


Comment

Consultee	Patricia Gauci (1335090)
Email Address	
Address	X X X
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	Patricia Gauci (1335090)
Comment ID	PS698
Response Date	03/03/23 13:41
Consultation Point	Policy RSA 13 Land north of A4 Bath Road, Woolhampton (Site Ref MID4) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Bookmark	Gauci, Patricia

1. Do you consider the Local Plan Review is legally compliant?

Please see the guidance note for an explanation of what 'legally compliant' means

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Whilst legally the review may have ticked the required legal boxes, as a resident it has not only been hard to access this representation form, the fact that this local plan review is taking place has not been advertised widely. The consultation process has been poor and this could have easily been missed, and indeed I am sure it has been missed by many residents who will be affected by housing development in their area. With regards to RSA13, this is a repeated pattern of poor consultation of residents. In addition the house allocation information was published after the plan which is the wrong way round.

2. Do you consider the Local Plan Review is sound?

Please see the guidance notes for an explanation of what 'soundness' means.

The soundness of the LPR should be assessed against the following criteria from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Please tick all that apply:

Positively Prepared: The plan provides a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed need and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development. . No

Justified: the plan is an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence. . No

Effective: the plan is deliverable over the plan period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground. . No

Consistent with national policy: the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies of the NPPF. . No

Please give reasons for your answer

1. It has not been positively prepared as the consultation has been poor (again).
2. I don't believe it has been justified as with regards to RSA 13, it does not seem to have taken into account other significant development in the village where a large number of houses have been recently built having a massive impact on the local infractures - this is not sustainable way forward.
3. There is no evidence that there has been a cross boundary approach: RSA13 is in the parish of Midgham (literally on the boundary with Woolhampton); the recent large development is in Woolhampton only 3-400 metres further down the road so development impacting an area is not be considered holistically.
4. For the above reason I don't believe his is consistent with national policy

3. Do you consider the Local Plan Review complies with the Duty to Co-operate?

Please see the guidance note for an explanation of what 'Duty to Cooperate' means.

No

Please give reasons for your answer

I do not see how it can be cooperative because as residents, the information on this review has not been forthcoming. The consultation process was poorly advertised, and as this is not the first time this has happened, it seems that this is a deliberate policy. In addition, this process of representation is not straightforward to complete and take part in - again, not being inclusive and trying to work with the communities affected.

There needs to be thorough consultation with the local communities and not just a box ticking approach to get things pushed through as quickly as possible; due process also has to be completed which I don't believe is the case because the plan should have been created following the house allocation.

4. Proposed Changes

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan Review legally compliant or sound, having regard to the tests you have identified above (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).

You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan Review legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

There needs to be thorough consultation with the local communities and not just a box ticking approach to get things pushed through as quickly as possible; due process also has to be completed which I don't believe is the case because the plan should have been created following the house allocation.

5. Independent Examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearing session(s)? No

6. Notification of Progress of the Local Plan Review

Do you wish to be notified of any of the following?

Please tick all that apply

The submission of the Local Plan Review for Independent Examination . Yes

The publication of the report of the Inspector appointed to carry out the examination . Yes

The adoption of the Local Plan Review . Yes