainability issues with potential sites and potential mitigation, infrastructure and development requirements should the sites progress further. The selection of sites progressed beyond the Site Selection Framework assessments and these were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process. The process therefore used the site selection framework scoring</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>(with the weighting) and built on this to progress the potential sites through the process of the SA.</p> <p>The site currently being promoted has been designed to address the previously identified concerns, with an overall masterplan to protect matters of importance. The draft masterplan is a Core Document (CD10/63), available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p>
Dr David Cooper		No	No	The SA calculates the walking distance to Newbury Town Centre from Newbury College instead of from the average for the site. The vertical height of the walking route should be factored in.	<p>Both the North Newbury and Sandleford sites were measured from a recognisable point. Measuring from the midpoint of the Sandleford site would not reflect the proposed extent of the built development.</p> <p>It is not clear how gradient could be consistently factored into the SA/SEA.</p>
Mr Adrian Clark		Yes	No	<p>Negative impact upon traffic congestion and degradation of landscape likely by developing Sandleford. Large additional numbers of car journeys likely. Traffic infrastructure struggles to cope.</p> <p>Reduce the number of houses planned for</p>	The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Sandleford to only the northern area bordering Monks Lane. Develop mixed use brownfield sites in Newbury town centre to compensate for the reduced housing.</p>	<p>http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893. Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>The TA work and the IDP have been discussed through the Examination process, specifically at hearing sessions on 4th and 11th November 2010.</p> <p>In terms of the landscape, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandleford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.
Ms Isobel Collyer		No	No	<p>Alterations to the scoring system has never been explained to local residents, appear arbitrary and are mystifying to the electorate. With regard to Sandleford, assumptions about use of public transport seem to be wildly optimistic and not borne out by existing data. Distances appear to have been taken from the nearest site boundaries. Concern over traffic impact - e.g. Andover Rd and Monks Lane. Retail park specialises in items which require car use.</p> <p>Assumptions also made about need to protect employment land which are not consonant with the expressed views of local employers. Employment land should be released for housing and would result in less environmental damage.</p> <p>Surrounding wildlife by concrete is not likely to produce biodiversity.</p> <p>Questions 40% affordable housing figure on basis of WBC's track record.</p>	<p>In terms of 'alterations to the scoring system' please see response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>Both the North Newbury and Sandleford sites were measured from a recognisable point. Measuring from the midpoint of the Sandleford site would not reflect the proposed extent of the built development.</p> <p>Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) does not make any assumptions about future bus use. Therefore TA4 represents a worst case scenario and site specific public transport will provide a reduction in car trips. However, modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The protection of employment land stems from the Council's evidence base in the form of the Employment Land Assessment (ELA) which is available from the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16712. The policy implications of the ELA and policy CS10 have been discussed at Examination hearing sessions. No evidence is provided by the respondent on the 'expressed views of local employers'.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p> <p>In terms of biodiversity, the biodiversity of the ancient woodland blocks were assessed both through an Ecology report undertaken by WYG (CD10/50) and in a Nature Conservation Management Strategy undertaken by HDA (CD10/62). In terms of buffer zones, the masterplan has been designed to ensure that there is a minimum 15m buffer between development and the ancient woodland which will enable informal paths to be formed to take the recreational pressure off the ancient woodland itself. The masterplan as set out also ensures that no properties back onto any of the areas of woodland and ensures that they do not become isolated from each other.</p> <p>The HDA work demonstrates the improvement, enhancement and future management of the woodland and open space.</p> <p>40% affordable housing will be delivered at Sandleford Park in accordance with emerging Core Strategy policy CS7.</p>
<p>Cllr Tony Vickers (West Berkshire Liberal Democrat Shadow</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Several of the statements in revised Appx 8 appear to be wrong or selective, leading them to question the whole process by which the decision to include Sandleford Park has been made.</p>	<p>See Appendix E for detailed submission and officer response.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Executive)				<p>Lack of community involvement using the scoring system agreed by Members makes the Core Strategy non compliant in this respect. The revised SA/SEA fails to deal with these flaws and instead introduces spurious reasons for calling its choice sustainable, leading us to conclude that the process is unsound as well as non compliant in the process.</p> <p>Neither Sandlesford nor North Newbury are needed at this time. The housing can be delivered from the Racecourse and a 'broad location' on the eastern periphery of the town centre.</p> <p>Will lead to legal challenges. Additional concerns over infrastructure deliverability and cost.</p> <p>This response also contains several appendices which are summarised and responded to in detail in an attachment to the Council's response.</p>	
Mr Tony Hammond		No	No	<p>Little evidence of community engagement. SA has been rescored without consultation.</p> <p>No strategic clarity as to the local generation of electricity which is set out in policy CS4.</p> <p>The sustainable travel link in Warren Road is unsound due to congestion and needing to take a right turn onto Andover Road. There are issues with the economic viability of the current bus link in Wash Common.</p>	<p>Responses to objections are set out in the Council's Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publicly available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14). The revised SA/SEA was published for consultation between 4 November and 16 December 2011. The reassessment takes the previous SA as a starting point and reappraises where appropriate, taking account of the consultation responses and additional technical evidence, including work carried out to develop the</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>The local services which are listed as within walking distance of the Sandleford site will generally be visited by car.</p> <p>As the site is at the top of a hill in relation to Newbury Town Centre, cycle usage will be low.</p> <p>There is no mention of existing pollution issues, or the impact of the Racecourse and Sandleford sites on the overall transport plan in policy CS14.</p> <p>A major rebuild would be required for the Park House school.</p> <p>There is no description of how wildlife corridors would be integrated to ensure that the two woodland areas do not become isolated.</p> <p>Some baffling re-assessment in the rescoring of the SA, with a lack of additional detail about how the scores were changed.</p> <p>A credible SA should look at the practicalities of living in an area.</p> <p>The revised details have been used to justify a positive re-scoring and to confirm the previous decision to select Sandleford. The original scoring should stand and strategic site allocation should be considered in that light.</p>	<p>planning concepts for the sites.</p> <p>Under policy CS16, 10% of the site's energy will be required to be produced on-site. However, the Council may wish to negotiate a higher degree of renewable energy generation from this site.</p> <p>A detailed assessment has been carried out by the site's promoters which sets out the renewable energy options for this site (CD10/47). This shows that appropriate on-site renewable energy can be provided and further details of this will be set out during the masterplan SPD stage.</p> <p>Policy CS14 is the overarching transport policy for the Core Strategy – and all planning applications will need to demonstrate how they improve travel choice and reduce car use. The Transport Assessment set out specific information on the transport infrastructure to deliver the Sandleford and Racecourse developments and can be found at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893. Effective infrastructure provision and traffic management measures will both play a role in managing pollution levels.</p> <p>In terms of education provision, the Council's Education Department believe that the most viable and sensible solution is to meet the impact of the Sandleford development through existing local secondary provision. This is likely to be on existing land and will involve re-modelling of the existing accommodation as required. At this stage they do not feel that there would be a requirement</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>for additional land, but if this should be the case then this would form part of any detailed discussions/negotiations with the developer/land owner. This approach is based on current pupil numbers, pupil projections, the anticipated additional pupils from new housing, anticipated development timeframes and current Government policy.</p> <p>The masterplan has been designed to ensure that there is a minimum 15m buffer between development and the ancient woodland which will enable informal paths to be formed to take the recreational pressure off the ancient woodland itself. The masterplan as set out also ensures that no properties back onto any of the areas of woodland and ensures that they do not become isolated from each other.</p> <p>Information about how the SA/SEA scorings have evolved are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA, and summarised in the response to Mr Cooper above.</p>
Mr Philip Hawker		Yes	No	CS4 bullet point 6 refers to Appendix Ci in error. This should be amended to read Appendix cii.	Agreed. This is an error and needs to be corrected.
Mr Philip Hawker		Yes	No	<p>Many concerns arising from the traffic impact of Sandleford Park are not addressed within the Transport Assessment Phase 4, e.g. Pinchington Lane/A339 roundabout.</p> <p>There is no credible comparison of the relative traffic impact of the Sandleford/North Newbury alternatives. The concentration of both</p>	<p>Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=1</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>strategic sites in South Newbury remains a worse alternative from a traffic congestion standpoint than North Newbury.</p> <p>The SA re-assessment contains errors of fact and highly misleading statements which is either due to ignorance or a desperation to save face by spurious justifications of a decision reached in error.</p> <p>Policy CS4 should be removed and replaced wither by North Newbury or by the serious consideration of mixed use developments on employment sites to the east of Newbury.</p>	<p>9636</p> <p>The TA work and the IDP have been discussed through the Examination process, specifically at hearing sessions on 4th and 11th November 2010.</p> <p>The relative traffic impacts of Sandleford/North Newbury were assessed in Transport Assessment Phase 2 http://www.westberks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=22606&p=0 which assessed the impact of strategic development at the 3 'reserve' sites in combination with Newbury Racecourse, setting out what mitigation would be required for each.</p> <p>The reassessment takes the previous SA as a starting point and reappraises where appropriate, taking account of the consultation responses and additional technical evidence, including work carried out to develop the planning concepts for the sites.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available or why North Newbury would be a preferable choice. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p>
Mr Tim Smith		No	No	The development site is not within easy reach of the town centre and people will choose to drive.	Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site. The town

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>The web based consultation package is extremely difficult to use and will put people off.</p> <p>1,000 homes could be found by recycling empty office buildings and by a policy to encourage the re-use of flats above town centre shops. The shortfall should be sited in North Newbury which is a more sustainable solution than Sandleford.</p>	<p>centre of Newbury is not the only location that will be visited by residents from the proposed Sandleford site. However, public transport will be provided.</p> <p>It is an involved consultation but we have tried to make it as user-friendly as possible and have made it clear that the officers are happy to help anybody with the process of registering their comments. The Council's preferred method of receiving consultation responses is a web based system widely used by planning authorities. It is an efficient system that enables consultees to comment directly on the document, to retain a copy of their comment for their own records, to receive automatic acknowledgement of their comment and for comments to be efficiently analysed and made viewable on the consultation portal. Comments can also be submitted on paper forms which are readily available, or by e-mail.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the 1,000 homes could be situated. No evidence is given by the respondent about why North Newbury is a more sustainable solution than Sandleford.</p>
Cllr Horace Mitchell		No	No	Supports BDBC response. No clear and effectively argued rationale for the selection of the Sandleford Park site. Alternative sites	The reasons for the selection of the Sandleford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>should be properly assessed against clear criteria. Continued support for the site appears to arise from officer opinion rather than a proper and balanced assessment. The site will make it unattractive for North Hampshire residents to use Newbury as their main centre due to traffic issues.</p>	<p>base which were previously separate documents. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process. Council Members have been involved in the process throughout and it is unclear why the respondent suggests that support for the site arises from 'officer opinion'. No information or evidence to support this comment has been provided.</p> <p>Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Mrs Diane Smith		No	No	The Council has failed to provide objective measures to justify why Sandleford's sustainability rating was adjusted. No evidence for statements about highways, education and facilities.	In terms of 'alterations to the scoring system' please see response to Mr Les Cooper (above). The full evidence base for the Core Strategy fully supports the statements made in the SA/SEA. The evidence base is all set out in Core Documents and the documents are publically available either in electronic copy from the Council's website or in hard copy from the set of Core Documents. The Core Documents list can be found at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=24862&p=0
St Gabriel's		Yes	No	The road infrastructure changes that will be required are not dealt with adequately. Improved access to other businesses including St Gabriel's will be required due to pressure caused by this development. Increased public access to the historic parkland is more likely to damage than preserve it. Retention of the historic parkland as countryside with managed access in the form of public footpaths linking areas such as Greenham Common and the Battlefield, with covenants preventing development in perpetuity would be a better way of preserving the historic landscape.	Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636 The TA work and the IDP have been discussed through the Examination process, specifically at hearing sessions on 4 th and 11th November 2010. The proposal does not include any of the historic parkland. The areas adjacent are proposed to be protected from development in perpetuity. This is shown on the draft masterplan. The draft masterplan is a Core Document (CD10/63), available on the Council's website.

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Mr James Lewin		Yes	No	<p>It is unclear why officers have favoured the Sandleford site. It has not been compared with the other reserve sites with a consistent, sound, evidence based methods. Insufficient weight was given to Sandleford's reliance on the A339 as the main access. Selection of Sandleford risks making central Newbury very difficult, time consuming and unattractive to access from the south, southeast and southwest. This may cause economic impacts as well as environmental.</p> <p>A site evaluation process should be carried out which gives weight to the topography of Newbury and its surrounding catchment and its accessibility for essential services and for the economic benefit of the town.</p>	<p>The reasons for the selection of the Sandleford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence base which were previously separate documents.</p> <p>The 3 reserve sites were assessed in the same way and were each assessed in combination with Newbury Racecourse. Paragraphs 10.6 to 11.18 specifically deal with the 3 reserve sites and set out the information on these site assessments which was previously included within Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phase 2.</p> <p>Council Members have been involved in the process throughout and it is unclear why the respondent suggests that support for the site arises from 'officers favouring the site'. No information or evidence to support this comment has been provided.</p> <p>Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Mrs Kim Whysall-Hammond		No	No	<p>The local community, including the Parish Council, have not been engaged in this plan. The re-scoring of the SA has been done without local consultation. The sustainable travel link in Warren Road is already congested and the exit onto the Andover Road is busy. This will cause delays to buses and people will use their cars. The services which are within walking distance will be visited by car. This will result in gridlock in South Newbury.</p> <p>Sandleford is at the top of a hill in relation to Newbury Town Centre which will make cycling unpopular.</p> <p>Newbury already has air quality issues.</p> <p>A major rebuild of the Park House school site would be required.</p> <p>No description of how wildlife corridors would be integrated into the development plan to ensure that areas do not become isolated and die out.</p> <p>Many of the re-assessments in the re-scoring are strange.</p> <p>This is not a credible SA. The infrastructure cannot cope with an extra 2000 people. The plans and policies have no credible solutions.</p>	<p>The local community have been consulted in full at each stage of the Core Strategy and the details of this are set out in full in the Council's Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publicly available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p> <p>The revised SA/SEA was published for consultation between 4 November and 16 December 2011.</p> <p>Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636 Effective infrastructure provision and traffic management measures will both play a role in managing pollution levels.</p> <p>The TA work and the IDP have been discussed through the Examination process, specifically at hearing sessions on 4th and 11th November 2010.</p> <p>The Council accepts that many people will wish to use their car but the choice of more sustainable modes of travel is important, particularly for the young and elderly who may not have access to a car. The provision of cycleways to link the</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>The present scoring is a falsification and must be disregarded.</p>	<p>development to local facilities and educational establishments and the improvement of bus services will be important provisions of the development. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>In terms of education provision, the Council's Education Department believe that the most viable and sensible solution is to meet the impact of the Sandleford development through existing local secondary provision. This is likely to be on existing land and will involve re-modelling of the existing accommodation as required. At this stage they do not feel that there would be a requirement for additional land, but if this should be the case then this would form part of any detailed discussions/negotiations with the developer/land owner. This approach is based on current pupil numbers, pupil projections, the anticipated additional pupils from new housing, anticipated development timeframes and current Government policy.</p> <p>In terms of biodiversity, the biodiversity of the ancient woodland blocks were assessed both through an Ecology report undertaken by WYG (CD10/50) and in a Nature Conservation Management Strategy undertaken by HDA (CD10/62). In terms of buffer zones, the masterplan has been designed to ensure that there is a minimum 15m buffer between development and the ancient woodland which will enable informal paths to be formed to take the recreational pressure off the</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>ancient woodland itself. The masterplan as set out also ensures that no properties back onto any of the areas of woodland and that they do not become isolated from each other. Suitable species passages will be provided.</p> <p>The HDA work demonstrates the improvement, enhancement and future management of the woodland and open space.</p> <p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p>
Mr Richard Aston		No	No	<p>The selection of Sandleford Park is perverse and illogical. My living to the South of Newbury has resulted in many additional car journeys across Newbury which would not have been necessary if I had lived North of the centre. This leads me very much to the conclusion that the second strategic housing site should be in North Newbury.</p> <p>Any appraisal that dismissed the Eastern area due to unpopularity is ridiculous.</p>	<p>The relative traffic impacts of Sandleford/North Newbury were assessed in Transport Assessment Phase 2 http://www.westberks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=22606&p=0 which assessed the impact of strategic development at the 3 'reserve' sites in combination with Newbury Racecourse, setting out what mitigation would be required for each.</p> <p>With regard to the Eastern area, public consultation forms part of the evidence base. However, there were wider reasons for why Whitehart Meadow and Pincents Hill were not taken forward as strategic sites and these reasons are set out in full in documents including Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phases 1 and 2 and the revised SA/SEA specifically at paragraphs 7.3 to 8.5 and 11.19 to 11.30 of the document.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Ressance Limited		No	No	The selection of Sandleford appears to rely on a fundamental change to the scoring system, which has not been explained. The original scoring system resulted in a rejection of the site. Sandleford should not be preferred over PDL sites, such as exist in and around the town centre. The Council should examine a positive strategy of encouraging regeneration of old stock (of which there is plenty), empty.	<p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated</p>
Mrs Carolyn Aston		No	No	<p>Location of houses to the south of Newbury is illogical due to the location of most of the employment opportunities to the north and north-east. Empty offices and brownfield sites should be built on instead.</p> <p>Housing development should be on the Racecourse and the north side of Newbury.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p> <p>The Racecourse development has planning permission.</p> <p>Not all brownfield sites will be suitable locations for the provision of all types of development, for example family homes.</p>
Mrs Rachel Page		No	No	The Core Strategy appears to be not legal and unsound. Consultation with local communities in South Newbury has been wholly inadequate.	The local community have been consulted in full at each stage of the Core Strategy and the details of this are set out in full in the Council's Statements of

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Where is the plan and funding to show that appropriate infrastructure solutions are feasible to deal with the increased traffic levels? WBC have not made sufficient assessment of available and potential future brownfield sites. SA does not appear to have reassessed all the other sites but has focused on Sandleford. Concerned about the level of influence exerted by the Sandleford landowners and developers in WBC to result in this decision.</p>	<p>Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publically available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p> <p>The reassessment of sites has focused, following the Inspector's conclusions on this matter, on the choices to be made following Options for the Future, and therefore, in the Newbury/Thatcham area the reassessment has focused on the 3 sites of North Newbury, Sandleford Park and Siege Cross, all in combination with Newbury Racecourse which was a preferred strategic site by this stage.</p> <p>Whilst comments from site promoters have been received at each stage of the Core Strategy,</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>together with a significant level of evidence in support of their sites, 'level of influence' of developers has not influenced the site selection process. It is unclear why the respondent has this view – no evidence to support this comment has been provided.</p>
Sutton Estates	RPS Group	No	No	<p>Concern as to how Newbury Battlefield site came to be excluded from phase 1 of the combined sites document.</p> <p>The consultation documentation is difficult to follow and the paper trail is at best a distraction from the main issues.</p> <p>The content of the Combined Sites Phase 1 report and Appx 3 in the revised Strategic Sites Policy paper are different. Appx 3 adds little of substance that is now, and there is not an objective re-appraisal of reasonable alternatives.</p> <p>The contents of para 5.7 and 5.8 in the Strategic Sites Policy Paper describe fundamental shortcomings in the process of the consideration of alternatives that can only be corrected by re-considering all sites with potential and/or actual mitigation. Selecting one site based on mitigation whilst rejecting others is not sound nor legally compliant.</p> <p>The all eggs in one basket from one large scale strategic site maximises risk. Size was not previously used as a reason for site</p>	<p>The revision of the SA/SEA largely relates to how decisions were made following the Options for the Future stage. The original shortlisting of the sites is set out in full in Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phase 1. For the purposes of completeness, this is now included as part of the revised SA/SEA report.</p> <p>Appendix 3 does not contain new information – but instead incorporates the contents of Combined Strategic Housing Sites Phase 1 into the revised SA/SEA document. Paras 5.7 and 5.8 cannot be read in isolation.</p> <p>The site selection framework scoring (with the weighting) was a starting point which was then built on to progress the potential sites through the process of the SA. The selection of sites progressed beyond the Site Selection Framework assessments and these were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>selection. If the SA/SEA is to meet the requirements of the regulations, it must include a 'with mitigation' assessment of all relevant sites.</p> <p>Policy CS4 in the Core Strategy cannot be considered as sound or legally compliant in the context of the SA/SEA.</p>	<p>the process.</p> <p>The revised SA/SEA specifically sets out that the site selection process needs to consider the potential layout of development within the site and potential mitigation, and that it is one of the purposes of the SA/SEA to identify these factors. Clearly there are some factors which can be mitigated against and some which cannot, and this is described in Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document phase 1.</p> <p>Work undertaken in the early preparation stages of the Core Strategy supported an urban focus and development on a combination of brownfield land, strategic urban extensions and smaller urban extensions. Allocating one extra strategic site means that there is long term certainty for developers, stakeholders and the District's community about the future direction of growth. This also enables the effective delivery of infrastructure and helps to deliver wider community benefits and the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. Other non strategic sites will still be needed to meet the wider needs of the District and these will be allocated through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>It is a detailed consultation but we have tried to make it as user-friendly as possible and have made it clear that officers are happy to help anybody with the process of registering their comments.</p>
Rivar & Others	Carter Jonas	Yes	No	The strategic development opportunity	The site was originally assessed through Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phase

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
	LLP			<p>promoted by Rivar at South East Newbury has not been accepted by the LPA for inclusion in the Core Strategy. The latest SA confirms Rivar's view that the rejection of this site was not soundly based. The site has not been considered by the LPA as a reasonable alternative. Advantages of the strategy include that it promotes the Newbury urban focus, contains further development within established landscape capacity; accessibility and avoiding over extending the town, restores underdeveloped land, secures a high quality network of green infrastructure and will be more effective in delivering new housing.</p> <p>Initial site selection was limited to 27 ha of the site, however Rivar are promoting 42 ha which has the potential to deliver a new neighbourhood. The negative aspects identified by the site selection framework are capable of being mitigated and this should have been taken into account as it was at Sandleford.</p> <p>The sites scored highly in the sites selection framework and are acceptable in terms of landscape sensitivity.</p> <p>The TA does not acknowledge the potential to extend existing bus services.</p> <p>An effective ecological mitigation/enhancement strategy could be designed as part of the masterplan.</p>	<p>1. Additional information was then provided and assessed following the Options for the Future consultation, but this did not change the original assessment of the site's suitability to form a strategic urban extension.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>If proper regard is given to the potential for mitigation, the SSA would not justify the rejection of this site. A reasonable alternative strategy of reducing the capacity of Sandleford in combination with Greenham to form an urban extension has not been properly assessed.</p>	
Mr Richard Page		No	No	<p>Process to select Sandleford as a strategic site is deeply flawed. The increase in scoring in Appendix 7 is highly questionable. Questions elements of the scoring in Appendix 7, specifically sub-objectives on housing; green infrastructure; improving access to the countryside; improving access to education; reducing the need to travel, especially by car; to conserve and enhance the biodiversity; to conserve and enhance the character of the landscape; to reduce air pollution; to reduce energy use and to reduce water consumption.</p> <p>The scoring has been retro-fitted to elevate Sandleford from a predominantly neutral site to one that is predominantly positive.</p>	<p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>The reassessment takes the previous SA as a starting point and reappraises where appropriate, taking account of the consultation responses and additional technical evidence, including work carried out to develop the planning concepts for the sites by site promoters.</p> <p>The scoring has not been 'retro-fitted' it has been reassessed taking into account all information available as set out above.</p>
Newtown Parish Council		Yes	No	<p>Newtown Parish Council supports the response provided by BDBC. There is still no clear and effectively argued rationale for the selection of the Sandleford Park site.</p>	<p>The reasons for the selection of the Sandleford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence base which were previously separate documents. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process.
Mrs Sally Fish		Yes	No	<p>Building on greenfield sites is not the answer when there are brownfield sites available.</p> <p>In combination with the Newbury Racecourse development there is too much development for south Newbury. Adding an additional 3,000 cars is unrealistic and will cause traffic grid lock. Nearby facilities involve crossing a busy road. Gradient is uphill on the way back from the town centre, meaning that most people will drive.</p> <p>Due to Park House's academy status there is no legal requirement for the school to expand, and as a sports college it is in no position to use up land for building extensions.</p> <p>The local community has not been consulted properly.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>In terms of education provision, the Council's Education Department believe that the most viable and sensible solution is to meet the impact of the Sandford development through existing local secondary provision. This is likely to be on existing</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>land and will involve re-modelling of the existing accommodation as required. At this stage they do not feel that there would be a requirement for additional land, but if this should be the case then this would form part of any detailed discussions/negotiations with the developer/land owner. This approach is based on current pupil numbers, pupil projections, the anticipated additional pupils from new housing, anticipated development timeframes and current Government policy. Whilst Park House has become an academy, the Local Authority currently retains the responsibility for school organisation and is the body which negotiates and receives funding through section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy. Even though Academies are not maintained by the LA they are state maintained and continue to be part of our pupil place provision, and the Council will continue to work with them to ensure we meet our duty.</p> <p>The local community have been consulted in full at each stage of the Core Strategy and the details of this are set out in full in the Council's Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publically available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p>
Ashmansworth Parish Council		No	No	Whilst Ashmansworth is in North Hampshire it is only 5 miles from Sandleford. Already the A343 at Park House School and Monks Lane get very congested causing long delays and	The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>the retail park is usually grid locked at weekends. Newbury railway station gets busy and it is often impossible to park there. The Racecourse and Sandford developments will generate lots of extra traffic and residents won't cycle or use buses.</p> <p>Express concerns about the limited consultation process which has ignored the concerns of parishes in Hampshire. Support BDBC's objection.</p>	<p>infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The local community have been consulted in full at each stage of the Core Strategy. As part of this, adjoining parishes which are outside of West Berkshire have been involved at each stage of the Core Strategy process. The details of this are set out in full in the Council's Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publically available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p>
Miss Airlie Dyson		No	No	<p>No reason has been given in the Core Strategy why Sandford Park is the preferred strategic site. In May, Sandford was on the reserve list. The SA should be made available at the same time as the Core Strategy. Changes have been made to it to justify the choice of Sandford.</p> <p>The retail park is beyond the busy A339, not an easy walk or cycle. In order to walk or cycle at Greenham it may be necessary to drive there and back. The town centre is accessible</p>	<p>The revised SA/SEA sets out in full the process of site selection and details how Sandford was selected as the preferred strategic site from the list of 3 reserve sites.</p> <p>The SA was developed alongside the Core Strategy and was available at the same time. The SA was published with the Draft Submission Core Strategy at Publication stage in February 2010 and submitted with the Core Strategy in July 2010 as this is a regulatory requirement. The SA Report is CD07/10 on the Core Documents List.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				only down a steep hill.	<p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>Whilst the retail park is beyond the A339, there is a toucan crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
Mrs Lisa Haynes		Not specified	No	<p>The Core Strategy is unsound and unjustified. I feel I have had little time to participate. A basket of smaller sites spread across Newbury would be a viable alternative. A huge strategic site generates undesirable social and management issues.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure is extremely important.</p> <p>Chronic congestion and increased pollution will be unsustainable.</p> <p>Capability Brown landscape should be preserved in its entirety.</p> <p>Losing the greenfield setting of the classic</p>	<p>The local community have been consulted in full at each stage of the Core Strategy and the details of this are set out in full in the Council's Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publically available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p> <p>Work undertaken in the early preparation stages of the Core Strategy supported an urban focus and development on a combination of brownfield land, strategic urban extensions and smaller urban extensions. Allocating one extra strategic site means that there is long term certainty for developers, stakeholders and the District's community about the future direction of growth. This also enables the effective delivery of infrastructure and helps to</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>book Watership Down would reflect very badly on the town.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should be a vehicle for enlightened planning in the 21C; we do not want to become an identity visually illiterate place.</p>	<p>deliver wider community benefits and the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. Other non strategic sites will still be needed to meet the wider needs of the District and these will be allocated through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>In terms of the landscape, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The proposal does not include any of the historic parkland. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandleford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>The fictional route that the rabbits took in the book 'Watership Down' would be largely protected from development. There is evidence of a warren just below the rugby club which will also remain</p>
Ilan and Erica Campbell		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Object to Sandleford proposal for 2 main reasons:</p> <p>1. Concerned over Warren Rd access. Serious road safety issues bearing in mind proximity to</p>	<p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				schools. 2. Narrow section of the A343 north of Tydems needs to be widened.	on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636
Mrs S Toop		Not specified	Not specified	Opposed to over development of the Greenham/Wash Common area. This will completely spoil a very pleasant area and add to the prosperity of landowners/developers. There are houses for sale and other developments in the pipeline so no excuse for the development of Sandlford Park.	Objection noted. However, the allocation forms part of the 10,500 housing requirement for West Berkshire as a whole, and this is not negated by properties currently for sale.
Dr Peter Constable		Not specified	Not specified	The scale and site of development are inappropriate. The southern green approach to Newbury is an area of outstanding beauty and should be preserved. Need to avoid the reckless destruction of this site, and the Council should look at alternative options to redevelop inner urban brownfield sites.	<p>The reasons for the selection of the Sandlford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence base which were previously separate documents. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process.</p> <p>The southern approach to Newbury is not designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In terms of the landscape, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandeford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>In terms of brownfield development, the Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p>
Mr and Mrs Hancock		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Newbury is a small town which cannot take more development. "Green Lungs" are badly needed on the outskirts. Traffic is already a problem.</p> <p>Planners should never agree to accept any further building except on brownfield sites.</p> <p>The Sandeford proposals affect the loss of an area of beauty, with an impact on local wildlife. The owners will make good money from selling the land, but do not live locally or consider local residents.</p> <p>The proposals that the exit / entrance is onto</p>	<p>The housing distribution was discussed at the hearings on 28 and 29 June 2011. The distribution was not based on a proportionate amount relative to population but on an analysis of the facilities, character and sustainability of the settlements in the District and on the assessment of potential sites within the SHLAA.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Monks Lane is ridiculous. Traffic already queues along here, so how will new residents get to and from home.</p> <p>Monks Lane used to be a pleasant walk from Wash Commons, but not now, even out of rush hours.</p>	<p>situated.</p> <p>In terms of the landscape, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>In terms of local wildlife, the biodiversity of the ancient woodland blocks were assessed both through an Ecology report undertaken by WYG (CD10/50) and in a Nature Conservation Management Strategy undertaken by HDA (CD10/62). In terms of buffer zones, the masterplan has been designed to ensure that there is a minimum 15m buffer between development and the ancient woodland which will enable informal paths to be formed to take the recreational pressure off the ancient woodland itself. The masterplan as set out also ensures that no properties back onto any of the areas of woodland and that they do not become isolated from each other. Suitable species passages will be provided.</p> <p>The HDA work demonstrates the improvement,</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>enhancement and future management of the woodland and open space.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p>
Ms Celia Read		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Should not go from the 11th least favourable site to having it developed for 2,000 houses. No infrastructure, houses will need to be demolished and Monks Lane made a dual carriage way. Bypass was built to take the traffic out of Newbury, now it is being brought back. Should not be building on a green site, should build on brownfield - convert empty office blocks to flat and homes. No to Sandleford!</p>	<p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>The TA work and the IDP have been discussed at the Hearing Sessions on 4 and 11 November 2010.</p> <p>In terms of brownfield development, the Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p>
Susan Smith		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Sandleford Park should be saved from development. If brownfield sites are available these should be utilised and with increased population these open spaces must be treasured ad retained.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					deliverability.
West Berks & Hampshire Joint Action Group		Not specified	Not specified	<p>The public inquiry in 2000 condemned the Sandleford site. This is now being ignored.</p> <p>The revised SA arbitrarily alters the previous agreed rating process so Sandleford moves from 11th in sustainability to 2nd. This defies reasonable explanation. Other more suitable sites such as Dennison Barracks were rejected. Both sites near Thatcham were not considered. There are a number of mixed use sites which were not even considered. All existing infrastructure is overloaded in Newbury so new infrastructure will be required.</p> <p>North Newbury registers as more sustainable on any intelligent assessment. The already very congested and polluted A339 and Monks Lane will be further heavily impacted and it is impossible to see how mitigation could be effective.</p> <p>The concept of the public open space is deeply flawed. This is a Site of Special Landscape Interest which will be impractical if not impossible to protect and maintain. What protection will there be to stop the housing being extended southwards.</p> <p>It is hilly terrain and people will not use bikes and buses.</p>	<p>The scheme now being promoted at Sandleford differs substantively from the site which was previously put forward and has been designed from the outset to fully address the previous Inspector's concerns. The site would be developed in a comprehensive manner to ensure that the maximum potential can be derived with an overall masterplan to protect matters of importance. The full details of how the scheme has changed are set out in Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phase 2, which is available on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=24270&p=0.</p> <p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>Dennison Barracks lies within Hermitage which is a service village in the District's settlement hierarchy. This means that it is expected to accommodate low levels of future development over the Core Strategy period. Both Thatcham sites have been fully assessed as part of the process of strategic site selection. This is explained in full within the revised SA/SEA.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>The supporting text of policy CS4 confirms that "The formation of a Country Park or equivalent area of public open space in the southern part of the site will protect the sensitive landscape area in perpetuity". Substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandleford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan for the site.</p>
Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council		Not specified	Not specified	Wish to raise concerns about the process of site selection (identification of Sandleford). The site was treated differently in comparison to	It is unclear why the respondent suggests that the Sandleford site has been treated differently to other reasonable alternatives. No information or evidence

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>other reasonable alternatives on the basis of a developer submission.</p> <p>Remains unclear as to why Sandford Park is favoured, when initial site selection process scored Sandford poorly. BDBC remains of the view that the site selection approach is unjustified and unclear.</p> <p>Concern on the impact of the proposed allocation remain.</p>	<p>to support this comment has been provided.</p> <p>The reasons for the selection of the Sandford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence base which were previously separate documents. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process.</p> <p>Where the development would result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636.</p>
James Kay		Not specified	Not specified	<p>This is not the best place to build 2000 houses. Roads are already overloaded. It is not sustainable. Each house is likely to own 2 cars and will use them to access Newbury Town Centre. Small sites in the middle and east of the town centre should be promoted instead, and walking and cycling promoted. Due to access to the A34/M4 junction it would be better to build on the centre or north sides of town.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>There is a lack of clarity in the process regarding ranking. The good people of Newbury deserve clarity and objectivity in this process.</p>	<p>Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p>
Mike Eaton		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Concerned about the additional children to be absorbed into the existing schools (particularly at secondary level). Concerned about the environmental impact of building the new houses, the additional traffic creation and the destruction of a large area of the countryside.</p>	<p>In terms of education provision, the Council's Education Department believe that the most viable and sensible solution is to meet the impact of the Sandleford development through existing local secondary provision. This is likely to be on existing land and will involve re-modelling of the existing accommodation as required. At this stage they do not feel that there would be a requirement for additional land, but if this should be the case then this would form part of any detailed discussions/negotiations with the developer/land owner. This approach is based on current pupil numbers, pupil projections, the anticipated additional pupils from new housing, anticipated development</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>timeframes and current Government policy.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The supporting text of policy CS4 confirms that "The formation of a Country Park or equivalent area of public open space in the southern part of the site will protect the sensitive landscape area in perpetuity". Substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandleford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.
Julia Phillips		Not specified	Not specified	<p>I cannot believe that this is the correct use of this land. I do not see that there is any proposal for new schools. Monks Lane is already full at peak times. Health Care is squeezed already without the addition of thousands of new patients. The Liberal Democrats have outlined available brownfield sites and these should be developed first. Developments should be spread around. The wildlife and woods and coppices together with the open fields are too valuable to be consumed by this proposal. The relaxation of the planning laws will give more power to local people.</p>	<p>In terms of education provision, a primary school is planned to be provided on the site and in terms of secondary education, Park House school is likely to be extended. This is likely to be on existing land and will involve re-modelling of the existing accommodation as required. At this stage the Council's Education Department do not feel that there would be a requirement for additional land, but if this should be the case then this would form part of any detailed discussions/negotiations with the developer/land owner. This approach is based on current pupil numbers, pupil projections, the anticipated additional pupils from new housing, anticipated development timeframes and current Government policy. This information is set out in policy CS4 and in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Where the development would result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p> <p>Substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>The biodiversity of the ancient woodland blocks were assessed both through an Ecology report undertaken by WYG (CD10/50) and in a Nature Conservation Management Strategy undertaken by HDA (CD10/62). In terms of buffer zones, the masterplan has been designed to ensure that there is a minimum 15m buffer between development and the ancient woodland which will enable informal paths to be formed to take the recreational pressure off the ancient woodland itself. The masterplan as set out also ensures that no properties back onto any of the areas of woodland and that they do not become isolated from each other. Suitable species passages will be provided.</p> <p>The HDA work demonstrates the improvement,</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					enhancement and future management of the woodland and open space.
Mrs Alison Sloan		No	No	<p>The appraisal process has moved from a set of objective measures to a set of very subjective measures. Discounting the early scoring mechanism and shortlisting sites that did not score well has introduced a natural bias towards Sandleford. Other sites have not had the opportunity to present information to the same degree as the Sandleford site.</p> <p>In the east, Pincents Hill and Theale were deemed unsuitable due to local opposition. However Sandleford has created as much if not more opposition. Consultation on Sandleford was flawed as it was referred to as a reserve site and changed to a strategic site once the consultation had closed.</p> <p>Appendices 7 and 8 reveal a number of very subjective analysis.</p> <p>CS4 should be deleted and the council should re-appraise whether it needs a second strategic development site.</p>	<p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>Public consultation forms one part of the evidence base. However, there were wider reasons for why Whitehart Meadow and Pincents Hill were not taken forward as strategic sites and these reasons are set out in full in documents including Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phases 1 and 2 and the revised SA/SEA specifically at paragraphs 7.3 to 8.5 and 11.19 to 11.30 of the document.</p> <p>The reassessment takes the previous SA as a starting point and reappraises where appropriate, taking account of the consultation responses and additional technical evidence, including work carried out to develop the planning concepts for the sites by site promoters.</p>
Mr Bryan Harper		No	No	<p>The appraisal process has moved from a set of objective measures to a set of very subjective measures over time. A natural bias towards Sandleford has been introduced (10.8). Concerned that other sites have not had the opportunity to present information to the same degrees as the Sandleford site (5.8). Any one</p>	<p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>Public consultation forms part of the evidence base. However, there were wider reasons for why Whitehart Meadow and Pincents Hill were not taken forward as strategic sites and these reasons are set</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>of these points could be a point of legal challenge.</p> <p>In the eastern area, sites were dismissed due to local opposition. However, Sandleford has created as much if not more opposition. The Council's consultation on Sandleford was by their own admittance flawed as it was referred to as a reserve site and then changed to a strategic site. An appraisal of Appendices 7 and 8 reveals a number of very subjective analysis.</p> <p>CS4 should be deleted and the Council should reappraise whether it needs a second strategic development site.</p>	<p>out in full in documents including Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phases 1 and 2 and the revised SA/SEA specifically at paragraphs 7.3 to 8.5 and 11.19 to 11.30 of the document.</p> <p>The term 'reserve' site was changed in response to the consultation at the 'Options for the Future' stage. It became apparent that the term was causing some confusion (PTG minutes 3/10/09) about what was meant. This is summarised in the Strategic Sites Policy paper of the Revised SA/SEA report at para 11.16.</p>
<p>Ms Gabrielle McGarvey (Newbury Town Council)</p>		<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Sandleford is counter to National Housing Policy. It is neither economically nor environmentally sustainable and will increase carbon emissions. It will build on a greenfield site of importance for its landscape value. It is a site of literary importance due to the book Watership Down. A significant amount of Newbury's housing needs could be catered for through sustainable town centre housing provision. As Regional plans are being revoked, we don't need to rush to implement strategies and identify sites for the amount of housing allocated under the RSS. The planning authority should look at what makes sense for Newbury.</p> <p>The Council's consultation was flawed as it referred to Sandleford as a reserve site only to</p>	<p>The reasons for the selection of the Sandleford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence base which were previously separate documents. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process.</p> <p>As far as the landscape is concerned, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>change it to a strategic site once the consultation had closed.</p>	<p>is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p> <p>Planning remains a plan-led system and it is important that development is effectively managed. Without a plan, and if the Council's 5-year land supply dips, then it will become increasingly likely that there will be planning by appeal within the District. The saved policies of the Local Plan are out of date and it is important to get an up to date Core Strategy in place as soon as possible.</p> <p>The term 'reserve' site was changed in response to the consultation at the 'Options for the Future' stage. It became apparent that the term was causing some</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>confusion (PTG minutes 3/10/09) about what was meant. This is summarised in the Strategic Sites Policy paper of the Revised SA/SEA report at para 11.16.</p>
<p>Pat and Chris Webb</p>		<p>Not specified</p>	<p>Not specified</p>	<p>The thinking behind a second strategic site is fundamentally flawed and WBC should be looking for smaller sustainable sites in and around Newbury including empty office blocks and small industrial units. WBC should not be inviting developers to provide them with sites, but the Council should determine the best sites for ownership irrespective of ownership.</p> <p>The consultation process is fundamentally flawed as many people will not have been able to respond due to the complexity of it. People who do not own or understand computers could find the whole process overwhelming. The website was difficult to access and the font was too small. The previous term of reserve site may have given false assurance to people. Consultation deliberately held close to Christmas when everyone is so busy.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p> <p>The consultation began on 4 November and ran for 6 weeks which is a statutory period. Ending on 16 December it was deliberately organised to avoid being held over Christmas.</p> <p>It is a detailed consultation but we have tried to make it as user-friendly as possible and have made it clear that the officers are happy to help anybody with the process of registering their comments. The Council's preferred method of receiving consultation responses is a web based system widely used by planning authorities. It is an efficient system that enables consultees to comment directly on the document, to retain a copy of their comment for their own records, to receive automatic acknowledgement of their comment and for comments to be efficiently analysed and made viewable on the consultation portal. The consultation documents have been made available to view in hard copy at all of the District's libraries and at the Council Offices. Comments can</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					also be submitted on paper forms which are readily available, or by e-mail.
Greenham Parish Council		No	No	<p>Specific reference is made in 11.36 to GPC making no comment at the Options Stage. However, although the GPC minutes don't say so, the presumption must be that it was not realised that reserve actually meant selected and strategic. The failure of GPC to comment was due to WBC's woolly and misleading definition. 2 large strategic sites lie in Greenham Parish which already has the largest proportion of affordable housing; however parish boundaries have not been taken into account.</p> <p>WBC must explain why and how it consulted on the basis of sites being termed reserve and then made strategic decisions on the basis of that consultation.</p>	<p>It is unclear what part of Options for the Future policy CS9 that GPC did not understand. The policy states that there were 3 options for 'the identification of a broad location for the future expansion of Newbury/Thatcham for up to 2,000 houses'.</p> <p>The term 'reserve' site was changed in response to the consultation at the 'Options for the Future' stage. It became apparent that the term was causing some confusion (PTG minutes 3/10/09) about what was meant. This is summarised in the Strategic Sites Policy paper of the Revised SA/SEA report at para 11.16.</p>
Greenham Parish Council		No	No	<p>It is claimed at 15.5 that a re-evaluation of the Sandleford site alters significantly the findings of the SA. However the scorings of the site have been enhanced significantly because the development will be in accordance with policy. Why doesn't Appendix 7 show a similar re-scoring for North Newbury?</p>	<p>The reassessment takes the previous SA as a starting point and reappraises both the North Newbury and the Sandleford sites on exactly the same basis where appropriate, taking account of the consultation responses and additional technical evidence, including all of the work carried out to develop the planning concepts for the sites by site promoters.</p>
Mrs Sally Evans		Not specified	No	<p>The many brownfield sites have not been fully appraised. Greenfield development should be a last resort. The SA claims that Sandleford presents the opportunity to walk, cycle and use</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>public transport to access facilities. This is not the case and the claim is flawed. The residents will in large part require cars to access facilities. Road planning will not solve this problem. There will be gridlock and pollution.</p>	<p>available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p> <p>The Council accepts that many people will wish to use their car but the choice of more sustainable modes of travel is important, particularly for the young and elderly who may not have access to a car. The provision of cycleways to link the development to local facilities and educational establishments and the improvement of bus services will be important provisions of the development. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636.</p>
Mr Terence Evans		Not specified	No	<p>The many brownfield sites have not been fully appraised. Greenfield development should be a last resort. The SA claims that Sandleford presents the opportunity to walk, cycle and use public transport to access facilities. This is not the case and the claim is flawed. The residents will in large part require cars to access</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>facilities. Road planning will not solve this problem. There will be gridlock and pollution.</p>	<p>The Council accepts that many people will wish to use their car but the choice of more sustainable modes of travel is important, particularly for the young and elderly who may not have access to a car. The provision of cycleways to link the development to local facilities and educational establishments and the improvement of bus services will be important provisions of the development. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p>
Mr James Sinclair		Not specified	No	<p>The many brownfield sites have not been fully appraised. Greenfield development should be a last resort. The SA claims that Sandleford presents the opportunity to walk, cycle and use public transport to access facilities. This is not the case and the claim is flawed. The residents will in large part require cars to access facilities. Road planning will not solve this problem. There will be gridlock and pollution.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p> <p>The Council accepts that many people will wish to</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				There are no jobs available in the area.	<p>use their car but the choice of more sustainable modes of travel is important, particularly for the young and elderly who may not have access to a car. The provision of cycleways to link the development to local facilities and educational establishments and the improvement of bus services will be important provisions of the development. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p>
Mr Thomas Reid		Not specified	No	<p>The many brownfield sites have not been fully appraised. Greenfield development should be a last resort. The SA claims that Sandleford presents the opportunity to walk, cycle and use public transport to access facilities. This is not the case and the claim is flawed. The residents will in large part require cars to access facilities. Road planning will not solve this problem. There will be gridlock and pollution. There are no jobs available in the area.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability.</p> <p>The Council accepts that many people will wish to use their car but the choice of more sustainable modes of travel is important, particularly for the young and elderly who may not have access to a car. The provision of cycleways to link the</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>development to local facilities and educational establishments and the improvement of bus services will be important provisions of the development. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p>
Mr Peter Norman (Say No to Sandleford)		No	No	<p>The appraisal process for Sandleford has moved from a set of objective measures against which it is reasonable to attempt to score to a set of very subjective measures. Other sites have not had the opportunity to present information to the same degree as the Sandleford site. Any of these points could be a point for a legal challenge.</p> <p>Local opposition to Sandleford has not been taken into account in the same way that it was in the east.</p> <p>An appraisal of appendices 7 and 8 shows a number of very subjective analysis.</p>	See Appendix F for response to full submission.

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				Detailed analysis and response attached as appendix.	
Kennet District Scouts		Not specified	Not specified	This is a positive response about the potential for Sandleford for potential scouts and guides who might move to the development.	Noted.
Mr Anthony Pick (Conservative Group, Newbury Town Council)	Councillor	Yes	Yes	<p>Minority report due to the official response from NTC being exclusively written by the LibDem group who are in a majority of 13 to 12.</p> <p>2 substantive failures of due process which have biased the likely outcome of any report that NTC writes.</p> <p>Firstly, feedback from public meeting likely to be biased as it was promoted and advertised jointly by the LibDem group and the Say No to Sandleford campaign.</p> <p>Secondly the group set up to write NTC's response was set up to consist of 2 Libdems and one Conservative.</p> <p>Generally agree that the present proposal to develop Sandleford is the best available solution and gives flexibility beyond 2026. Single site makes possible a well-planned and integrated development which can provide for a mixture of large and small dwellings and provide certainty that the land is available.</p> <p>The proposed layout has been carefully considered to minimise the effects on</p>	<p>General support for Sandleford noted.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>landscape character and historic environment and will preserve the ambience of the Grade II listed Sandford Priory. Can be seen as an extension of the existing built environment.</p> <p>Sets out some concerns expressed at the public meeting - the need for a public meeting hall; concern over traffic generation; the proposed bus route; the exit point for the proposed business area and safe access to Greenham Common.</p>	
Mr David Merchant		Not specified	No	<p>The proposal to extend Park House School is flawed due to its academy status.</p> <p>Extending Park House would mean using existing sports areas which would be inappropriate for a Sports College, and would remove the cross country course.</p> <p>Queries the operation of the proposed bus system in Warren Road.</p> <p>Queries how the traffic will exit the site and join the A339 or Monks Lane as these roads are very busy and congested.</p> <p>Newbury does not have the infrastructure to deal with a 10% increase in population.</p> <p>The houses should be spread over brownfield sites.</p> <p>A site out of Newbury would be preferable for education and population, with purpose built</p>	<p>In terms of Academy status, whilst some schools, including Park House have become academies, the Local Authority currently retains the responsibility for school organisation and is the body which negotiates and receives funding through section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy. Even though Academies are not maintained by the LA they are state maintained and continue to be part of our pupil place provision, and the Council will continue to work with them to ensure we meet our duty.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>schools and other infrastructure. Traffic would be better at a site north of Newbury.</p>	<p>encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p>
Mrs Diana Merchant		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Queries the future management of the ancient woodland.</p> <p>Queries how site rose from 11th to 2nd in the order for building. It may be needed for crops in the future. There are plenty of brownfield sites - better for social housing occupiers who do not have cars.</p> <p>Extending Park House would mean using existing sports areas which would be inappropriate for a Sports College.</p> <p>How will 4000 cars get out onto Monks Lane, this will cause grid lock. The grid lock going across the bridge will put people off coming to Newbury for business or shopping.</p> <p>Does not agree that the buses on Warren Road will work due to congestion etc.</p>	<p>In terms of the ancient woodland, the biodiversity of the ancient woodland blocks was assessed both through an Ecology report undertaken by WYG (CD10/50) and in a Nature Conservation Management Strategy undertaken by HDA (CD10/62). In terms of buffer zones, the masterplan has been designed to ensure that there is a minimum 15m buffer between development and the ancient woodland which will enable informal paths to be formed to take the recreational pressure off the ancient woodland itself. The masterplan as set out also ensures that no properties back onto any of the areas of woodland and that they do not become isolated from each other.</p> <p>The HDA work demonstrates the improvement, enhancement and future management of the woodland and open space.</p> <p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Queries the operation of the proposed bus system in Warren Road.</p> <p>The proposal to extend Park House School is flawed due to its academy status.</p> <p>Queries how the traffic will exit the site and join the A339 or Monks Lane as these roads are very busy and congested.</p> <p>Newbury does not have the infrastructure to deal with a 10% increase in population.</p> <p>The houses should be spread over brownfield sites.</p> <p>A site out of Newbury would be preferable for education and population, with purpose built schools and other infrastructure. Traffic would be better at a site north of Newbury.</p>	<p>set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>In terms of education provision, the Council's Education Department believe that the most viable and sensible solution is to meet the impact of the Sandleford development through existing local secondary provision. This is likely to be on existing land and will involve re-modelling of the existing accommodation as required. At this stage they do not feel that there would be a requirement for additional land, but if this should be the case then this would form part of any detailed discussions/negotiations with the developer/land owner. This approach is based on current pupil numbers, pupil projections, the anticipated additional pupils from new housing, anticipated development timeframes and current Government policy.</p> <p>In terms of Academy status, whilst some schools, including Park House have become academies, the Local Authority currently retains the responsibility for school organisation and is the body which negotiates and receives funding through section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy. Even though Academies are not maintained by the LA they are state maintained and continue to be part of our pupil place provision, and the Council will continue to work with them to ensure we meet our duty.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p>
Lisa Haynes		Not specified	Not specified	<p>The Capability Brown landscape should be preserved for future generations.</p> <p>The impact of the loss of land from the book Watership Down would reflect very badly on Newbury.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure important.</p> <p>Walking distance to town taken from nearest point to the town, rather than the centre of the</p>	<p>As far as the landscape is concerned, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The proposal does not include any of the historic parkland. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandleford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				development.	<p>retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>The fictional route that the rabbits took in the book 'Watership Down' would be largely protected from development.</p> <p>The site was measured from a recognisable point. Measuring from the midpoint of the site would not reflect the proposed extent of the built development.</p>
Cllr Jeff Beck		Not specified	Not specified	Any major new housing development in or near to Newbury is, in my opinion, best allocated to this strategic site for the reasons stated by the professional officers.	Noted.
Kennet District Scouts		Not specified	Not specified	If Sandleford goes ahead, could the developer build a hall with some adjacent land that could be used by both the Guides and Scouts, to be transferred into the ownership of the Scouting and Guide associations. Can provide further guidance on necessary amenities.	The provision of community facilities will be an important part of the next stages of planning the Sandleford site and will be looked at through the development brief process.
Mr David Peacock		Not specified	No	<p>Once Newbury Racecourse earmarked for development no need for any other major housing site in the Newbury area.</p> <p>The figure of 2000 houses has not been adequately justified and no clear figure has been made available for the number of dwellings built/approved etc in the plan period. This reduces the necessary size of the</p>	Work undertaken in the early preparation stages of the Core Strategy supported an urban focus and development on a combination of brownfield land, strategic urban extensions and smaller urban extensions. Allocating one extra strategic site means that there is long term certainty for developers, stakeholders and the District's community about the future direction of growth. This also enables the effective delivery of infrastructure and helps to deliver wider community benefits and the vision and

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Sandleford site.</p> <p>Greater weight needs to be given to alternatives. No serious consideration was given to finding a number of smaller sites. Converting empty office space would further reduce the required numbers.</p> <p>On a map the Sandleford site appears more sustainable than it is in reality. The gradient means that walking/cycling is unlikely; the road network is inadequate. The preservation of the pockets of woodland which form part of the site will not protect the wildlife using them once they are surrounded by houses.</p> <p>Parkway as an Academy controls its own admissions policy. Access to primary schools means some children crossing one of two major roads.</p> <p>At present there are no areas marked on the proposed plan for community facilities.</p> <p>Sandleford Park deserves full protection as a Capability Brown landscape. It is bizarre that no planning protection appears to exist for this landscape.</p> <p>The selection process which changed the ranking 'without justification or proper explanation' was flawed.</p> <p>the form of consultation was 'intimidating' and</p>	<p>objectives of the Core Strategy. Other non strategic sites will still be needed to meet the wider needs of the District and these will be allocated through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p> <p>The outcome from the 4 phases of Transport Assessments shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636</p> <p>Public transport will be provided. Modal shift is encouraged by both the Core Strategy and the Local Transport Plan, and the infrastructure will be put in place to enable this. Additionally there will be a Travel Plan prepared for the site.</p> <p>In terms of the landscape, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				is via email only.	<p>draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>The biodiversity of the ancient woodland blocks were assessed both through an Ecology report undertaken by WYG (CD10/50) and in a Nature Conservation Management Strategy undertaken by HDA (CD10/62). In terms of buffer zones, the masterplan has been designed to ensure that there is a minimum 15m buffer between development and the ancient woodland which will enable informal paths to be formed to take the recreational pressure off the ancient woodland itself. The masterplan as set out also ensures that no properties back onto any of the areas of woodland and that they do not become isolated from each other.</p> <p>The HDA work demonstrates the improvement, enhancement and future management of the woodland and open space.</p> <p>In terms of Academy status, whilst some schools, including Park House have become academies, the Local Authority currently retains the responsibility for</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>school organisation and is the body which negotiates and receives funding through section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy. Even though Academies are not maintained by the LA they are state maintained and continue to be part of our pupil place provision, and the Council will continue to work with them to ensure we meet our duty.</p> <p>Community facilities will be assessed as part of the development brief process and are an important part of the next stage of the planning process.</p> <p>The proposal does not include any of the historic parkland. The areas adjacent are proposed to be protected from development in perpetuity. This is shown on the draft masterplan which is a Core Document (CD10/63) available on the Council's website.</p> <p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>It is a detailed consultation but we have tried to make it as user-friendly as possible and have made it clear that the officers are happy to help anybody with the process of registering their comments. The Council's preferred method of receiving consultation responses is a web based system widely used by planning authorities. It is an efficient system that enables consultees to comment directly on the document, to retain a copy of their comment for their own records, to receive automatic acknowledgement</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					of their comment and for comments to be efficiently analysed and made viewable on the consultation portal. The consultation documents have been made available to view in hard copy at all of the District's libraries and at the Council Offices. Comments can also be submitted on paper forms which are readily available, or by e-mail.
Croudace Strategic Ltd	Boyer Planning Ltd	Yes	No	<p>It is not clear that Sandleford Park is overall the most sustainable option out of the potential strategic sites. A number of the potential strategic sites were discounted at an early stage and do not appear to have been revisited as part of this further work.</p> <p>Would support an increase of the housing figure to 11,700. The housing target for the AONB is too high. A greater proportion of the housing allocation should be directed towards Thatcham as a recognition of its status in the settlement hierarchy and relationship with Newbury in strategic terms.</p>	<p>The revision of the SA/SEA largely relates to how decisions were made following the Options for the Future stage. The original shortlisting of the sites is set out in full in Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phase 1. For the purposes of completeness, this is now included as part of the revised SA/SEA report.</p> <p>The housing target for the AONB has been discussed through the Examination process, as was the role of Thatcham and the need for a period of consolidation. This is also documented within the revised SA/SEA report.</p>
Mr Paul Day		No	No	<p>The appraisal process for Sandleford has moved from a set of objective measures to a set of very subjective measures (appendix 8). Other sites have not had the opportunity to present information to the same degree as the Sandleford site and this could be a point of legal challenge.</p> <p>Public opposition was a reason for the dismissal of strategic sites in the east.</p>	<p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>The reassessment takes the previous SA as a starting point and reappraises where appropriate, taking account of the consultation responses and additional technical evidence, including work carried out to develop the planning concepts for the sites by</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>However Sandleford has created as much if not more opposition. The Council's consultation on Sandleford was flawed as they referred to it as a reserve site and then changed it once the consultation closed. An appraisal of appendices 7 and 8 reveals a number of very subjective analysis.</p> <p>CS4 should be deleted and the council should re-appraise whether it needs a second strategic development site and to re-appraise where best to site houses without regard to land banks acquired by developers.</p>	<p>site promoters.</p> <p>All site promoters have been able to submit information in response to Core Strategy consultations – it has been up to the site promoters how they seek to demonstrate the deliverability of their site.</p> <p>Public consultation forms part of the evidence base. However, there were wider reasons for why Whitehart Meadow and Pincents Hill were not taken forward as strategic sites and these reasons are set out in full in documents including Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phases 1 and 2 and the revised SA/SEA specifically at paragraphs 7.3 to 8.5 and 11.19 to 11.30 of the document.</p> <p>Work undertaken in the early preparation stages of the Core Strategy supported an urban focus and development on a combination of brownfield land, strategic urban extensions and smaller urban extensions. Allocating one extra strategic site means that there is long term certainty for developers, stakeholders and the District's community about the future direction of growth. This also enables the effective delivery of infrastructure and helps to deliver wider community benefits and the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. Other non strategic sites will still be needed to meet the wider needs of the District and these will be allocated through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Capital Corporation Projects Ltd	Bell Cornwell	No	No	Biased and inconsistent approach to site selection process, was incumbent upon Council to examine each of the sites on the same basis. Whitehart Meadow site, Theale scored highly in strategic site appraisal process and is suitable location for new development in the Eastern Urban Area. The Inspector should either find the Core Strategy unsound or he should recommend that in order for it to be found sound the Sandleford Park strategic allocation should be deleted.	<p>All of the strategic sites were assessed on the same basis. These assessments are set out within Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phase 1. For the purposes of completeness, this is now included as part of the revised SA/SEA report.</p> <p>Following the Options for the Future consultation, Whitehart Meadow was not taken forward as a strategic site. This is explained in Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phase 2. For the purposes of completeness, this information is now included as part of the revised SA/SEA report (paragraphs 11.19 to 11.30).</p>
Sandtrend Ltd		No	No	<p>The LPA have altered the site selection process in such a way that the SHLAA material which has been fed into the SA has become unfair and inappropriately weighted in favour of Sandleford Park, particularly by comparison to a potential development site north of Newbury.</p> <p>The Sandleford Park site has, through the revision of the SA been considered with regard to a concept plan which alleviates concerns regarding the low rating of this site in the SA. However, the North Newbury sites have only been considered having regard to their overall areas of ownership and not based on the concept Masterplan submitted.</p>	<p>The reassessment takes the previous SA as a starting point and reappraises where appropriate, taking account of the consultation responses and additional technical evidence, including work carried out to develop the planning concepts for the sites by site promoters of both the North Newbury and the Sandleford sites.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
The Fairhurst Estate and JSF Accumulation and Maintenance Settlement Trust	Gerald Eve	No	No	<p>Within the revised SA/SEA assessment, the Council has added more detail and reassessed the sustainability of a strategic site at Sandleford Park or North Newbury. The scoring methodology has now been altered and overall scores are not provided. Consider some of the commentary is in parts both factually incorrect and unbalanced.</p> <p>New masterplan provided and other appendices - response set out in full in Appendix G to responses.</p>	See Appendix G for response to full submissions.
Mrs Karen Gillam		No	No	<p>Appendix 8 revised SA. The sustainability criteria has changed and differs from the original scoring system that Councillors originally approved in 2009. This changes the ranking of Sandleford Park. Some of the statements do not reflect an accurate assessment of the criteria, therefore the scoring systems and assessments of Sandleford Park are not credible or justified.</p> <p>Would like to question whether the changes in the scoring system were put to Councillors formally and as a member of the public was not aware on the new plan advancing Sandleford Park.</p> <p>CS4 should be deleted.</p>	<p>Explanation of the evolution of the scoring system is set out in the SA/SEA in full and in summary in response to Mr Les Cooper (above).</p> <p>The evolution of the scoring system was discussed with Council Members, and this is described and explained in the revised SA/SEA report.</p> <p>The local community have been consulted in full at each stage of the Core Strategy. As part of this, adjoining parishes which are outside of West Berkshire have been involved at each stage of the Core Strategy process. The details of this are set out in full in the Council's Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publically available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p>
Sandleford Partnership	White Young Green	Yes	Yes	Consider that it is necessary to separate matters that go to the merits of the Sandleford	Noted.

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>strategic allocation from those which relate to SA/SEA compliance.</p> <p>Based on Counsel's advice, with regards to the substance of the SA process, WYG is satisfied that the Council properly considered alternatives. The Inspector himself concluded that he was content with the SA.</p> <p>The revised SA has allowed the Council to set out the full quantitative and qualitative assessments related to allocating the strategic sites in the Core Strategy, and by setting this out in detail it helps the reader to better understand the process undertaken and clearly justifies the Council decision in identifying Sandleford Park as a strategic site. It is considered that the SA fully justified the inclusion of Sandleford Park within the Core Strategy as a strategic allocation and fully details why other alternatives were not considered appropriate.</p> <p>The SA/SEA is both legally compliant and sound, being fully justified, effective and consistent with national policy.</p>	
A2 Housing Group & Angus Janaway	Barton Willmore	No	No	<p>Council has not re-assessed all of the potential strategic allocations (or reasonable alternatives) and has not taken into account matters raised by the Inspector, including the potential that he will be concluding upon the Core Strategy in a changed policy and legislative context. The Council has removed all references to the RSS but has failed to take</p>	<p>The Council has not re-assessed all of the potential strategic allocations as the Inspector's finding was that the SA did not previously sufficiently explain the reasons for the selection of the Sandleford site from the alternative options at Newbury/Thatcham put forward in Options for the Future, nor for the selection of the broad locational approach in the Eastern Area. The Council did not therefore revisit</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>this into account within the SA / SEA. The Council should be re-assessing the reasonable alternatives on the same basis and failure to reassess the role that Thatcham should play within the overall provision of housing is considered to be unsound and does not meet the SA / SEA regulations. The Council's decision to eliminate the strategic sites at Thatcham was based upon the omission of any explicit reference within the RSS to Thatcham, instead referring to Newbury as a second tier hub.</p> <p>The Council has not re-assessed the sites put forward in the 'Options for the Future' consultation as requested by the Inspector and in fact has not even re-assessed the two Newbury sites, but merely re-appraised them.</p> <p>The Council has failed at all stages to consider the alternative sites on a level playing field. Whilst the Council acknowledge that they had been provided with information on a number of the sites, they have failed to consider whether it was possible for potential mitigation to impact upon all of the sustainable assessment scores. Consideration should have been given to asking each of the (11 sites) promoters for sufficient information to allow the sites to be considered consistently providing a fair and level basis for the further assessments.</p> <p>The LPA did not circulate the information submitted by the promoters to other departments within the Council, including the</p>	<p>assessments for sites which had been ruled out prior to the Options for the Future stage. The revised SA did take into account consultation responses, including those received since publication in February 2010.</p> <p>With regard to potential changes to policy and legislation, the Core Strategy still needs to be in general conformity with the SE Plan, as discussed as the hearings in June 2011. Though the references to the SE Plan have been removed in order to future-proof the document, the SE Plan principles of an urban focus and urban renaissance have been carried through into the spatial strategy.</p> <p>The Council's approach to the role of Thatcham was not based purely on the SE Plan policies. The approach to Thatcham is covered in Section 11 of the Revised Strategic Sites SA Topic Paper. Newbury has a much wider range of services and facilities and is the administrative centre of the District, whereas Thatcham has more limited services and facilities and has experienced high levels of growth in recent years. The 789 home Kennet Heath development was completed as recently as 2009/10. The approach to Thatcham was discussed during the Core Strategy hearings in June 2011.</p> <p>The Council does not accept that it has failed to consider the alternative sites on a level playing field. The site selection framework scoring (with the weighting) was a starting point which was then built on to progress the potential sites through the process of the SA. The selection of sites progressed</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Education department, and as such did not request comments on the information submitted. At no point has this been considered and the re-appraisal of the SA / SEA has not taken it into account, resulting in the Education issues in Thatcham continuing to be used as a reason for not taking Thatcham forward as a potential location for strategic sites. Also failed to acknowledge the changes to the status of some Secondary Schools within West Berkshire which have recently been granted Academy status.</p>	<p>beyond the Site Selection Framework assessments and these were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process.</p> <p>In summary, The Council's approach to Thatcham was based on the role and function of the settlements, which was supported by the South East Plan approach but not dependant upon it.</p> <p>In terms of Academy status, whilst some schools, including Park House have become academies, the Local Authority currently retains the responsibility for school organisation and is the body which negotiates and receives funding through section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy. Even though Academies are not maintained by the LA they are state maintained and continue to be part of our pupil place provision, and the Council will continue to work with them to ensure we meet our duty.</p>
Greenham Parish Council		Yes	No	<p>SA Report non technical summary states that strategic site allocation was an unpopular option in the East. Unpopular with whom? How was the popularity measured and was the same test applied to other areas. Is it</p>	<p>Public consultation forms part of the evidence base and is taken into account alongside other considerations. However, there were wider reasons for why Whitehart Meadow and Pincents Hill were not taken forward as strategic sites and these</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>suggested that Sandleford was popular?</p> <p>Such a vague generalisation should be either justified or deleted.</p>	<p>reasons are set out in full in documents including Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Document Phases 1 and 2 and the revised SA/SEA specifically at paragraphs 7.3 to 8.5 and 11.19 to 11.30 of the document.</p>
Greenham Parish Council		Yes	No	<p>Why should the response from the Highways Agency (10.8) raise particular concerns about development at North Newbury due to the site's easy access to the Strategic Road Network and with jct 13 of the M4 and the A34? Is it preferable to build developments in areas where access to the strategic road network is difficult?</p> <p>This paragraph needs to be rewritten and the contents fully justified and explained.</p>	<p>The reason that it is stated that for North Newbury that the Highways Agency was particularly concerned was because this comment was made by the Highways Agency, who are a critical statutory consultee in the process.</p>
Greenham Parish Council		Yes	No	<p>Appendix 8 of the SA/SEA - the comparative tables for Racecourse/Sandleford v Racecourse/North Newbury differ only marginally and WBC is guilty of selective data inclusion.</p> <p>The wording with regard to green infrastructure illustrates that WBC was firmly wedded to Sandleford and was trying to justify it.</p> <p>How is the quality of the agricultural land identified - the Inspector previous recorded that land at Sandleford is very high grade agricultural land.</p> <p>Comparative AOD levels should be provided</p>	<p>The reassessment takes the previous SA as a starting point and reappraises where appropriate, taking account of the consultation responses and additional technical evidence, including work carried out to develop the planning concepts for the sites by the site promoters of both the North Newbury and the Sandleford sites.</p> <p>It is not clear what GPC mean regarding green infrastructure although substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan.</p> <p>The quality of the agricultural land was identified on a consistent basis for all strategic sites using information from the Council's Geographical</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>(presume for North Newbury vs Sandleford although this is not clear from the response).</p> <p>North Newbury should be re-scored on the same basis as Sandleford. Both should be subject to an independent assessment of their agricultural worth.</p>	<p>Information System.</p> <p>Comparative AOD levels have not formed part of the assessment to date, as the impact of this would not be possible to qualify with any degree of accuracy.</p>
Dr G Shillam		No	No	<p>Housing development at Sandleford is not consistent with local or national sustainability criteria. Brownfield development is preferable to greenfield development. Brownfield sites are available within the current town boundaries.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p>
Mrs Mair Edwards		Not specified	Not specified	<p>The consultation documents are complicated.</p> <p>The Sandleford proposal is fundamentally flawed, and will benefit only the landowners by way of profit from the sale of the land. The proposal will cause even more traffic misery, add to the poor quality of the air in Newbury, and overload existing schools. The proposal will damage the image of Newbury.</p> <p>There must be smaller sites to provide additional housing. Some of the villages around Newbury could be expanded - adding a few houses to each village would have far less</p>	<p>It is a detailed consultation but we have tried to make it as user-friendly as possible and have made it clear that the officers are happy to help anybody with the process of registering their comments. The Council's preferred method of receiving consultation responses is a web based system widely used by planning authorities. It is an efficient system that enables consultees to comment directly on the document, to retain a copy of their comment for their own records, to receive automatic acknowledgement of their comment and for comments to be efficiently analysed and made viewable on the consultation portal. The consultation documents have been made available to view in hard copy at all of the District's</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>of an impact on infrastructure schools and roads, and be more sustainable.</p> <p>Lack of advertising and discussion of the proposal. Seems to have been settled by the Council before residents have been made fully aware.</p>	<p>libraries and at the Council Offices. Comments can also be submitted on paper forms which are readily available, or by e-mail.</p> <p>The consultation was advertised as set in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The local community have been consulted in full at each stage of the Core Strategy and the details of this are set out in full in the Council's Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publicly available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p> <p>Work undertaken in the early preparation stages of the Core Strategy supported an urban focus and development on a combination of brownfield land, strategic urban extensions and smaller urban extensions. Allocating one extra strategic site means that there is long term certainty for developers, stakeholders and the District's community about the future direction of growth. This also enables the effective delivery of infrastructure and helps to deliver wider community benefits and the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. Other non strategic sites will still be needed to meet the wider needs of the District and these will be allocated through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p>
Mr Graham Hunt (Newbury Town Council)		No	No	Newbury Town Council held a public meeting on 7/12/11 which was attended by over 300 residents. Their views have been taken into account in compiling this response.	The reasons for the selection of the Sandleford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence base which were previously separate documents.

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>The Town Council is seriously concerned about legal compliance regarding the legality of the process by which this policy was arrived at.</p> <p>The Strategic Sites policy paper contains statements that appear to be inconsistent with due process - e.g. paras 5.7 and 5.8.</p> <p>A strategic site of this size is not needed in the current Core Strategy period. Other options such as sustainable Town Centre provision have not been adequately considered.</p> <p>Policy CS4 should be deleted.</p> <p>The development at Sandleford is not economically sustainable. It is not environmentally sustainable. It will be built on a green field of importance both for its landscape (Capability Brown landscape) and for its importance to the local community (e.g. Watership Down book). It could be argued that for these reasons the site is also of national importance.</p>	<p>The statements are not 'inconsistent with due processes.'</p> <p>The revised SA/SEA specifically sets out that the site selection process needs to consider the potential layout of development within the site and potential mitigation, and that it is one of the purposes of the SA/SEA to identify these factors.</p> <p>Clearly there are some factors which can be mitigated against and some which cannot, and these were taken into account in the site selection process, using all of the available information from the evidence base. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process. The information for all of the sites was taken into account on the same basis.</p> <p>Work undertaken in the early preparation stages of the Core Strategy supported an urban focus and development on a combination of brownfield land, strategic urban extensions and smaller urban extensions. Allocating one extra strategic site means that there is long term certainty for developers, stakeholders and the District's community about the future direction of growth. This also enables the effective delivery of infrastructure and helps to deliver wider community benefits and the vision and</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>objectives of the Core Strategy. Other non strategic sites will still be needed to meet the wider needs of the District and these will be allocated through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The Council's SHLAA has sought to identify all potential sites and no evidence is provided that more brownfield sites are available. Leaving such high numbers unallocated would mean not being able to demonstrate deliverability. No evidence is given by the respondent about where the homes could be situated.</p> <p>As far as the landscape is concerned, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan, which is a Core Document (CD10/63) and available on the Council's website. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The proposal does not include any of the historic parkland. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandleford Priory will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>The fictional route that the rabbits took in the book 'Watership Down' would be largely protected from</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					development. There is evidence of a warren just below the rugby club which will also remain
Mr David Hill		Not specified	Not specified	I am emailing you to fully support the consultation responses made on behalf of many Wash Common residents by the Say No To Sandleford campaign group.	Noted.
Greenham Parish Council		Yes	No	<p>The statements by the Education Dept in 10.7 of the SA/SEA are illogical and not understood. This contradicts comments made in the Site Selection Framework. WBC is referring to the maximum of 2000 dwellings in order to make North Newbury and Siege Cross less viable.</p> <p>The unbiased observer is left with the conclusion that either the Education Dept has bowed to some form of internal WBC pressure to slant its comments or the report authors have deliberately changed the Education comments to fit their needs.</p> <p>Additionally there is no reference to, or discussion about the effects of the granting of Academy status to various schools involved.</p>	<p>The statements made by the Education Department are as set out in their independent response to the 'Options for the Future Consultation'. These have been available to view on the Council's 'Objective' consultation system since 2009 and have not been modified in any way.</p> <p>In terms of numbers – each of the Siege Cross, North Newbury and Sandleford Park were assessed as having capacity to accommodate up to 2,000 dwellings and so were all considered on this basis.</p> <p>In terms of Academy status, whilst some schools, including Park House have become academies, the Local Authority currently retains the responsibility for school organisation and is the body which negotiates and receives funding through section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy. Even though Academies are not maintained by the LA they are state maintained and continue to be part of our pupil place provision, and the Council will continue to work with them to ensure we meet our duty.</p>
Greenham Parish Council		No	No	It is stated at 11.10 that the site selection framework and the sustainability appraisal at	The revised SA/SEA specifically sets out that the site selection process needs to consider the

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>options stage were based on the site areas promoted, the “red line boundary” of each site, without consideration of mitigation. However, we already know from 5.7 that Sandleford Park was only able to be considered because officers had already changed the rules, in respect of Sandleford only, to disregard the red line boundary and assume unquantified mitigation. Para 11.10 should be re-written and the contents fully justified and explained.</p>	<p>potential layout of development within the site and potential mitigation, and that it is one of the purposes of the SA/SEA to identify these factors.</p> <p>Clearly there are some factors which can be mitigated against and some which cannot, and these were taken into account in the site selection process, using all of the available information from the evidence base. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process. The information for all of the sites was taken into account on the same basis.</p>
Mr Timothy Goldsack		Not specified	No	<p>The appraisal methodology seems to be flawed, in that objectiveness has been severely compromised over time, introducing a bias towards the Sandleford development which was not present in the initial analysis. Delete section CS4 entirely. Does Newbury really need a “strategic development site”?</p>	<p>The reasons for the selection of the Sandleford site are set out in full within the revised SA/SEA which now incorporates the other parts of the evidence base which were previously separate documents. The Site Selection Framework assessments were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>service providers to inform the process.</p> <p>Work undertaken in the early preparation stages of the Core Strategy supported an urban focus and development on a combination of brownfield land, strategic urban extensions and smaller urban extensions. Allocating one extra strategic site means that there is long term certainty for developers, stakeholders and the District's community about the future direction of growth. This also enables the effective delivery of infrastructure and helps to deliver wider community benefits and the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy. Other non strategic sites will still be needed to meet the wider needs of the District and these will be allocated through the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD in accordance with the settlement hierarchy.</p>
Julian Swift-Hook		No	No	<p>Policy CS4 is not legally compliant. Decisions about the assessment of the site have been made without the formal approval by Members. This has given an unfair advantage to the promoters of the Sandeford site. See attached document.</p> <p>The consultation process has been difficult for residents to access, understand, and respond to. It has not been a meaningful consultation exercise.</p> <p>Soundness:</p> <p>There is no justification for policy CS4. The scoring criteria has changed, and the Sandeford site has moved from 11th to 2nd</p>	<p>The SA/SEA paper provides an account of the assessments undertaken and the decision making process which led to the proposed allocation of a strategic site at Sandeford. Throughout the process the assessments, along with background papers and reports have been taken to the Member Planning Task Group – see CD09/48A – and referred up through the Council's decision making committees at the appropriate stages.</p> <p>The consultation was advertised as set in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and documents were made available in libraries throughout the District, at the Council Offices as well</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>preference after Newbury racecourse – with no proper oversight or scrutiny by Members and no adequate explanation for this. In addition, this strategic site is not needed. There are other appropriate options which have not been considered.</p> <p>Policy CS4 is not consistent with national policy. National policy dictates that development should be economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable. Development of the Sandford site would not meet these three points, for example: no employment within the development, destruction of green fields (national policy notes that green areas that are of particular importance to the local community should be protected) and subsequent isolation of ancient woodland, increase in carbon emissions, the road network will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic, the site is of national importance (Capability Brown designed landscape, site referred to in the book 'Watership Down').</p> <p>Amendments can be made to CS10, ADPP1 and ADPP2 to provide the housing needed through mix use residential led development.</p>	<p>on the Council's website. This has been a comprehensive consultation but we have tried to make the process as user-friendly as possible and have made it clear that officers are happy to help anybody with the process of registering their comments.</p> <p>Additional ways of responding included email and the paper forms, which are readily available. The local community have been consulted in full at each stage of the Core Strategy and the details of this are set out in full in the Council's Statements of Consultation, which are both Core Documents for the Core Strategy Examination and are publicly available from the Council's website (CD07/13 and CD07/14).</p> <p>The SA/SEA process and its role in site selection are fully explained in the SA policy paper on Strategic Sites which was revised and published for consultation in November 2011. The Site Selection Framework used weighting in the scoring tables. This stage of the SA process was a starting point for considering sites, a strategic level assessment to provide an initial broad comparison of the proposed sites. They were not intended to be a detailed project level assessment. This assessment informed the Core Strategy at the "Options for the Future" stage, the preferred options document.</p> <p>Criteria were developed for the Site Selection Framework to assess the sites against the SA sub-objectives and a weighting attached to them. Limitations of this approach have been set out within the SA, such as the impact of site size and the</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>distance from the midpoint to the boundary of the site upon some of the criteria and therefore the scores achievable. The site selection framework was therefore the starting point and not necessarily the highest scoring sites would be taken forward as the commentary were key for taking forward in considering the sites in conjunction with the rest of the technical evidence base and the outcomes of public consultation.</p> <p>The assessment proved useful in highlighting potential sustainability issues with potential sites and potential mitigation, infrastructure and development requirements should the sites progress further. The selection of sites progressed beyond the Site Selection Framework assessments and these were further investigated within the Strategic Sites SA policy paper and Combined Strategic Housing Sites Appraisal Documents phases 1 and 2, bringing together national and regional planning guidance, outcomes of previous public consultation, the vision for the Core Strategy, the SA, the outcomes of the technical evidence base and the discussions with service providers to inform the process. The process therefore used the site selection framework scoring (with the weighting) and built on this to progress the potential sites through the process of the SA.</p> <p>The Core Strategy has taken the availability of brownfield sites into account. The alternative approaches to meeting the housing requirement were considered in the 'Options for Delivering Homes' consultation in 2007/2008 where the preferred option emerged of a mix of strategic scale</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>sites, some smaller urban extensions and a continued emphasis on use of previously developed land. The SHLAA provides the evidence base for housing land availability.</p> <p>Policy CS4 does make provision for business development within the site as well as retail facilities.</p> <p>The traffic impacts of the Sandleford development in combination with Newbury Racecourse and the other development in the Core Strategy have been assessed through 4 phases of Transport Assessment work which have been developed alongside the Core Strategy. These are published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16893. Transport Assessment Phase 4 (TA4) shows what relevant transport mitigation and improvement schemes will be needed to deliver Sandleford. Where these result in specific infrastructure requirements, these are set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which is published on the Council's website at http://www.westberks.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=19636. The TA work and the IDP have been discussed through the Examination process, specifically at hearing sessions in November 2010.</p> <p>In terms of the landscape, substantive green infrastructure is proposed and this is shown in the draft masterplan. It is proposed to direct development to the north-western and western parts of the site, towards land which is well related to the existing built up area of Newbury. The importance of the open views across the valley are recognised and as such views from the A339 and Sandleford Priory</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>will be retained with public open space/a country park created to retain the openness of this area and increase public access. This will respect the site as a gateway to Newbury and retain the attractive open landscape to the south.</p> <p>This representation was accompanied with an attachment regarding an analysis of the <i>Strategic Sites SA/SEA Policy Paper: Update October 2011</i>. The Council response to this document is the same as that for the Say No To Sandford attachment. See Appendix F.</p>
Housing Type and Mix (CS5)					
Gladman Care Homes Ltd		Not specified	No	<p>The evidence base for the Core Strategy should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * West Berkshire Supporting People Strategy 2005-2010 * Supporting People Strategy Review 2008-2012 * Housing Strategy 2010-2015 * Putting People First 2011-2012 Refresh <p>A new policy should be added to the Core Strategy to reflect the older person strategies already in place in order to plan for and delivered the required accommodation for</p>	<p>The evidence base does include some of these documents, including the Housing Strategy and the Supporting People Strategy which are listed in the Core Documents List. The policy is a broad, strategic policy which seeks to ensure that the housing needs of all sectors of the community, including the elderly, are considered. The policy does say that the housing mix should have regard to other relevant evidence sources.</p> <p>The supporting text (paragraph 5.12) states that '...developments should include the provision of lifetime homes. This will assist in the Council meeting the needs of an ageing population in the District (footnote – Positive Planning for an Ageing Society, The Berkshire Authorities response to Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods'.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				older people.	
Infrastructure (CS6)					
Ressance Limited		Yes	No	IDP evidence published in the first Core Strategy consultation included a junction between Fleming Road and the A339 categorised as Critical to the Core Strategy and Low Risk of non-delivery. The junction has been deleted to comply with comments by the Inspector following the hearing. I have been unable to find any evidence to support this claim.	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has not yet been updated following the Inspector's comments (for the junction between Fleming Road and the A339 to be removed). The revised version, when published, will not include reference to the junction. Appendix Cii of the Core Strategy does not list the junction.
Affordable Housing (CS7)					
Cllr Tony Vickers (West Berkshire Liberal Democrat Shadow Executive)		Yes	No	The differential provision of affordable housing on brownfield and on greenfield land (30% and 40% respectively) is no longer justified by the relative economic viability of such sites, in the light of experience in the London Borough of Redbridge. Make the percentage of affordable housing to be delivered the same (40%) on brownfield land, from the time that CIL is adopted by the Council, which could be as early as 2013.	Policy CS7 reflects a range of viability issues which can be an influencing factor when developing previously developed sites, for example contamination issues. Each site should be taken on a case by case basis. The Council's Economic Viability Assessments 2007 and 2009 (CD09/17 & CD09/18) both show that a provision of 40% on previously developed land would not be viable across the whole District. Affordable housing is currently excluded from CIL and is proposed to remain part of S.106.
Ressance Limited		Yes	No	Evidence base is severely lacking. The imposition of Affordable Housing on developments of fewer than 15 dwellings will make small urban renewal projects unviable and therefore damage urban renewal, reduce	Policy CS7 is supported by Economic Viability Assessments 2007 & 2009 (CD09/17 & CD09/18) which examine how the development viability of market housing sites is impacted by a range of potential policy options for planning-led affordable housing. The 2007 study gives an indication of

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>housing provision and stifle development activity and thereby economic growth. It will prove commercially damaging to small developers. Furthermore, the price of land acquired prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy could not have factored in the dramatic impact of affordable housing.</p> <p>The threshold should remain at 15 units. The contribution from allocated sites, which produce massive land value uplift should be 50% or 60% to eliminate the need for contributions from small developments. There should be differentiation between green-field (where large uplift occurs) and urban renewal which requires the purchase and demolition of existing properties.</p>	<p>viability during buoyant housing markets and the update provides information of viability in poor housing market conditions to ensure a robust policy and the flexibility to respond to changing circumstances.</p> <p>The policy makes it clear that viability is key to delivery and negotiation on some sites may be necessary. The policy is sufficiently flexible to allow for this.</p>
AWE Aldermaston and AWE Burghfield (CS9a)					
NAG		Not specified	Not specified	Support the inclusion of planning statement CS91 in the Core Strategy Sustainability appraisal on the grounds of public safety, and urge the Council to follow the ONR's advice on planning applications in the relevant DEPZs.	Comment noted.
Health & Safety Executive		Not specified	Not specified	<p>HSE do not comment on individual Local Development Plans.</p> <p>LPA's are required by Reg 20 of the TCP Act to have regard for the objectives of Article 12.1 of the Seveso 11 directive in formulating their general policies in Part 1 of a unitary development plan.</p>	The proposals map is already annotated with the Development Consultation Zones relating to CS9a

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>Objectives are: to prevent major accidents and limit consequences of such accidents for man and environment and the need to maintain appropriate distances between establishments and residential areas, public areas and areas of sensitivity or interest.</p> <p>HSE extranet system is available to all Planning Authorities.</p> <p>Any major hazard sites should be indicated to potential developers . Paragraphs attached (see Annex of attachment) could be used.</p> <p>In addition suggest that proposals maps are marked to show the location of any major hazard sites.</p>	
Bovis Homes Ltd (& J A Pye)	Bell Cornwell Partnership	No	No	<p>WBC has consistently failed to look beyond its own borders. Tadley has good links with Basingstoke incidentally also one of the hubs identified in South East plan Policy WCBV1.</p> <p>What particularly needs to be borne in mind here is the very close proximity of the site to the large number of jobs at the AWE and also to others in Calleva Park.</p> <p>If the evidence of Dr Mike Thorne is accepted, development at Tadley will not in principle be constrained by HSE considerations and the AWE section of the SA Update note will accordingly now need to be completely reconsidered.</p>	<p>Any development proposal within the Inner Development Consultation Zones will be subject to consultation with the ONR.</p> <p>The ONR will monitor and adjust levels of acceptable development.</p> <p>The Council disagrees with this interpretation of the Boundary Hall decision notice, which the Council regards as site specific. The issue has been debated at length after the Boundary Hall decision was issued (CD10/96) at the examination on the 27th June 2011</p> <p>In paragraph 403 of the Boundary Hall inquiry the Inspector did not agree with Dr Thorne's assessment of the risks involved. <i>"This is a finely balanced case, with one very significant but unlikely</i></p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>In the light of the new evidence now submitted we would request that the SA be rerun to properly assess the comparable merits of Silchester Road, Tadley as a suitable and sustainable strategic site.</p>	<p><i>harm to be set against a range of more 'conventional' planning considerations. However the consequences of such an unlikely event would be so serious that it is considered that planning permission should not be granted".</i></p>
<p>Employment and the Economy (CS10)</p>					
<p>Ressance Limited</p>		<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Council has misinterpreted the Employment Land Assessment in respect of the demand and need for B1 office accommodation. Vodafone's relocation resulted in about 52 premises coming to the market, several of which are still vacant. The average uptake value post Vodafone's relocation is far lower than the long term average (we estimate around 7,000sqm compared to the 13,429sqm used in the report). The effect of factoring this in dramatically reduces the amount of employment land required. The Council appears to have ignored the Consultants comments about B1a (office) being built at higher density than B1c and/or B2. The land use ratio is therefore far more efficient in the case of offices, especially in or close to town centres. HMG guidance on preparing/using ELA's cites town centre office densities of between 0.75 and 2, i.e. between twice and five times that relied on by Core Strategy.</p> <p>CS10: The Council's approach to denying alternative uses (para b) is overly prescriptive and at odds</p>	<p>Policy CS10 does allow for employment generating uses other than B class uses within Protected Employment Areas where they are complementary to existing business uses in that location and consistent with the integrity and function of the location for employment purposes. Non B class employment generating uses will not be permitted which are likely to substantially prejudice the strategy set out within the policy. These changes (FEPFC 19) to the policy provide sufficient flexibility to allow for employment generating non B class uses within Protected Employment Areas whilst ensuring the overall strategy is not compromised.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>with Government guidance (e.g. PPS4). London Road Industrial Estate is the subject of a strategic regeneration strategy. A mix of uses including retail, leisure and residential would be entirely appropriate. Furthermore, the land available in this location, if built out at reasonable density could deliver over 200,000sqm of office accommodation - this exceeds the worst case shortfall across the entire district (which we say is in any event inflated). Quite clearly the land will therefore be available for other uses.</p> <p>The statement "Proposals for such non B class employment generating uses which are likely to substantially prejudice the strategy set out at the start of this policy, will not be permitted." is prescriptive in the extreme as it could be interpreted to limit all re-development to B1, B2 and B8. Such a presumption appears to conflict with paragraph (c) in the policy wording and paragraph 5.45n in the subtext and is contrary to the NPPF and other sustainability and economic stimulation policies. Paragraph 5.45o requires alternative uses to compliment existing uses, which creates an impossible test for regeneration.</p>	
Vodafone Ltd	Colliers International	No	No	<p>The emerging NPPF continues to require sustainability appraisal to form an integrated part of the Council's plan preparation process. Policy CS10 is not legally compliant or sound given that the SA (as revised), does not appropriately consider the change in emphasis in national policy on the location of office</p>	<p>The SA would not be assessing the impact of the NPPF at this stage as no changes to policy CS10 were proposed as a result of the draft NPPF. The impact of NPPF on the Core Strategy was a separate consultation.</p> <p>The approach to offices as set out within Policy</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				<p>development or the relaxation on the protection of employment land or floorspace, which is expressed in the draft NPPF.</p> <p>Policy CS10 and the explanatory text should be appropriately amended to reflect the NPPF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the requirement for the sequential approach to offices; • Ensure planning policy avoid the long term protection of land and floorspace; • Applications for alternative uses of designated land or buildings for employment purposes should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the need for different uses. <p>Consequent changes will be required to Policy ADPP2 (4th bullet under Town centre). The Sustainability Appraisal should be reviewed in light of these changes.</p>	<p>CS10 has been debated at length at the hearings into the Core Strategy and the sequential approach was included at the request of the Inspector.</p> <p>As set out in 5.45o Protected Employment Areas have been designated through the Local Plan for B class uses to ensure sufficient sites are provided in suitable locations to foster business development and promote sustainable economic growth across the District. A review of these areas will take place as part of the Site Allocations and Delivery DPD.</p> <p>Policy CS10 does allow for employment generating uses other than B class uses within Protected Employment Areas where they are complimentary to existing business uses in that location and consistent with the integrity and function of the location for employment purposes. Non B class employment generating uses will not be permitted which are likely to substantially prejudice the strategy set out within the policy.</p>
Mr Hew Jones		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Comment on appropriate location of business development (para. 5.45):</p> <p>In terms of Business Development, new retail development should not give cause to the potential elimination of current smaller retail outlets that are well supported and valued by the local community, nor require the addition of a significant number of houses close by in order to be sustainable.</p>	Comments noted.

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Town Centres (CS12)					
Vodafone Ltd	Colliers International	No	No	<p>The emerging NPPF continues to require sustainability appraisal to form an integrated part of the Council's plan preparation process (Paragraph 34). As such, sustainability appraisal is to remain an iterative process and a combined part of plan preparation, which should inform the evaluation of alternatives and choices between options, including policy options.</p> <p>Policy CS12 is not legally compliant given that the Sustainability Appraisal (as revised), does not appropriately consider the change in emphasis in national policy on the location of office development, which is expressed in the draft NPPF.</p> <p>Policy CS12 should be appropriately amended to reflect that B1 offices are effectively not regarded as town centre type uses in the emerging NPPF, as follows:</p> <p>Town Centre uses identified by PPS4 (79) <i>in national planning policy</i> will be directed to the town and district centres defined in this policy.</p> <p>Accordingly, the Sustainability Appraisal should be reviewed in light of this change</p>	<p>The SA would not be assessing the impact of the NPPF at this stage as no changes to policy CS12 were proposed as a result of the draft NPPF. It would be unreasonable to expect the SA to reflect guidance which is in draft format.</p>
Transport (CS14)					
Highways Agency		Not specified	Not specified	<p>Policy CS14 has been reworded as requested by HA. Recommend rewording of the policy in paragraph 5.67 to say "Where a Transport Assessment for a significant development</p>	<p>Propose minor amendment to paragraph 5.67 as follows:</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
				illustrates that there will be a impact on the capacity of the SRN, the developer will need to undertake detailed traffic modelling in accordance with national guidance".	"Where a Transport Assessment for a significant development illustrates that there will be an material reduction in capacity on <u>impact on the capacity of</u> the SRN, the developer will need to undertake detailed traffic modelling in accordance with national guidance".
Green Infrastructure (CS19)					
Mr Graeme Panting		Not specified	No	Page 102: Sporting provision - not sufficiently comprehensive. i.e. badminton, table tennis, tennis.	Comment noted. No change proposed.
Historic Environment and Landscape Character (CS20)					
Mr Anthony Pick (Newbury Society)		Not specified	Not specified	Can a target for Local Listing across West Berkshire be included in the Monitoring Framework for CS20.	Comment noted. The Delivery and Monitoring section of the policy notes that the Council will deliver the policy through the SAD DPD and as a partner in the production of the HEAP. In this instance is therefore felt more appropriate to consider setting measurable targets for local listing through the SAD DPD process
Appendix A: Strategic Objectives					
BBOWT		Not specified	Not specified	Presence of ancient woodland within Sandleford site has been recognised, but it may have been useful to also highlight ancient woodland habitat represented by 8 Local Wildlife Sites within the boundary of Sandleford.	Comment noted. Issues dealing with habitat protection will be dealt with by a specific SPD or other supporting document to the Masterplan for the Sandleford site.

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Appendix C: AWE Aldermaston and Burghfield					
Mr Hugh Dalgleish		Yes	No	<p>This section has been removed, presumably as a consequence of the Boundary Hall appeal in Tadley.</p> <p>Basingstoke and Deane are making constraints on planning permission in areas within the DPEZ part of their core strategy and there is no good reason for WBC not to follow this example too.</p> <p>The only way WBC can be certain of properly discharging its various legal obligations with respect to the two AWE sites in planning terms, is to adopt a presumption against any large scale developments within the DEPZ, and for the HSE to be consulted as per the procedure from the Basingstoke and Deane report.</p>	Appendix C has been deleted as a new policy CS9a: AWE Aldermaston and AWE Burghfield, covers the information previously contained in Appendix C
Appendix Cii: Critical Infrastructure Schedule of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan					
Dr David Cooper		No	No	<p>No consideration is given to water supply infrastructure, specifically how sufficient water will be provided and pumped to top of Wash Common.</p>	<p>Infrastructure provision is dealt with in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). The IDP is a living document which sets out the amount, cost, and funding of infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of growth.</p> <p>Houses will be built to current Building Regulations standards which incorporate water efficiency requirements.</p>
Mrs Judith		No	No	There is no consideration of water supply and	Infrastructure provision is dealt with in the IDP. The

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Cooper				provision infrastructure, for a development which is taking place on raised ground and which will eventually comprise 2000 houses.	IDP is a living document which sets out the amount, cost, and funding of infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of growth. Houses will be built to current Building Regulations standards which incorporate water efficiency requirements.
Mrs Judith Cooper		No	No	The lack of provision for improved pedestrian facilities along Andover Road towards town centre renders this assessment unsound. In particular, the present pedestrian pavement is one side of the road (the far side from the Sandleford development) and narrow.	Infrastructure provision is dealt with in the IDP. The IDP is a living document (and will be updated periodically) which sets out the amount, cost, and funding of infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of growth. The masterplan for the site will also take infrastructure into consideration.
Mrs Judith Cooper		No	No	The document lacks any consideration of safe pedestrian access from the proposed park onto the A339, despite the fact that the nearest bus service towards Basingstoke will be reached this way, there is a Girl's school opposite the park entrance, and there is a public house in Newtown.	Infrastructure provision is dealt with in the IDP. The IDP is a living document (and will be updated periodically) which sets out the amount, cost, and funding of infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of growth. It will therefore be updated in light of changing circumstances. The masterplan for the site will also take infrastructure into consideration.
Mr Charles Brookes		No	No	The critical appraisal infrastructure is unsound because it says nothing about the supply of additional water to a significant development. After all, water supply in the SE England is already under severe strain.	Infrastructure provision is dealt with in the IDP. The IDP is a living document which sets out the amount, cost, and funding of infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of growth. Thames Water has a legal duty to connect houses to the mains water supply and water extraction has

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
					<p>been discussed with Thames Water throughout the development of the Core Strategy and they have confirmed the sufficiency of the local water supply network. Houses will be built to current Building Regulations standards which incorporate water efficiency requirements.</p>
David Wilson Homes		No	No	<p>Reference made to IDP published in February 2010 prior to Racecourse being given permission. As a supporting document it has not been subject to consultation and so should carry limited weight. While the text has been updated to reflect the Racecourse getting permission the infrastructure list has not and makes reference to items that cannot be considered Critical or do not meet CIL regulation tests (e.g. Items that were only included in the S106 or reserved matters application and not considered vital to the granting of outline consent).</p>	<p>The IDP is a living document (and will be updated periodically) which sets out the amount, cost, and funding of infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of growth.</p>
Mrs Caroline Paus		No	No	<p>No consideration has been given to drinking water supply and this is unsound, clearly 2000 houses on the top of a plateau houses will require water supply.</p>	<p>Infrastructure provision is dealt with in the IDP. The IDP is a living document which sets out the amount, cost, and funding of infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of growth.</p> <p>Water extraction has been discussed with Thames Water throughout the development of the Core Strategy and they have confirmed the sufficiency of the local water supply network. Houses will be built to current Building Regulations standards which incorporate water efficiency requirements.</p>

Appendix A: Schedule of Comments on Submission Core Strategy in light of SA/SEA Report and the Council Response to the Comments

Consultee	Agent	Legal	Sound	Consultee Comment	Council Response
Mrs Caroline Paus		No	No	Does not takes into account the pollution, vehicle movements and traffic congestion onto surrounding roads. The proposed bus service will not be adequate for working parents and school children attending secondary schools. There to be few local places available and pupils would have to travel to north Newbury	<p>Infrastructure provision is dealt with in the IDP. The IDP is a living document (and will be updated periodically) which sets out the amount, cost, and funding of infrastructure necessary to support the delivery of growth.</p> <p>The masterplan for the site will also take infrastructure into consideration.</p>