

Development Management
Wokingham Borough Council
All planning operation managers

Wokingham, 25 Jun 2018 7.00 pm - Extraordinary Planning Committee

WBC – READING NEW LOCAL PLAN PROPOSAL

Wokingham Borough, Develop Management, Planning Committee and the New Local Plan responses to public concerns – Turning bad practice into good, I’m here on a positive note.

I have lived here for 7 years. I have been watching recent unfortunate local mass development taking place in all directions. I have also noticed the heavy transport collaboration between RBC, WBC and Reading buses. I’m here as a concerned resident advocating good governance.

I hope my objection to **Application No:** 172048 will lead to new discussion and action regarding this **Superior Site, address:** Land Between Thames Valley Business Park and Napier Road, Reading, to the south of the River Thames, and north of the Great Western, Main Line Railway.

Let me today give my full support to the community orgs SOAR and ACER, I applaud their resilient campaigning putting a halt to un-necessary degrading development by our ‘public garden’ which is used for the purposes of public recreation, our public open riverside space. I Quote them;

“Following our complaint to The Local Government Ombudsman about WBC's misappropriation of Broken Brow, the LGO has contacted us with the below update on their investigation.

" We have been trying to obtain more information from the Council in order to carry out our assessment. Regrettably, however, we have been unable to obtain a response from it as yet. As a result, I have now decided to pass your case straight through to one of our Investigation Teams so that we can pursue matters further with the Council. "

WBC's failure to respond to the LGO's inquiries is possibly because no-one at the council has a clear role regarding open space appropriation in this case. The council's solicitor may suspect there is something fishy about the £1 deal with Oracle, and we doubt that she will take responsibility.”

What is this about, how do you expect us to counter sensibly when you respond as you like? This is one of the regrettably that make one-sided planning decision making unfair.

I have three planning issues of why the Local Plan planning approval process immediately need to be halted. Both in large, medium and small scale.

Firstly

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) from 2012 is being revised, all policy changes that will come into force 2019 and also aligned with the globally binding agreement the New Urban Agenda. These actions will form the Government’s **Planning Practice Guidance**.

It’s clear the RBC is seeking approval of the New Local Plan based on the 6 years old Framework, while both RDG’s and WBC’s planning committees totally aware the NPPF being revised right now. The new Planning Framework already proposes a number of policy changes even before them being

implemented. **Nothing from the revised National Planning Policy Framework NPPF has been referred to in the consultation and the new planning applications.**

WBC AND RBC IS AWARE IT NEEDS TO BE FULLY IN LINE WITH THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK.

The way the whole Local Plan consultation process in RDG and WBC has been presented and lunched to its residents is highly inappropriate and purpose only seek to get away with town planning approval without having to fulfil standards. I'm talking about a planning emergency. **It's a planning scandal.**

The revised Framework includes a number of further changes to policy. It brought together around 1,000 pages of planning policy and guidance into a single document.

This revised Framework:

- makes a number of structural changes, in particular dividing the document into clear chapters;
- incorporates policy proposals on which the Government has previously consulted; and
- incorporates additional proposals on which the document is consulting

The Government welcomes everyone's reactions on the ways in which the draft Framework implements changes to planning policy. **It now challenges developers, local authorities, communities, councillors and professionals to work together to ensure that great developments in line with the Framework are brought forward and to enable more people to meet their aspirations.**

E.g. Tree removal

"The revised Framework strengthens protection for ancient woodland and other irreplaceable habitats, by making clear that development resulting in their loss or deterioration should be wholly exceptional, and maintains a high level of protection for individual aged or veteran trees found outside these areas. This policy strikes a balance between protecting these important natural assets, while allowing development to proceed in the very limited circumstances where it would have significant public benefits, but we welcome views on this during the consultation period. In particular, we are interested in views on how best to protect aged and veteran trees."

Secondly

In your professional obligation and responsibility you must consider our fast changing climate in every action. You have a duty to protect firstly Wokingham's, also Reading's residents and assets with emergency planning and services.

Dependent of your local natural environment? Think self-restoration, well performed adaptation can lead to net-mitigation impact measures - Safeguarding, the welfare of the child is paramount. EVERYBODY has a duty to protect children.

Climate Change – Paris Agreement – SDGs

I'm afraid the Local Public Consultation does not have a risk-impact assessment in place, this park & ride scheme will affect all Readinger's work-life balance for the next 18 years...🤔

We are supposed to protect our green spaces flora and fauna, not turn them in to developed places. How is his even possible in 2018, I just wonder...

An Environmental Impact Assessment is not a Risk-Impact Assessment!!

You are part of a diligence to protect the People and Assets in Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire etc...

The Local Plan refer over again to **prosperity for a healthy economy**. Looking at this globally, you might save £££ in any other cases, the point really is that investing in resilience always pays. A genuine risk assessment will half the costs instead of doing it after planning approval.

As part of the Reading LP the MRT scheme in my objection is quite similar, saying that the RBC planning has not taken on-board a risk assessment in drafting the MRT scheme and use references to sub-documentation and sustainability appraisals not up-to-date. Has RBC or WBC carried out a Model Risk-Impact Evaluation Plan? How does the MRT scheme fit in with Govt's new 25-year environment plan?

The Local Plan consultation claim it is an open and transparent urban planning process. When it comes to decision making, for many of the WBC and RBC residents and for a clear majority of objectors it is certainly Not open and transparent. As an increase of planning objections resulting in no changes proofing the case. Are these councils disclosing its greenhouse gas emissions data, managing climate risk and cutting emissions together with planning? Again, instead of engaging with all non-state stakeholders and together plan for a smooth urban transition the council's inaction will lead to **an increase in residents impacted by misled planning, causing harm**.

This meaning that RBC and WBC has been lacking in actions to slowing climate change, but what is interesting, with this knowledge there seem to be no interest to repair for damage done and trying to catch up for 5 years of lost time with **climate damage control measures** that has not yet been implemented in council planning policy!

Reading's unique and pristine green land along the river side should not be exposed or developed by any bus road for 24 millions, this is against the peoples will, Don't trash the Thames.

WBC must ensure that all architecture follows highest possible safety, environmental and aesthetic standards, making it safe to live in, green in footprint and pleasant to look at by being in harmony with its surroundings.

Maintenance and expansion of our Green Public Open Spaces, which have been shown to be highly beneficial for physical and mental health, instead saving the NHS millions of pounds.

You, council committee members should put all people's health first and you know this...

Thirdly

Open and transparent consultations are all fine but when it comes to decision making it's a shamble. What's the point with council openness and transparency, the local residents spend thousands of hours on local consultations, because we as the stakeholder share citizen concerns. Only in decision making will our voices be heard, you as local authority should fix this now. Start this practising from now, for the MRT scheme here and tonight, appoint one of us as a community representative to be part of the voting in the decision process. Why don't the WBC embrace our community objections to **Application No: 172048**? Why don't you invite all non-state actors to truly inclusive integrated group discussions so that we can consult and move forward with fit solutions on track to the future with a holistic overview?

Another shamble is the RBC's Riverside Museum (Exhibition about Reading's 2 rivers). It's a joke to be honest.

In Summary

As you can see, the whole community is present from Reading is here reacting to Rdg's misleading New Local Planning application.

Trying to get away with an 18 year+ plan with the lowest or non-safeguards is beyond foolish and should wake up voices and call for change, we do live in an enlightened and well-informed world.

Planners think they know everything. Let me share the new - holistic overview

You don't plan change due to a planning application:

When you are in a new development plan for 1 square inch of space it is global planning.

For every square inch taken away from healthy soil affects free flowing waters and instead replaces oxygen production with greenhouse gas production. The climate math awareness is here and it doesn't make up.

You, local authorities' individuals play an important role in improving the local governance performance of Greater Reading and beyond, in line with the ambitions of the reviewed National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), this will be considered further as the Government develop its consultation on policy change proposals. WBC, you have a chance to lead this change.

You all in the room, has the power to stop **Application No: 172048**, the MRT scheme from going ahead.

You have to offer to a community representative a vote in the decision-making process.

If you choose not to then it's a farce

Compromise with a slick and modern fossil fuel-free Monorail via a tree-free urban route to multi-storage carpark at the Thames Valley Park?

Thank you - Kindly support our way to future proof urban development in the UK.
Your sincerely,

/Carl Emerson- ate Change Centre Reading

