

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the problems in our water bodies? Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know**What would you change?**

There does not appear to have been a proper collation of the facts available from outside sources to determine the true biological state of the river. There also appears to be no assessment of what facts are missing to verify any such determination. In the stretch between Swallowhead Springs and Fyfield there is a currently confusing situation of silt deposit and underwater algal deposit with good ranunculus growth and healthy fish. Why? These conditions are normally incompatible.

2. Do you agree with our proposed objectives? Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree Don't know**What would you change?**

The lack of ambition to make any improvement by 2015 shows a disregard of the objectives of the WFD even if it is acceptable in law. How has the EA reached its conclusions? Does it not risk an action for judicial review?

3. For some water bodies we have proposed objectives with deadlines after 2015 or a lower overall target. Do you agree with these changes we have proposed? Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

j_n Don't know

What would you change?

The whole of England is heavily modified. In no way is the upper Kennet more heavily modified than anywhere else. It is in need of improvement. It could be improved. What is lacking more than money is the political will to act.

4. We have followed a process to assess (appraise) these actions. This process is described in detail in annex E. Do you agree with how we have done this?

j_n Strongly agree

j_n Agree

j_n Disagree

j_n Strongly disagree

j_n Don't know

What would you change?

This needs to be re-written in layman's language. As it is it appears to be a smokescreen for inactivity.

5. What comments do you have on these actions? Are there any actions we've missed, or any changes you'd propose?

In the context of the upper Kennet you have received an excellent response from ARK to make a starting point for your action plan.

6. What comments on Scenario C actions do you have, including any additional information you can supply about specific actions?

Has the EA considered how outside bodies interested and knowledgeable about the river could help bring key items up the priority scale from C to B? More detailed monitoring is vital to ensure the effectiveness of any action under A,B or C.

7. What support can you offer, such as undertaking any actions or providing resources to help deliver more for your environment?

As a riparian owner of some 1 km of river I have a vested interest in the quality of the river. Naturally I am prepared to help, but I channel anything I do through ARK.

8. Do you agree with our assessment of how climate change will affect the pressures on the water environment?

j_n Strongly agree

j_n Agree

j_n Disagree

jⁿ Strongly disagree

jⁿ Don't know

What would you change?

Nature has adapted to climate change down the centuries. I believe it can continue to do so if only we take the necessary steps to restore the river to a good ecological condition. It is not so at present. If the river is left alone climate change can only make things worse.

9. Do you have any other comments on this draft plan that you haven't already told us?

This plan appears to be an intellectual political exercise with little regard to the practical implementaion of improvements. There is much that could be done. What is needed is a plan with specific goals supported by verified information. If any of these goals are unobtainable we need to know why. A mere statement like 'disproportionately expensive' is unacceptable.