

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: P09286 - Land east of Regency Park Hotel (Site CA17) - Consultation on Proposed Main Modifications
Date: 28 January 2025 10:19:52
Attachments: [REDACTED]

This is an EXTERNAL EMAIL. STOP. THINK before you CLICK links or OPEN attachments.

Dear Planning Policy,

Please find attached, completed Part A form and representation letter of support for site CA17.

The representation letter relates to proposed modification references MM36, MM42 and MM43.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any queries

Kind regards,

Ellis Heath

[REDACTED]

OLD CHURCH COURT, CLAYLANDS ROAD, LONDON, SW8 1NZ

[REDACTED]



**West Berkshire Local Plan Review 2022-2039 (LPR)
 Consultation on Proposed Main Modifications
 (6 December 2024 – 31 January 2025)**

Representation Form

Ref:
 (For official use only)

Please complete and return this form:	By email: [Redacted]
	By post: Planning Policy, Development and Housing, Council Offices, Market Street, Newbury, RG14 5LD
Return by:	11:59pm on Friday 31 January 2025

Please read the **Guidance Note**, available on the Council’s website <https://www.westberks.gov.uk/lpr-proposed-main-modifications>, before making your representations.

This form has two parts:
 PART A – Your details
 PART B – Your representation(s)

Please complete a new form for each representation you wish to make.

<u>PART A: Your details</u>		
<i>Please note the following:</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>We cannot register your representation without your details.</i> <i>Representations cannot be kept confidential and will be available for public scrutiny, however, your contact details will not be published.</i> 		
	1. Your details	2. Agent’s details (if applicable)
Title		Mrs
First Name*		Jan
Last Name*		Donovan
Job title <i>(where relevant)</i>		[Redacted]
Organisation <i>(where relevant)</i>	Regency Homes Limited	Rolfe Judd Planning Limited
Address* <i>Please include postcode</i>	Manor of Groves High Wych Hertfordshire CM21 0JU	Old Church Court, Claylands Road London Sw8 1NZ
Email address*	c/o agent	[Redacted]
Telephone number		[Redacted]
Consultee ID <i>(if known)</i>		

*Mandatory Field

PART B – Your representation(s)

All comments made at previous stages of the LPR have been taken into account by the Inspector and there is no need to resubmit these. Publication of the proposed Main Modifications is a regulatory stage and any representations made should relate specifically to the legal compliance and soundness of the proposed Main Modifications and should not relate to parts of the Plan that are not proposed to be modified.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change.

Your name or organisation (and client if you are an agent):	Rolfe Judd Planning Limited (Regency Homes Limited)
--	---

Proposed Main Modifications and Proposed Changes to the Policies Map

1. Please indicate whether your representation relates to the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications or the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Policies Map and provide the modification/change number you are commenting on below:

Document name	Proposed Main Modifications
Modification/Change reference number (MM / PMC)	MM36 MM42/PMC12 MM43/PMC13

2. Do you consider the Proposed Main Modification or Proposed Policy Map Change to be:
(please tick/mark 'X' one answer for a and one for b)

- a) **Legally compliant** Yes No
- b) **Sound** Yes No

Please refer to the guidance notes for a full explanation of 'legally compliant' and 'soundness'

If you consider the Proposed Main Modification or Proposed Policy Map Change not to be sound, please identify which test of soundness your representation relates to:
(please tick/mark 'X' all that apply)

Positively Prepared: The LPR should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements.	
Justified: the LPR should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives	
Effective: the LPR should be deliverable	
Consistent with national policy: the LPR should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies of the NPPF	

3. If you have answered ‘No’ to question 2a or 2b above, please provide details of why you consider the Proposed Main Modification or Proposed Policy Map Change is not legally compliant or is unsound, including any changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound.

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.

--

Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)

4. Do you have any comments on the updated Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Report – Proposed Main Modifications (November 2024)?
(Please be as precise as possible)

Page number	
Paragraph number	
Comments:	

Habitats Regulations Assessment

5. Do you have any comments on the addendum to the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Proposed Main Modifications (November 2024)?

(Please be as precise as possible)

Page number	
Paragraph number	
Comments:	

Notification of Progress of the Local Plan Review

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

(please tick/mark 'X' all that apply)

<i>The publication of the report of the Inspector appointed to carry out the examination</i>	X
<i>The adoption of the Local Plan Review</i>	X

Please ensure that we have either an up-to-date email address or postal address at which we can contact you. You can amend your contact details by logging onto your account on the Local Plan Consultation Portal or by contacting the Planning Policy Team.

Signature		Date	27/01/2025
-----------	---	------	------------

Your completed representations must be received by the Council by 11:59pm on Friday 31 January 2025.

Regency Park Hotel

21 January 2025

Ian Kemp

Land east of the Regency Park Hotel, Bowling Green Road, Thatcham (site ref: CA17)

Dear Mr Kemp,

As per our previous correspondence, I would like to reiterate that this site is available for development and that we look forward to working with the council in the development of their Local Plan and the future delivery of our site for residential development.

It is noted that the allocation of site CA17 is recommended to come forward alongside the adjacent site CA12. Subject to the detail, timescales and further discussions, if this was considered appropriate and if the delivery timescales were compatible.

Our Planning Consultants Rolfe Judd Planning Limited, have reviewed the 'The West Berkshire Local Plan Review (LPR) 2022-2039 Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (MM) – November 2024', and have provided the following comments:

Main Modifications (November 2024)

It is welcomed that site CA17 has been allocated as part of the main modifications. It is noted in reference number MM36 that both site allocations are CA17 and CA12 currently have the same policy reference "RSAX". It is anticipated and assumed that these policies will be renamed to give each site allocation their own specific policy reference. However, for the purposes of this document, reference of Policy RSAX will refer to the policy that relates to site allocation CA17.

Policy RSAX Land East of Regency Park Hotel Bowling Green Road, Thatcham (Site ref CA17) states that the site will be required to be developed in accordance with the parameters set out within parts A – I.

Part A - "The provision of approximately 45 dwellings".

The site is capable of comfortably delivering a minimum of 45 residential units. The overarching aim of emerging Policy SP1 is to optimise the density of development and to make the best use of land, with subsequent parts of the policy setting out that developments located within the edge of Thatcham are generally expected to secure a net density of at least 30-35 dwellings per hectare. Given that the site area of CA17 is approximately 2.2ha - subject to the layout, design and mix of dwellings provided and other site parameters, the site has the capacity to deliver more than 45 dwellings. It is welcomed that a specific limit of dwellings to be provided on site has not been set, and that there is still an opportunity for further dwellings to

Henwick Park) must also be provided”.

It is welcomed that this policy has been reworded following our response to Inspectors Note IN31 and that the policy no longer requires site access to provided from the existing hotel access. It is also noted and accepted that a walking and cycling link between Site Allocations CA12 and CA17 is required to be provided, and as stated above the owner of site CA17 is willing to work alongside the adjacent landowner to deliver a more holistic approach to development of both allocations.

Part C “Internal walking and cycling routes for the site will be provided, and will be linked to existing routes”

The inclusion of part C is noted and as stated above the landowner is willing to work with and engage with local stakeholders to ensure that these are delivered and optimised.

Part F - The site will be developed in accordance with the Landscape Capacity Assessment (2015).

The scheme will comprise a development design and layout in line with policy SP7, that will be further informed by a full detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and will include the following measures:

- i. No development above the 95 metre AOD contour;
- ii. The balance of land in the north of the site to be retained as a landscape buffer which will be retained outside the settlement boundary for Thatcham;
- iii. Reinforcement of the existing tree line along the Bowling Green Road, eastern, and northern boundaries; and
- iv. Green Infrastructure to break up the built form;

It is accepted that an LVIA will need to support any future application and that there is a need for a landscape buffer to retain the settlement boundary. However, as stated in previous representations, the size and scale of the landscape buffer suggested in the site map (figure 2 below) requires further scrutiny and investigation. This is particularly the case if the adjacent allocation CA12 comes forward with or at a similar time to the development of CA17.

It is possible that that a smaller scale landscape buffer could be sufficient to retain the Thatcham settlement boundary and allow for a larger provision of dwellings to be provided on site. The overarching aim of emerging Policy SP1 is to optimise the density of development and to make the best use of land, with subsequent parts of the policy setting out that developments located within the edge of Thatcham are generally expected to secure a net density of at least 30-35 dwellings per hectare.

Land East of Regency Park Hotel, Bowling Green Road, Thatcham



Figure 1: Proposed Site layout of CA17 In Draft Local Plan

It is understood that there is a need for a landscape buffer to prevent adverse impacts on the setting of the AONB and to ensure adequate separation from Cold Ash. However, it is considered that the extent of the landscape buffer proposed could be reduced to accommodate a greater housing density on site whilst maintaining the purpose of the landscape buffer. It would be greatly appreciated if the inspector could take this into consideration and reword part ii. of the policy, to ensure that the site development potential is not restricted by an unnecessary large landscape buffer.

Part G "A Heritage Impact Assessment will be required to inform the development design and layout due to the presence of non-designated heritage assets".

It is acknowledged following the latest examination, that Part G has been reworded to explain that a Heritage Impact Statement will be required to "inform the development design and layout to the presence of non-designated heritage assets". However, on review of the current database of designated heritage assets, none are registered within or in close proximity to the site and the necessity for a Heritage Impact Assessment for this site is still questioned. We would be grateful if the inspector could remove part G or identify the Non designated heritage asset that is required to be considered as part of any future design development of the site.

Parts H, I & J

There is no further comment on parts H, I and J of Policy RSAX and it is accepted that the reports stated are required for residential development of the site to come forward.

Part K "The development design will respond positively to the challenge of climate change and be designed for climate resilience, including maximising the efficient use of sustainable technologies, resources, materials and solar gain, in accordance with policy SP5".

The inclusion of part K of the Policy is noted and it is understood that a Sustainability Statement that demonstrates how the proposed development will embed the principles set out in emerging Policy SP5 will be required to support any future application.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted signature]

STEPHEN HUNG [Redacted name]