

Comments

Local Plan Review 2020 -2037 Emerging Draft December 2020 (11/12/20 to 05/02/21)

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr749
Response Date	04/02/21 22:04
Consultation Point	1 Introduction and Background (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

The results of traffic modelling are not included in the consultation documents. Modelling has been done, though inadequately - particularly for the Theale and Calcot area.

Many residents' concerns about new development centre on the anticipated effect on infrastructure and services, such as highways and medical services. The omission of an infrastructure delivery plan in this draft mean they cannot determine whether planned infrastructure will be adequate.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Full traffic modelling of the proposed development areas should be carried out and the results published and incorporated in the draft local plan.

The infrastructure delivery plan should be developed to address problems identified in the model and incorporated in the draft new local plan.

The revised draft, incorporating the above, should then be consulted upon.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr750
Response Date	04/02/21 22:04
Consultation Point	2 Context (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web

Version 0.1

Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach? No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

It is true that West Berkshire has several major arteries running through it, but it cannot be said that it is "well connected". Both national (M4 and A34) and local highway networks are overloaded and congested at peak times. This affects roads in and around Newbury, Thatcham and Theale in particular.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

The section should be re-worded to reflect the problems.

Comment by Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID lpr752
Response Date 04/02/21 22:06
Consultation Point Policy SP 2 North Wessex Downs AONB ([View](#))
Status Submitted
Submission Type Web
Version 0.2
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach? No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

The statement "planning permission will be refused for major development in the AONB except in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated to be in the public interest" is too restrictive.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Restricting development to this extent would increase pressures for development elsewhere in the district. It would also allow villages to "wither on the vine" because their population would age and thus reduce the viability of services such as shops, pubs, primary schools and churches.

Major developments SHOULD be allowed in the AONB where they do not have a significantly adverse effect on landscape character.

Comment by Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID lpr753
Response Date 04/02/21 22:06
Consultation Point Policy SP 3 Settlement Hierarchy ([View](#))

Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

The imposition of the DEPZs around AWE sites mean that housing site allocations can no longer be made at two of the Rural Service Centres: Burghfield Common and Mortimer. This means that other RSCs and Service villages are being asked to take more housing and thus stretching their infrastructure and services.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Modest-sized housing allocations should be made at larger villages that have services such as convenience stores, pubs, primary schools, churches, village halls and/or public transport. Such allocations would increase the viability of the services and help such villages become more sustainable.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr754
Response Date	04/02/21 22:07
Consultation Point	Policy SP 5 Responding to Climate Change (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

There is no policy covering renewal energy development.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

A separate policy is needed to encourage renewal energy developments where they would not have an unacceptable impact on the landscape.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr756
Response Date	04/02/21 22:08
Consultation Point	Policy SP 6 Flood Risk (View)
Status	Submitted

Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

A sequential test should be required for all major developments, including those involving a change of use. A change of use may be to a more vulnerable use.

Developments should take the opportunity to improve **all** watercourses, not just rivers.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

The statement “a Sequential Test does not need to be applied for minor development, changes of use, or development sites allocated within the Local Plan Review” should be changed to “a Sequential Test does not need to be applied for minor development”.

The statement “all new development close to rivers and culverts should take advantage of the opportunity presented to improve and enhance the river environment, and contribute to biodiversity targets” should be changed to “all new development close to watercourses and culverts should take advantage of the opportunity presented to improve and enhance the river environment, and contribute to biodiversity targets”.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr757
Response Date	04/02/21 22:10
Consultation Point	Policy SP 12 Approach to Housing Delivery (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

Sites for far too many homes are proposed to be allocated.

There is far too little allowance being made for windfall sites because only sites of under 10 units are being counted.

Section 6.12 under “Future Supply” says sites for a further 1,661 dwellings need to be found, however the new sites proposed to be allocated would total 2039 homes, an excess of 378

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

ALL windfall sites should be included with the handful of large sites allocated elsewhere in the plan being subtracted (to avoid "double-counting"). An allowance for homes converted from offices, etc. using permitted development rights should be included.

Sites RSA16 and RSA17 should be removed from the plan.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr758
Response Date	04/02/21 22:11
Consultation Point	Policy SP 13 Sites allocated for residential and mixed-use development in Newbury and Thatcham (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

The proposal to allocate a 2,500 homes strategic housing allocation at NE Thatcham (SP17) risks "putting all eggs in one basket" making it subject to risks such as have been experienced with the strategic allocation at Sandford.

The proposed strategic housing allocation at NE Thatcham (SP17) would greatly increase the level of traffic on the A4. Many vehicles would head east along the A4 to Reading and to the M4 leading to increased, unacceptable congestion at junctions, particularly with the A340 in Theale, with Hoad Way and Waterside Drive in Theale and at M4 Junction 12. There is already significant delays of 165 seconds for traffic emerging from Waterside Drive onto the A4 in the evening peak (TomTom data for April 1-4 2019).

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Strategic allocation SP17 should be removed from the plan and modest allocations made at larger villages around the district (as described in comment on SP3), thus spreading traffic increases around the district and reducing the extra traffic on the A4.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr759
Response Date	04/02/21 22:12
Consultation Point	Policy SP 21 Sites allocated for economic development (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach? No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

The Covid-19 pandemic and resulting increase in home-working means that demand for new office space is likely to be significantly reduced over the plan period.

There is a large amount of unlet office space in Theale, including in the nearby Arlington Business Park, dating from before the pandemic. Reports in the local and property press say that Reading International Business Park, less than 9km from the site and 2km from the district boundary, is 48% vacant. There is therefore unlikely to be a demand for new office space in Theale during the plan period.

The proposal to allocate a site for 20,000 sq m of office space in Theale (ref EMP6) is unacceptable because:

- . It would adversely affect the setting of Theale as viewed from the A4, M4 J12 and M4 motorway.
- . The built form of office and car parking would significantly reduce, if not eliminate, the gap between the settlements of Theale and Calcot, contrary to the requirement in policy SP1 that "the individual identities of the separate settlements within this [Eastern Spatial] area will be maintained".
- . It would adversely affect the Theale High Street conservation area.
- . Offices would overlook numerous homes in Hoad Way and in the High Street east of Hoad Way.
- . The site would be largely covered in built form and car parking, leaving little or no space for soft landscaping or SUDS drainage.
- . The site is in flood zone 2 and regularly suffers from surface water and groundwater flooding. This means that infiltration SUDS measures would not be possible.
- . It would generate an additional approximately 800 vehicle movements* in peak periods. This would contend with traffic to or from Theale High Street at its junction with Hoad Way. It would also contend with traffic arriving or departing the Arlington Business Park and employment areas to the south of Theale at the A4/Hoad Way/Waterside Drive roundabout in the peak periods. This would cause a significant problem for traffic leaving Waterside Drive in the evening peak that is already subject to a 164-second delay (historical traffic data for 1-4 April 2019). It would also add to existing congestion at M4 J12.

The use identified for the site in the HELAA was "mixed use residential and employment (14,000sq,m B1 floorspace)". Allocation for 20,000 sq.m. office space is therefore contrary to policy SP1 of this plan which states that "Allocations will be related to the role and function of settlements and **the development opportunities identified through the HELAA**".

* Calculated using Bracknell Forest Council's parking standard for offices of one parking space per 25 sq. m. of office space.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

The proposal to allocate 20,000 sq m. of new office space (EMP6) should be removed from the plan.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr760
Response Date	04/02/21 22:13
Consultation Point	8 Non strategic site allocations: our place based approach (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web

Version 0.1

Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach? No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

- 1 Section 4.35 of the Core Strategy contained the following statement: "The Lakeside development has planning permission to provide 350 homes in a range of different sizes and types, which would become a well-integrated part of the Theale community. If this development goes ahead, Theale would need to undergo a period of consolidation to provide an opportunity for facilities and services to be upgraded". Housing construction on this development has not yet commenced, although the permission has been implemented and Reserved Matters approved. Therefore, that statement is still valid and Theale will still need that "period of consolidation" once construction has been completed.

Traffic generated from proposed housing sites RSA16 and RSA17 and employment site EMP6 would greatly exacerbate existing traffic problems in Theale. Traffic data provided by TomTom for the period 1st to 4th April 2019 show the following problems:

Morning peak	Delay (Secs)
High St EB	78
High St WB	82
A4 Hoad Way to J12 M4	51
J12 EB	60
Bradfield Rd EB/Church St	67
Bradfield Rd WB/A340	60
Common Hill EB	192
A340 SB/A4	192
Englefield Rd NB/A340	37

Evening peak	Delay (Secs)
High St EB	74
High St WB	77
A4 Hoad Way to J12 M4	34
M4 J12 EB	75
Waterside Dr NB	164
Waterside Dr SB	81
Brunel Rd WB	85
Brunel Rd EB	69
Common Hill EB/A340	69
A4 WB/A340	52
Englefield Rd WB/A340	54
Englefield Rd EB/Church St	45

Please also see sections on RSA16 and RSA17 for additional reasons for rejecting these sites.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

- 1 Sites RSA16 and RSA17 should be removed from the plan.
- 2 "The Lakeside development has planning permission to provide 350 homes in a range of different sizes and types, which would become a well-integrated part of the Theale community. If this development goes ahead, Theale would need to undergo a period of consolidation to provide an opportunity for facilities and services to be upgraded". Should be added the text following "Non-strategic site allocations".

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr761
Response Date	04/02/21 22:14
Consultation Point	Policy RSA 16 Whitehart Meadow, Theale (Site Ref THE1) (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

This site is important to the setting of Theale and to its maintenance as a separate settlement. Any development on this site would erode Theale's separation from Calcot and Tilehurst, contrary to the requirement in policy SP1 that "the individual identities of the separate settlements within this [Eastern Spatial] area will be maintained".

The site is bounded by the M4 motorway and thus subject to noise and air pollution. The latter is exacerbated in the morning peak because the M4 eastbound frequently slows to a crawl or standstill past this site. This worsens air pollution because:

- . The density of vehicles increases as they close up
- . Vehicle engines produce more pollution when idling or running slowly
- . The pollution does not disperse so widely because it is not dispersed by moving traffic.

High voltage power lines run over the site. In addition to visual intrusion and danger of electrocution (e.g. from climbing ladders or scaffolding or from flying kites), scientific research shows that they generate ozone and nitrogen oxide air pollution (increased by 13% and 30% over normal levels according to paper "Emissions of pollutants and air quality in the area of influence of high voltage overhead electrical lines" by Cociorva Danut, Mihaela Andreea Mitiu and Natalia Raischi:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31978124_Emissions_of_pollutants_and_air_quality_in_the_area_of_influence_of_high_voltage_overhead_electrical_lines

This would add to the pollution caused by the M4.

The site also suffers from groundwater flood risk and much of it is in flood zone 2. High groundwater levels also preclude infiltration as a SUDS solution.

The site is the source of the Sulham Brook and the high peat content of its soil attenuates surface water run-off into the brook. Any development of the site would significantly reduce this attenuation and increase the flood risk downstream (the brook flooded part of Pangbourne in 2007).

Traffic generated from the housing would contend with the traffic from the congested High Street at the Hoad Way Junction and with that on the busy A4, particularly in the morning peak. This would add

to congestion in the High Street, at the Hoad Way/A4 roundabout and at M4 J12. It would also exacerbate traffic problems elsewhere in the highway network in Theale as described in the comments on the Non-strategic site allocations section.

The use identified in the HELAA is "Employment uses (B2/B8)". Residential use is therefore contrary to policy SP1 of this plan which states that "allocations will be related to the role and function of settlements and the development opportunities **identified through the HELAA**".

The reasons for removing this site from the Housing Site Allocations DPD are still valid:

- . The site was assessed in the 2013 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (site ref was THE002) as 'potentially developable'. The site was subsequently assessed in more detail during the preparation of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document, whereby the site was not recommended for allocation due to the location of the site adjacent to the M4 (and resultant noise and air quality issues), and the location of a pylon in the centre of the site
- . In addition, the Environment Agency strongly recommended that the site was not allocated due to majority of it being in Flood Zone 2. A sequential test would have been required to allocate the site in the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document. Other suitable sites with a lower risk of flooding were available in Theale and across the district, so the Council would have been unable to carry out the sequential test.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Site RSA16 should be removed from the plan

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr762
Response Date	04/02/21 22:14
Consultation Point	Policy RSA 17 Former Theale Sewage Treatment Works, Theale (Site Ref THE7) (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

The site is severely contaminated from its history as a sewage works (until the mid-1980s) and as a depot for the old Bradfield Rural District Council. The cost of de-contamination would make the provision of affordable housing on the site unviable, and perhaps make development of the site unviable.

The site is close to the M4 motorway and thus subject to noise and air pollution. The latter is exacerbated in the morning peak because the M4 eastbound frequently slows to a crawl or standstill past this site. This worsens air pollution because:

- . The density of vehicles increases as they close up
- . Vehicle engines produce more pollution when idling or running slowly
- . The pollution does not disperse so widely.

High voltage power lines run over the site. In addition to visual intrusion and danger of electrocution (e.g. from climbing ladders or scaffolding or from flying kites), scientific research shows that they generate ozone and nitrogen oxide air pollution (increased by 13% and 30% over normal levels according to paper "Emissions of pollutants and air quality in the area of influence of high voltage overhead electrical lines" by Cociorva Danut, Mihaela Andreea Mitu and Natalia Raischi:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319378124_Emissions_of_pollutants_and_air_quality_in_the_area_of_influence_of_high_voltage_overhead_electrical_lines

This would add to the pollution caused by the M4.

A large proportion of the site is in floodzone 2. The site also has a risk from surface water and groundwater flooding (please see section in the HELAA). This significantly reduces the extent of deliverable land and the latter makes SUDS problematic.

The access to the site would be from the single-track end of Blossom Lane. Blossom Lane is very narrow in places and also has narrow footways. The footway on its southern side (that most likely to be used by pedestrians from the site) is not continuous, meaning that pedestrians would either have to walk in the road or cross it twice giving road safety concerns.

The majority of pedestrians walking to the western end of Theale High would walk along Blossom Lane and Crown Lane. Crown Lane's footways are extremely narrow, only 60cm in places, meaning that pedestrians would have to step off footways to pass each other. There is no footway at all on the west side of Crown Lane at its southern end. The combination of increased pedestrian traffic and narrow and missing footways means increased numbers walking in, and crossing, the road. This, in combination with increased vehicle movements caused by the development would pose road safety dangers.

The majority of traffic accessing the site would use Crown Lane*. It would impose another 48 to 52 movements in the am peak and 40 to 48 in the pm peak**. This would have the following problems:

- . The lane is effectively sing-track because its eastern side is a parking bay reserved for residents. Opposing vehicles could cause gridlock.
 - . Contention with traffic on the convoluted junction with the High Street would increase tailbacks on Crown Lane.
 - . It would add to congestion on the High Street and at the Station Road min roundabout.
- 12 to 16 vehicles accessing the site would use the Play Platt/Englefield Road junction in both peaks*. This would exacerbate the existing delays of 40 seconds in the am peak at this junction.

It would also exacerbate traffic problems elsewhere in the highway network in Theale as described in the comments on the Non-strategic site allocations section.

The reasons that the site was not allocated in the Housing Site Allocations DPD are still valid:

- . When the preferred options version of the Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document was consulted upon, significant concern was raised regarding access to the site, with limited scope for improvements to be made without acquiring third party land.
- . Further technical work was carried out following preferred options, in particular landscape assessment work indicated that the site would be suitable for development subject to various mitigation measures, including a buffer to separate the site from the existing village. As a result, the site was not considered to be well related to the existing settlement and could result in a negative impact in terms of impact on the character of the built environment.

At the submission stage, the site was not recommended for allocation.

* Traffic movement information from the traffic assessment in the planning statement for application 16/02850/OUTMAJ, 88 homes at Former Sewage Treatment Works Theale, adjusted for 70 homes

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Site RSA17 should be removed from the plan

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr763
Response Date	04/02/21 22:15
Consultation Point	Policy DC 3 Building Sustainable Homes and Businesses (View)
Status	Submitted

Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

The requirement for development of up to 200 homes to achieve HQM 4 stars by 2029 is not ambitious enough. "10-200" and "200+" are ambiguous.

The requirements for 0-9 and 10-200 are the same and should be amalgamated.

The requirement for 200+ homes needs to be qualified so that phases of a 200+ development that are themselves less than 200 homes are covered by the requirement.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

The timescale for the requirement to achieve HQM 4 stars should be changed to 2025.

The requirement for 200+ homes needs to be qualified so that phases of a 200+ development that are themselves less than 200 homes are covered by the requirement.

The timescale for the requirement to achieve HQM 4 stars should be changed to 2025.

The requirements for 0-9 and 10-200 are the same and should be amalgamated.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr766
Response Date	04/02/21 22:17
Consultation Point	Policy DC 31 Designated Employment Areas (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

"Theale Rail-Road site" does not represent the current use of the site as it includes:

- . A coated road-stone (asphalt) plant
- . Concrete batching plants

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

It should be renamed "Theale Rail-served Site" and the policy wording changed to:

"The rail-served site at Wigmore Lane, Theale, is reserved solely for those uses that require rail access..."

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
-------------------	---------------------------------

Comment ID	lpr764
Response Date	04/02/21 22:16
Consultation Point	Policy DC 36 Parking and Travel Plans (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

Agree with policy for residential parking. However, requirements for the most common forms of non-residential development should be given to give developers and residents certainty.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Requirements for the most common forms of non-residential development, e.g. office and retail, should be given.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr768
Response Date	04/02/21 22:18
Consultation Point	Policy DC 32 Supporting the Rural Economy (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

"adaptation of existing buildings" would appear to allow the change of use of residential buildings.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

"adaptation of existing buildings" should be changed to "adaptation of existing non-residential buildings".

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr769
Response Date	04/02/21 22:19

Consultation Point	Policy DC 39 Local shops, farm shops and community facilities (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

The policy should be split into two: one for local and farm shops and one for provision of community facilities. The threshold of 1,500 homes is too high and facilities other than shops should be required. Developments of 800+ homes should be required to provide a convenience store (i.e. one stocking food and household essentials). Developments of 1,500+ homes should be required to provide community facilities, such as a meeting hall.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

The policy should be split into two: one for local and farm shops and one for provision of community facilities. Developments of 800+ homes should be required to provide a convenience store (i.e. one stocking food and household essentials). Developments of 1,500+ homes should be required to provide community facilities, such as a meeting hall.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr770
Response Date	04/02/21 22:20
Consultation Point	Appendix 5 Critical Infrastructure Schedule of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

This is a major omission!
 Many residents' concerns about new developments centre on the anticipated effect on infrastructure and services, such as highways and medical services. The omission of an infrastructure delivery plan means they cannot determine whether planned infrastructure will be adequate

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Critical infrastructure should include a new bypass connecting the A4 east of Thatcham with the A339 and A34 south of Newbury. This would relieve the A4 and A339 of traffic, and resulting pollution, both existing and from the proposed strategic housing site north east of Thatcham. It would also remove heavy goods vehicles from the A4 and A34 and the resulting noise, vibration and air pollution. It would also relieve pressure on the Station Road level crossing in Thatcham

The infrastructure delivery plan should be developed and incorporated in the local plan which should then be consulted upon.

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr771
Response Date	04/02/21 22:20
Consultation Point	Appendix 6 Existing Designated Employment Areas (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

"Station Road and adjacent estates" is ambiguous.

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

"Station Road and adjacent estates" should be reworded: "Estates off Brunel Road and Station Road, Theale".

Comment by	Councillor Alan Macro (1254369)
Comment ID	lpr772
Response Date	04/02/21 22:21
Consultation Point	Appendix 9 Schedule of policies to be superseded/ deleted (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Do you agree with the proposed policy/ site allocation or approach?	No

What are your reasons for supporting or objecting?

RL5 Kennet and Avon Canal superseded by SP18 Housing type and mix?

What changes are you seeking/ what would be your preferred approach?

Correct the table.