

Comment

Consultee	Sam Coppinger (1334951)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	Sam Coppinger (1334951)
Comment ID	PS438
Response Date	02/03/23 00:40
Consultation Point	Policy ESA 2 Land west of Ramsbury Road, Membury Industrial Estate, Lambourn Woodlands (Site Ref: LAM6) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
Bookmark	Coppinger, Sam

Please give reasons for your answer

Not qualified to say

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

This site LAM6 (now ESA2) did not appear in the original draft plan but when a planning application 19/02979/OUTMAJ was made it miraculously appeared in the second draft plan ahead of the decision. Some documentation even seemed to hint that the application proposed and already been approved... I would like to see some investigation as to what happened here...

Comment to follow is relevant to ESA2 and 3

The LPA's own consultation (Stantec) found that Membury is unsustainable as a location for B2/B8 industrial development due to its location 4.5km away from A338 and M4 J14. There is only one bus per day 1.5 km away along roads that are unlit and with no footpaths. Cycling is also dangerous. Highways Officers state that travel plans are generally unsuccessful as a solution. Traffic assessments must use TRICS data and applicants should not be able to use their own traffic data in applications. Conditions pertaining to traffic data should not be allowed in order to better control traffic volumes on the local road network. It is unclear why the LPA continues to pursue this location for industrial development. It is not in line with the sustainability policies of the LPA nor with the NPPF.

There have been 4 serious accidents in the last 3 months on the B4000 / Ermin Street, each one involving 3 or 4 vehicles. One incident involved an HGV crashing into trees, taking out an electricity pole and jackknifing into a residential property. Sleeping residents were just a couple of feet from the cab. One week later, the same spot saw yet another accident with two cars written off and a builders lorry driven through a hedge. Two accidents involving multiple vehicles at the Ermin Street / Ramsbury Road (Membury) crossroads have also taken place. One of which took out an electricity pole. In all instances, all 3 emergency services were called and the road closed for several hours. When these roads are closed businesses are impacted and the rural road network is heavily affected. This situation is exacerbated when the M4 is closed as the B4000 is a diversion road in this instance.

The rural character of the area is being significantly impacted through traffic and the volume of traffic is impacting the structure of some of the older properties situated close to the road. Air pollution levels along the B4000 are already high at 10.4 similar to the centre of Newbury, adding more traffic to the roads will only make this worse. Increasing light pollution has been devastating on our local bat population despite the LPAs poor attempts at mitigation. Noise pollution is also increasing. Local ancient woodland is also heavily impacted by industry. I have lived in Lambourn Woodlands since 1994 but have only noticed a significant deterioration in local amenity in the last 8 years. It seems unhelpful when officers dismiss any objections regarding negative impacts on the amenity of residents as the area is already impacted.

There is no evidence or justification for allowing the development of further sites especially of this size at Membury. The location cannot sustain it. Expansion is inappropriate. Critical infrastructure is missing. There are electricity supply issues as the industrial estate often draws too much power and the network cannot sustain it. Cables burn out from time to time and there are frequent outages. Residential supply can be unreliable as a result. There is a known surface water flooding issue on 3rd party land as a result of overdevelopment on the industrial estate. The LPA continues to ignore this - allowing sites to come forward and be developed in a piecemeal fashion. Their approach is not resolving the problem - residents should not be asked to attenuate water run-off on their land. A Surface Water Management Plan is required.

It would also be appropriate to have a Flight Safety Zone for Membury and also a major incident plan as none exists at the moment. Membury is home to two service areas with fueling stations, adjacent to a trunk route, a fuel depot, light aircraft activity, a chemical company dealing in solvents, a timber yard and a grain drier amongst other things. Not to have a plan for this is negligent.

Please see attached photograph demonstrating how HGVs are unsuitable on B4000/Ermin Street.
(Attachment 0960.jpg)

Please give reasons for your answer

Not qualified to say

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.

A masterplan for Membury is required encompassing a site specific environmental impact assessment and including a surface water management plan to ensure infrastructure is in place before further development can go ahead.

5. Independent Examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearing session(s)? Yes

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Our community would like be able to answer questions about Membury and to give a residents view point. Our community feels unheard.

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

Upload a document

Please use this function if you would like to upload a document that supports your comment. Please note that your formal comments must still be made above, where relevant. Individual documents should not exceed 10MB.

[IMG_0960.jpeg](#)

Comment

Consultee	Sam Coppinger (1334951)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	Sam Coppinger (1334951)
Comment ID	PS439
Response Date	02/03/23 00:21
Consultation Point	Policy DM 37 Equestrian and Horseracing industry (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Bookmark	Coppinger, Sam

Please give reasons for your answer

Not qualified to say

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 . No

strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground.

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

I am concerned that the LPA does not consider the health and wellbeing of racehorses when making planning decisions in Lambourn and the surrounding area. Pollution has a negative impact on horse health.

Please give reasons for your answer

Not qualified to say

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.

The LPA should actively seek to curb development at Membury which might harm the health of racehorses in and around Lambourn.

5. Independent Examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearing session(s)? Yes

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

Comment

Consultee	Sam Coppinger (1334951)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	
Event Name	Proposed Submission (Reg 19) West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039
Comment by	Sam Coppinger (1334951)
Comment ID	PS1126
Response Date	02/03/23 00:40
Consultation Point	Policy ESA 3 Land to the south of Trinity Grain, Membury Industrial Estate, Lambourn Woodlands (Site Ref: LAM10) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.2
Bookmark	Coppinger, Sam

Please give reasons for your answer

Not qualified to say

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

This site LAM6 (now ESA2) did not appear in the original draft plan but when a planning application 19/02979/OUTMAJ was made it miraculously appeared in the second draft plan ahead of the decision. Some documentation even seemed to hint that the application proposed and already been approved... I would like to see some investigation as to what happened here...

Comment to follow is relevant to ESA2 and 3

The LPA's own consultation (Stantec) found that Membury is unsustainable as a location for B2/B8 industrial development due to its location 4.5km away from A338 and M4 J14. There is only one bus per day 1.5 km away along roads that are unlit and with no footpaths. Cycling is also dangerous. Highways Officers state that travel plans are generally unsuccessful as a solution. Traffic assessments must use TRICS data and applicants should not be able to use their own traffic data in applications. Conditions pertaining to traffic data should not be allowed in order to better control traffic volumes on the local road network. It is unclear why the LPA continues to pursue this location for industrial development. It is not in line with the sustainability policies of the LPA nor with the NPPF.

There have been 4 serious accidents in the last 3 months on the B4000 / Ermin Street, each one involving 3 or 4 vehicles. One incident involved an HGV crashing into trees, taking out an electricity pole and jackknifing into a residential property. Sleeping residents were just a couple of feet from the cab. One week later, the same spot saw yet another accident with two cars written off and a builders lorry driven through a hedge. Two accidents involving multiple vehicles at the Ermin Street / Ramsbury Road (Membury) crossroads have also taken place. One of which took out an electricity pole. In all instances, all 3 emergency services were called and the road closed for several hours. When these roads are closed businesses are impacted and the rural road network is heavily affected. This situation is exacerbated when the M4 is closed as the B4000 is a diversion road in this instance.

The rural character of the area is being significantly impacted through traffic and the volume of traffic is impacting the structure of some of the older properties situated close to the road. Air pollution levels along the B4000 are already high at 10.4 similar to the centre of Newbury, adding more traffic to the roads will only make this worse. Increasing light pollution has been devastating on our local bat population despite the LPAs poor attempts at mitigation. Noise pollution is also increasing. Local ancient woodland is also heavily impacted by industry. I have lived in Lambourn Woodlands since 1994 but have only noticed a significant deterioration in local amenity in the last 8 years. It seems unhelpful when officers dismiss any objections regarding negative impacts on the amenity of residents as the area is already impacted.

There is no evidence or justification for allowing the development of further sites especially of this size at Membury. The location cannot sustain it. Expansion is inappropriate. Critical infrastructure is missing. There are electricity supply issues as the industrial estate often draws too much power and the network cannot sustain it. Cables burn out from time to time and there are frequent outages. Residential supply can be unreliable as a result. There is a known surface water flooding issue on 3rd party land as a result of overdevelopment on the industrial estate. The LPA continues to ignore this - allowing sites to come forward and be developed in a piecemeal fashion. Their approach is not resolving the problem - residents should not be asked to attenuate water run-off on their land. A Surface Water Management Plan is required.

It would also be appropriate to have a Flight Safety Zone for Membury and also a major incident plan as none exists at the moment. Membury is home to two service areas with fueling stations, adjacent to a trunk route, a fuel depot, light aircraft activity, a chemical company dealing in solvents, a timber yard and a grain drier amongst other things. Not to have a plan for this is negligent.

Please see attached photograph demonstrating how HGVs are unsuitable on B4000/Ermin Street.
(Attachment 0960.jpg)

Please give reasons for your answer

Not qualified to say

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.

A masterplan for Membury is required encompassing a site specific environmental impact assessment and including a surface water management plan to ensure infrastructure is in place before further development can go ahead.

5. Independent Examination

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearing session(s)? Yes

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Our community would like be able to answer questions about Membury and to give a residents view point. Our community feels unheard.

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

Upload a document

Please use this function if you would like to upload a document that supports your comment. Please note that your formal comments must still be made above, where relevant. Individual documents should not exceed 10MB.

[IMG_0960.jpeg](#)

