



# Report to Wokingham Borough Council

by Geoff Salter BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of  
State for Communities and Local Government

The Planning  
Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ 0117 372 8000

Date: 27<sup>th</sup> October 2009

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

SECTION 20

**REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE WOKINGHAM BOROUGH  
CORE SPATIAL STRATEGY  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

Document submitted for examination on 20 August 2008

Examination hearings held between 17 March and 30 April 2009

File Ref: LDF 000315

## ABBREVIATIONS

AAP	Area Action Plan
AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
BREEAM	Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method
BSP	Berkshire Structure Plan
CEA	Core Employment Area
CS	Core Strategy
DPD	Development Plan Document
EA	Environment Agency
EiP	Examination in Public
GOSE	Government Office for the South East
HA	Highways Agency
LDF	Local Development Framework
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LP	Local Plan
LTP	Local Transport Plan
LTTS	Long Term transport Strategy
NE	Natural England
NRR	Northern Relief Road
NWC	North Wokingham Consortium
PPG	Planning Policy Guidance
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
RIF	Regional Infrastructure Funding
RSL	Registered Social Landlord
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SANG	Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace
SDL	Strategic development Location
SDR	Southern Distributor Road
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SEEPB	South East England Partnership Board
SEP	The South East Plan
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SRN	Strategic Road Network
SPA	Special Protection Area
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
TBH	Thames Basin Heaths
WDLP	Wokingham District Local Plan
#	paragraph
ha	hectares

## INTRODUCTION AND OVERALL CONCLUSION

- 1.1 Under the terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the purpose of the independent examination of a Development Plan Document (DPD) is to determine:
- (a) whether it satisfies the requirements of s19 and s24(1) of the 2004 Act, the regulations under s17(7), and any regulations under s36 relating to the preparation of the document; and
  - (b) whether it is sound.
- 1.2 This report contains my assessment of the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy DPD in terms of the above matters, along with my recommendations and the reasons for them, as required by s20(7) of the 2004 Act. Annexes A and B contain schedules of changes; the first is a list of those changes required to make the DPD sound; they include those put forward by the Council, including those in response to representors or my questions, the progress of which are shown in this report as **[A1, B2,C3]** etc and other additional changes included by me as **[IC1]**. The second list includes those changes proposed by the Council to correct typographical errors or reflect factual changes as the document progressed. Where a change does not appear in the schedules it is not endorsed by me. References to core documents are shown thus (CD..). The Council's suggested Schedule of Changes has been publicised on the CS website and was available for comment.
- 1.3 I am satisfied that the DPD meets the requirements of the Act and Regulations. My role is also to consider the soundness of the submitted Core Strategy (CS) against the three aspects of soundness set out in paragraphs 4.51-4.52 of PPS12 – *Local Spatial Planning* – that it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local planning authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The changes I have specified in this binding report are made only where there is a clear need to amend the document in the light of the legal requirements and/or for soundness. None of these changes should materially alter the substance of the overall plan and its policies, nor undermine the sustainability appraisal and participatory processes already undertaken.
- 1.4 My report firstly considers the legal requirements and then deals with the relevant matters and issues considered during the examination in terms of assessing justification, effectiveness and consistency with national policy. **My overall conclusion is that the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy is sound, provided it is changed in the ways specified. The principal changes which are required are, in summary:**
- **Changes to some elements of infrastructure provision in the Strategic Development Locations (SDLs)**

- **Deletion of Policy CP13 – Gaps**
- **Change to the calculation for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) requirements**
- **Amendments to the Key Diagram**

1.5 This report sets out all the detailed changes required, including those suggested by the Council, to ensure that the plan meets the legal requirements and is sound.

## **2 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

- 2.1 The Wokingham Borough Core Strategy DPD is contained within the Council's Local Development Scheme (LDS), as updated in July 2009. It is shown as having a submission date of August 2008. There has been no material slippage. The content of the DPD is in accordance with the LDS.
- 2.2 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (CD09/21) has been found sound by the Secretary of State and was formally adopted by the Council before the examination hearings took place. It is evident from the documents submitted by the Council, including the Regulation 30(d), 30(e) and 32 Statements and the Self Assessment, that it has met the requirements as set out in the Regulations.
- 2.3 Alongside the preparation of the DPD it is evident that the Council have carried out a parallel process of sustainability appraisal (CD09/04, 08, 11 & 24), which included an appraisal of the site allocation representations (CD09/25).
- 2.4 In accordance with the Habitats Directive, I am satisfied that an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Directive has been carried out properly (CD09/05). There would be no significant harm to the conservation of any European sites as a result of the policies and proposals within this DPD.
- 2.5 Subject to my recommended changes, I am satisfied that the DPD has regard to national policy.
- 2.6 During the hearings the South East Plan (SEP) was not in its final form, although the SoS's proposed modifications had been published for comments. The approved plan was published very shortly after the hearings closed, without any significant changes affecting the regional planning context for Wokingham Borough. The South East England Partnership Board (SEEPB), the new Regional Planning Body, has stated in a letter dated 25 June 2009 that the DPD generally conforms to the approved South East Plan; I am also satisfied that it is in general conformity.
- 2.7 The CS complies with the specific requirements of the 2004 Regulations including the requirements in relation to publication of

the prescribed documents; availability of them for inspection and local advertisement; notification of DPD bodies and provision of a list of superseded saved policies.

- 2.8 Accordingly, I am satisfied that the legal requirements have all been met.

### **3 GENERAL OVERVIEW OF SOUNDNESS**

*Does the Core Strategy present a clear spatial vision for the Borough which accords with the South East Plan?*

- 3.1 Section 2 of the Core Strategy (CS) sets out the physical planning context for the Borough area, which is dominated by the provisions of the SEP with regard to housing. The section contains much background information which in my view need not have been included in the CS; while PPS12 requires the vision for the area to be informed by an analysis of the area and the CS to be based on thorough evidence, it does not require this to be set out in detail in the strategy itself. Nevertheless, it is not my role to suggest improvements to the DPD, so I make no recommendation about these or any other matters of presentation; they do not affect the soundness of the CS.
- 3.2 Notwithstanding the above comments, I consider that Section 2 provides a good analysis of the main issues facing the plan area. The location of the Borough within the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region, and the associated housing requirements, are key factors which will determine the development of the Borough up to 2026. The CS takes full account of the SEP strategy to support the successful economy of this corridor through the provision of new housing and well managed infrastructure and environmental protection. The CS recognises the role of the Borough and Wokingham itself as a lower order centre in regional terms, in helping to meet the wider needs of both Reading, a 'diamond hub for growth' and Bracknell Forest.
- 3.3 The identification of key issues and challenges in the CS leads into a well focused section on Strategic Vision and Aims which are carried through effectively into the rest of the document. It deals with cross boundary and close partnership working and has taken account of the plans and policies of neighbouring authorities. The Council is a unitary authority and has fully involved its own education authority as well as health authorities and other public organisations in the planning of necessary infrastructure to support housing growth. The CS is clearly a spatial plan. The strategy takes proper account of the interdependence of the Borough with its neighbours, particularly Reading, through its policies for housing and employment provision (including a proposed Science Park strongly related to Reading University) and transport links. By and

large the strategy seeks to ensure that any problems and issues resulting from new development are addressed within Wokingham wherever possible.

- 3.4 Of critical importance to the strategy is the SEP requirement for a substantial amount of new housing at an average annual rate of over 600 per year. As I go on to discuss below, I consider the DPD provides a sound basis to show how these significant increases in housing provision compared with past levels of development can be accommodated in an environmentally acceptable yet deliverable way. A key element of this spatial strategy is the proposal for four Strategic Development Locations (SDLs), which evolved from options considered in 2005. Two of these locations, for 3,500 dwellings at Arborfield Garrison and 2,500 dwellings to meet the needs of Greater Reading (termed South of the M4), are specifically endorsed by the SEP. The CS includes Additional Guidance for the Development of the SDLs in Appendix 7, to show how the new housing can be provided in an efficient way through detailed planning, with proper infrastructure to support the substantial population growth proposed.
- 3.5 The strategy also indicates that these housing needs can be met without recourse to releasing green belt land in the northern part of the Borough, again in compliance with government policy and the SEP. The SEEPB has confirmed in writing that the CS accords with the SEP as finally approved. Other detailed matters are dealt with through suggested changes.
- 3.6 Although Wokingham does not contain any parts of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA), a substantial area in the south of the Borough lies within 5km of the designated areas. The CS takes full account of the location of a substantial part of the Borough's area outside the green belt lying within this zone of influence of the SPA. The overall policies specifically address this context and the proposals for specific development areas include requirements for necessary mitigation that are consistent with the relevant SEP policy and representations from Natural England (NE).
- 3.7 The CS contained a policy to preserve gaps between settlements which has been carried forward from the previous Wokingham District Local Plan (WDLP). The general principle of retaining settlement identity is widely supported, although the SEP now contains no policy framework for such designations. I have concluded that the CS policy as submitted was not consistent with regional policy and the proposals for growth in the SDLs. I deal with this fully as an individual issue in section 7, where I reason that the protection of settlement identity could be secured in a different way.
- 3.8 On publication, the Highways Agency (HA) regarded the CS as unsound because its transport elements conflicted with national

policy and lacked evidence on the delivery of infrastructure. However, in the intervening months there have been constructive discussions and further stages of modelling. The Council has put forward changes which I consider would meet the HA's objectives to safeguard the Strategic Road Network (SRN). These changes do not go to the heart of the strategy but to my mind give adequate assurance about the delivery of key elements of highway infrastructure and the requirement to mitigate any effects on the SRN, in this case part of the M4. The HA is generally supportive of the CS's aims of locating development where it will reduce the need to travel, bringing about a modal shift from car use to high quality public transport. Policy CP10 and the policies for the SDLs (CP19-22), together with further detail in Appendix 7, set out in some detail the infrastructure requirements needed to underpin the substantial housing growth proposed. This policy context will give sufficient guidance for more detailed requirements to be set out in SPD and/or DPD and to progress the draft Infrastructure Delivery Schedule.

- 3.9 Overall, there has been no significant change to the content of the CS and the public consultation already carried out has not been undermined. In some parts the strategy does not add much to national or regional guidance but it is not my role to 'improve' the CS and these duplications do not in themselves make the document unsound. In conclusion, I find that the CS will be effective in delivering its clear spatial vision and strategic aims.

#### **4 HOUSING SUPPLY AND DELIVERY**

*Whether the CS is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in delivering the right amount of housing to meet SEP requirements in appropriate, sustainable locations, at the right time and with a satisfactory mix.*

- 4.1 The SE Plan has now confirmed the number of 12,460 projected net additional dwellings to be provided in Wokingham Borough between 2006 and 2026. It should be noted that this requirement is expressed as an average annual rate of 623, rather than minimum target per year. The final letter from SEEPB indicates that it is for individual Councils to determine whether any shortfall in provision up to 2006 should be added to the new requirements. In Wokingham's case the Council says that it intends to make up the shortfall of 772 outstanding from the previous Berkshire Structure Plan target, by 2016. The CS has been prepared on this basis from the outset on the understanding that this was what the SEP was likely to require. Criterion (viii) of Policy H2 indicates that any backlog of unmet need (the type of which is not specified) should be met in the first 10 years of the plan. In these particular circumstances I see no good reason why the overall housing target in the submitted CS for the plan period to 2026 should not be

retained, since the SEP targets are considered to be floors, not ceilings, and there is a clear housing need, including affordable housing, identified in the Berkshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). I therefore endorse (with some minor modification) the Council's suggested changes **[E18, E20, E22, E49]** which are necessary to provide clarity on this issue.

- 4.2 Table 4.3 of the CS shows that the number of completions up to March 2008 comprised about 11% of the dwelling target. The severe downturn in the economy in the following year to March 2009 saw a substantial reduction in the annual completion rate. I comment on the implications of current housing market conditions in more detail with regard to the delivery of the SDLs and the provision of affordable housing below. But in summary, any slippage would be the result of factors beyond the short term control of land use planning. Following the example of the inspector who reported on the Poole CS, I consider it would be an unreasonable requirement for the CS to make contingency arrangements on the assumption that these unusual economic circumstances would continue indefinitely.
- 4.3 The SHLAA identifies a number of committed sites which are expected to come forward within the plan period. This information was updated to March 2009 and appears to provide an accurate indication of known available sites. The committed sites themselves reflect past WDLP allocations or already have planning permission. A large site at Sandford Farm has been refused permission, but on detailed design grounds only; the principle of development has been established and I see no good reason why the site should not be developed.
- 4.4 The location of several parts of the TBH SPA close to the Borough has clear implications for deliverability, which will depend on the provision of SANG(s). The SHLAA shows those sites requiring mitigation are not programmed for completion until 2011. The Council has updated the information discussed at the hearings, following the refusal of a joint bid with Hart DC for Regional Infrastructure Funding (RIF) from the 2009-10-11 budgets. However, the back-up measure of providing a SANG on 20ha of Council-owned land at Barkham Ride is being progressed, through the submission of a planning application for open space. This land will be capable of mitigating the impact of over 900 dwellings. A further bid for RIF funding in 2011-12 could be progressed. In these circumstances I am satisfied that the need to mitigate the impact of these sites on the SPA is neither likely to affect overall housing numbers nor lead to undue delay in short term housing supply.
- 4.5 The strategy is heavily dependent on the delivery of about three quarters of the housing requirement through the SDLs. In summary, all potential developers/consortia thought they could

provide more dwellings than the Council has estimated. For the reasons set out in discussion of each SDL below, I consider the numbers of dwellings set out in the CS are reasonable estimates of the capacity for each area. Bearing in mind their locations, I am not convinced that the SDLs have scope to provide significantly more housing without generating unacceptable environmental effects; I note also that the Council's modelling of transport and other infrastructure, including schools, has been based on the CS numbers.

- 4.6 However, I see no problem with the overall strategy of concentrating new dwellings in four key locations. This should enable the provision of fully funded social, environmental and transport infrastructure, as the Council aspires. The Council is not putting all its eggs in one basket; no single SDL is planned to provide more than 25% of the total dwellings.
- 4.7 Some representors suggested that more housing should be provided outside the SDLs through sites within or as extensions to the settlements identified in the hierarchy of Policy CP9. To do so would undermine the overall spatial vision of the CS and in any event is not necessary; the target can be met through the planned SDLs.
- 4.8 The additional element of dwelling provision from within the limits of major, modest and limited sized settlements set out in Policy CP9 is not from specified sites. The updated SHLAA (CD 10/20C) indicates that there is scope for 247 dwellings within the three categories of settlement, of which 26 are dependent on SPA mitigation. However, the SHLAA shows that sites for a further 4,732 dwellings lie adjacent to the settlements, over 1,400 of which do not need to rely on SPA mitigation measures. The Council presented evidence that the dwelling numbers expected from this source reflect past experience, and my site visits to the area indicated that the settlements concerned have physical scope to accommodate the relatively small number of dwellings proposed for the whole plan period to 2026, within or adjoining their boundaries.
- 4.9 I consider it reasonable to set a normal maximum size for an individual development within the 'modest' and 'limited' settlements, to be consistent with the overall aim of the strategy to concentrate new development at the most sustainable locations, as required by Policy SP3 of the SEP. New housing in these settlements will help to sustain local services, in accordance with government policy in # 36 of PPS3. However, while the submitted Policy CP9 refers to housing as a specific land use to which it applies, the Council has made clear that Policy CP9 sets the broad framework for all development, not just housing. I consider the suggested changes **[D22-25, D38-39]** which set the broad limits in Policy CP18 on new housing schemes for minor and modest settlements are needed to make the CS sound in terms of clarity.

- 4.10 The proposed hierarchy, which modifies the approach taken by the WDLP, generally appears to reflect the services available within settlements and their transport links, particularly public transport services. For example, Earley and Green Park, suggested for 'downgrading' by some representors, are both amongst the most sustainable locations in the Borough with regard to public transport access and proximity to a wide range of services, including those in Reading itself; I consider their place in the hierarchy is correct.
- 4.11 As drafted, the settlement hierarchy takes no account of the proposed development of the SDLs, which in the case of Arborfield Garrison, Shinfield, Spencers Wood, and Three Mile Cross would substantially change the nature and size of the settlements. Once development of the SDLs is complete, however, the settlements will be categorised anew. Change [D26] is needed to clarify this point.

#### *The 5 year supply*

- 4.12 The provision of a five year supply rests heavily on the ability of the SDLs to deliver a significant number of homes in 2011 to 2014. I discuss this in more detail below, together with the likely capacity of each SDL. The proposed trajectories show that it is realistic to expect development to come on-stream in time to help meet the five year supply target. All the consortia involved in the SDLs expected to meet the planned trajectory in Appendix 6. Once the CS has been approved, further detailed master planning, refining the considerable amount of work that has already been undertaken, could start quickly to ensure that some housing starts would be underway by 2011-12 in all four SDLs.
- 4.13 The current economic circumstances introduce some uncertainty regarding the delivery of these and other sites, particularly schemes with planning permission which will expire during the first five years. However I consider there is a reasonable prospect that the schemes will be delivered over a five year period. Any slippage in the SDLs might equally be matched by delays in implementing other sites, if they were subject to the same appropriate requirements regarding infrastructure contributions.

#### *Balance between SDLs and other sites*

- 4.14 While much of the overall housing provision (about 75%) would be located within the SDLs, I do not agree with some representors that this is a cause for concern. As discussion in Section 5 below, I have concluded that each SDL would deliver sustainable development, subject to various changes. To provide more development on smaller sites would undermine the Council's vision for accommodating the housing growth required by the SEP, accompanied by adequate infrastructure.

- 4.15 Greater reliance on smaller sites would not necessarily provide the strategy with better flexibility to meet changing economic circumstances. The severe economic downturn that was taking place during the examination of the Plan, and the poor outlook for the housing market in particular, is potentially just as likely to affect the deliverability of smaller sites as larger ones. While some of the SDLs would be dependent on the provision of significant elements of infrastructure as part of the development, smaller sites would also quite properly be required to contribute proportionately to many of the same elements, for example, new schooling, SPA mitigation, investment in public transport etc. The planned delivery of these elements is likely to be undertaken more efficiently through the larger sites, especially the SDLs.
- 4.16 PPS12 states that Core Strategies should not deal with non-strategic sites. Therefore this report does not consider in detail other sites put forward during the consultation process as preferable alternatives to providing the new housing largely through the SDLs. Having seen and heard the evidence about a number of such sites, I have found no compelling arguments to recommend changing the basic nature of the strategy, taking into account general and site specific evidence about sustainability, transport and infrastructure provision and other constraints such as flood risk. Policy CP18 provides for about 1,000 new dwellings to be provided in the major, modest and limited settlements. The SHLAA shows that some land is available within current boundaries but these may need to be reviewed to meet this target. However, the approved LDS indicates that this review should be carried out on a comprehensive basis as part of the Housing Site Allocations DPD.
- 4.17 The Council acknowledges that the position with regard to the five year supply is tight, but achievable. To some extent this reflects past slippage against the former Berkshire Structure Plan (BSP) target, but difficulties are almost inevitable in the current housing market, where demand appears to be severely constrained by shortages of mortgage finance. Government predictions are that this national problem will be overcome in due course. The Council's estimate is that the current shortfall against target is in the order of 10-20%, which is an acceptable margin in the short run; Appendix 6 indicates that a surplus against target will be achieved by 2011-12 and continue for several years thereafter as the SDLs come on stream.

### *Flexibility*

- 4.18 In the economic climate at the time of the hearings, it was argued that the CS had insufficient flexibility to provide enough housing to meet RSS targets in the event that one SDL were to fail to proceed as planned. For the reasons set out in my discussion of each SDL in the paragraphs below, I think this is highly unlikely. The 10% contingency allowance appears on past evidence of demand in an

economically vibrant area to be on the generous side of realistic. The CS also refers to the Council's intention to allocate reserve sites for development after 2026 which could be brought forward if necessary (for example to meet the five year supply requirement) thus affording further flexibility. Moreover, the clarification letter of SEEPB has provided additional scope by indicating that making up the previous Berks SP shortfall of 772 is discretionary. This gives further re-assurance that enough housing can be provided to meet the minimum SEP target of 12,460.

*Will the housing policies provide an acceptable mix?*

- 4.19 I see no need for the CS to provide for specific needs such as retirement homes outside existing settlements. The provision of such housing as an exception to countryside policy could conflict with sustainability objectives to reduce travel, including journeys to work by staff, and to promote social inclusion within existing settlements. In the absence of any specific regional or national policy framework I consider the case for allowing such sites as an exception to normal policy to direct new housing to urban locations has not been fully justified. In any event the issue could be addressed in another DPD if there proved to be clear need.

Section 4: Housing Supply and Delivery	
Changes required:	E18, E20, E22, D22-26, D38, D39, E49

## 5 THE SDLS

*Are the SDLS justified and will they be effective in delivering the required amount of new housing? Are the capacities correct, the locations sustainable and the developments viable? Will adequate infrastructure be delivered? Will unacceptable transport effects result? Can the proposed trajectories of development be achieved? Are the concept statements in Appendix 7 robust?*

### ARBORFIELD GARRISON

#### *Capacity*

- 5.1 Policy WCBV3 of the SEP has confirmed the requirement for 3,500 homes, based on land at Arborfield Garrison, adding a rider that the area has potential for further continuing development during and/or beyond the Plan period. The Council's estimate of 3,500 potential dwellings up to 2026 is based on an average density assumption of about 30-35 dph, in accordance with the normal minimum set out in PPS3. Some variation of mix and density of housing should be provided in accordance with the concept statement (#A7.10), including development near the centre of the new settlement being

built at a higher density. I note that Policy H5 of the SEP indicates that the regional density target should be 40 dph. However, that applies to a substantial area containing many large, densely developed urban areas, in contrast to Wokingham Borough. The policy indicates that LPAs can set local variations to the target, which should not be applied uniformly.

- 5.2 I consider the Council's overall figure to be appropriate, given the rural nature of the surroundings and the projected size of the new settlement. A density of 30-35 dph would be consistent with the pattern of development that has occurred in the Borough over recent years. The built up area would not be substantial and taller buildings capable of enabling higher density development are unlikely to be acceptable, even in the village centre.
- 5.3 The consortium of landowners is confident that the designated area could provide a further 1,500 dwellings after 2026. However, this is not justified on viability grounds, since there is no dispute that the projected size of 3,500 homes would have enough critical mass to support a range of commercial and community facilities. To achieve the increased number of dwellings would require a higher density, unless the site were to be expanded. The consortium's Draft Density Profile for a settlement of 5,000 homes shows the majority of residential land at a 'medium' density of 45-60 dph, with some small blocks at an even higher 70 dph. Like the Council, I cannot envisage this form of development being appropriate in this largely rural context. I therefore recommend no change to the CS on this point. I consider a guideline figure of 3,500 should be retained, but some flexibility could be afforded by reasoning this as a minimum, to allow scope to make the best use of the land without compromising environmental objectives.

## Sustainability

- 5.4 At present Arborfield Garrison neither contains nor is well connected to a range of services and community facilities. A significant part of the area is brownfield land, which would be redeveloped in a manner which would improve its accessibility to services. However, a substantial area of undeveloped 'greenfield' is needed to generate sufficient critical mass for a viable settlement with an acceptable number of facilities. The long term sustainability of the area therefore depends on the provision of new transport, commercial and social infrastructure to prevent unnecessary travel and promote a reasonable degree of self-containment. The concept statement allows for some expansion of the Hogwood Industrial Area, which falls within the SDL boundary. Further employment, including some retail jobs, would be provided in the district centre. The Council estimates that around 1,000 new jobs could be created in the area but even if the propensity for homeworking increased, inevitably there would be a considerable amount of out commuting to major

employment centres such as Reading, Winnersh triangle and further afield, including London.

- 5.5 It is acknowledged that current bus services to Wokingham and Reading have poor frequency and journey time. However, the consortium's draft transport plan allows for a range of measures to support public transport services, to provide much better frequency of services, with a target modal share of 15%. These measures include the provision of a new bus interchange to enable better penetration of services into the surrounding rural areas and better links to Reading, Wokingham and Bracknell.
- 5.6 The provision of both a new secondary school and primary schools is expected to reduce journeys for education in the Borough overall. Re-modelled pupil predictions have informed a revised education strategy which is being implemented by the Council as Local Education Authority. A decision has already been taken to close Ryeish Green School in 2010. The new secondary school at Arborfield Garrison is part of a strategy to provide a better spread of places around the Borough, which includes the potential closure of Emmbrook School. The new school will be well placed in relation to the proposed catchment in the southern part of the Borough, including substantially increased populations of school age at the Arborfield SDL, the South of M4 SDL and existing pupils at Finchampstead Parish. The proposals should provide for more sustainable travel patterns. It is essential that this school is delivered in the first phase of development.

### *Infrastructure*

- 5.7 The consortium and the Council have submitted a considerable body of evidence about the delivery of infrastructure, including the transport improvements set out below. I consider that this provides sufficient information to show that a reasonably self-contained settlement would be achieved which meets the sustainability objectives of the CS and government policy.

### *Transport*

- 5.8 The extent to which the settlement meets the self-containment objective is critical to the likely need for new roads. In considering residents' fears about inadequate capacity, I appreciate that several roads in Borough, including those serving this SDL, suffer congestion and delays. However, and in accordance with government policy, quite rightly the CS does not intend to meet unconstrained demand for continuing traffic growth, but to encourage other modes. As mentioned in #5.5 above and set out in the consortium's evidence, planning for several public transport measures as well as improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes is underway.

- 5.9 Capacity on the A327 is a current problem but the Council's modelling shows that 750 homes could be built before improvements to Arborfield Cross junction or new by pass are needed. The infrastructure requirements in CS# A7.7 refer to two links from Nine Mile Ride to the A327 and a number of possible measures to providing increased capacity along the A327, subject to further modelling. From the transport evidence presented at the hearings I see no overriding reason why a solution should not be worked up as part of the master planning process and any necessary and proportionate funding secured through a Section 106 agreement when planning permission is sought. The Appendix forms part of the Plan and provides an adequate level of detail for a strategic site at CS stage.
- 5.10 Other capacity constraints affect the A327 further afield, at the 'Black Boy' roundabout and in Reading. These problems would have to be addressed by the relevant authorities in any event. The Shinfield eastern relief road proposed as part of the South of M4 SDL will provide a significant enhancement to the corridor. I deal with the possible link from the A327 to the A33 below. In the context of early planning for a strategic site, I consider there are no intractable transport issues that should prevent the designation of the SDL.

#### *Viability/Deliverability*

- 5.11 The most recent letter from Defence Estates and other owners confirms the commitment of all landowners to progress the development. The Garrison, including Hazebrouck Barracks, will close as a result of the Defence Training Review (DTR) programme. One part of the site (Rowcroft Barracks) is already vacant. The latest information from Defence Estates confirms that Hazebrouck Barracks, which comprises about 20% of the SDL, will become available in 2014/15. I see no reason to doubt that all of the site will not come forward to achieve the proposed housing numbers by the end of the plan period.
- 5.12 There is no dispute that the development of 3,500 dwellings would have sufficient critical mass to support the costs of providing necessary infrastructure, particularly public transport and highways improvements, schools and community facilities and SANGs (including maintenance). The detailed amount of funding required for major projects such as the Arborfield Cross by-pass will be determined at a later stage but there appear to be no major costs that threaten implementation. In current market conditions the proposed level of affordable housing provision may be challenging but there is no real concern that over the long term of the proposed settlement an appropriate mix of housing can be provided in accordance with the CS principles in CP5 (as proposed to be changed; see Section 6 below). Necessary change **[D40]** reflects this agreed position.

## Other matters

- 5.13 Adequate SANG can be provided, in line with Policy CP8 and supporting text, as amended by me to reflect a reduced household size (see section 8 below). The proposed location of a substantial area of SANG around the listed building at West Court is sensible, as agreed by NE (necessary changes C10, C16,C18 refer).
- 5.14 I consider the Council's suggested change to Appendix 7 clarifying the nature of the retail facility is essential to meet the objectives of PPS6 to protect town centres. The retail study supporting a store of up to 4,000 sq m was not challenged by the Council and would be appropriate to a new District centre in the retail hierarchy, subject to the proposed caveat that it should sell primarily convenience goods **[D52]**.

### *Alternative boundaries - Barkham Square Park*

- 5.15 The Barkham Square Park (BSP) scheme involves an extension to the north east of the SDL area shown on the key diagram, in place of land to the south. I consider the claimed benefits of scope for more employment development within the SDL and better access to employment areas at Wokingham and Winnersh triangle are overstated. The Council's most recent employment survey and the New Homes Survey showed that the main employment destinations for local residents were elsewhere in the Borough, Reading and Bracknell; the amended boundary would provide no benefit in terms of accessibility to these areas. Residents living in the alternative area of SDL would be likely to be more reliant on the B3349 School Road, rather than the A327 corridor with its enhanced public transport services to the larger employment area of Reading in particular. The alternative site area would not achieve any other sustainability benefits compared with the boundary shown on the key diagram of the CS.
- 5.16 I note that the traffic implications of the potentially significant increase in the amount of employment land within the SDL, have not been tested.
- 5.17 The alternative SDL boundary suggested by BSP would be capable of providing the same infrastructure as the Consortium proposal in general terms, for example with regard to SANG, schooling etc. However, the exclusion of some land to the south could adversely affect the deliverability of the extension to Nine Mile Ride, if the site of a key landowner were excluded.
- 5.18 I agree with the Council that the new development should have a distinct identity and a clear separation from nearby villages, in order to maintain the character of the settlement pattern. I deal in more detail with the retention of gaps in section 8 below. The BSP alternative boundary to the SDL, would not meet this objective,

which is strongly supported by the local community, as shown in the Regulation 32 representations. The proposed area of development, sited on rising ground to the west of the brook, would be very prominent in the local landscape. The urban edge would be seen especially intrusive from Barkham Road. I consider the consequent blurring of settlement identity between Barkham and the new housing and the adverse landscape impact to be serious drawbacks of the proposed change, which I do not recommend.

*Conclusion*

5.19 The proposed SDL for a new settlement of about 3,500 dwellings is soundly based, subject to provision of adequate infrastructure as detailed in Policy CP19 and Appendix 7 and subject to the changes identified below.

Section : SDLs Arborfield	
Changes required:	C10, C16, C18, D40, D52, D61

*SOUTH OF M4*

*Capacity*

5.20 The number of dwellings proposed for the South of M4 SDL accords fully with the confirmed projected target in Policy WCBV3 of the SEP, footnote 4, which refers to 2,500 dwellings that will contribute to the delivery of housing to serve the needs of Greater Reading. In essence the SDL would involve urban extensions of three villages. The consortium of developers involved in this proposal argue that the area has capacity for 3,000 dwellings in addition to the 700 already committed, suggesting an appropriate CS target of 3,500. However, to achieve this number would rely on a higher density than the Council’s proposed 30-35 dph and/or a narrowing of the gap between Shinfield and Spencers Wood. Development over a wider area than shown on the Concept Diagram in Appendix 7 is likely to prejudice the key objective for this SDL of maintaining the separate identities of the three villages concerned. I consider it would also be inappropriate to plan for densities at a significantly higher level than the housing areas of the villages.

5.21 While the provision of more dwellings near to Reading and transport links has benefits, these have to be balanced against the need to protect the local environment and the aspirations of the existing communities. The overall density of the SEP of 40 dph applies to the whole region, including much denser urban areas, unlike the SDL environs.

- 5.22 The exact locations of new parcels of development will be finalised at the detailed master planning stage. The eastern part of the SDL area is within the floodplain of the River Loddon. Taking into account this constraint, the illustrative plan for development of 3,500 dwellings indicates that the width of the SANG and playing fields separating the new development at Shinfield and Spencers Wood would be just 300m, with some parts of the gap between new and existing development at Ryeish Green much narrower. Although I recommend the deletion of Gaps Policy CP13 below, I endorse the commitment to maintaining the separate identities of the three settlements, which received strong support in principle from virtually all those who commented on the CS at all stages in its evolution. I am therefore not convinced that the capacity of the SDL could be increased without undermining this important objective **[D61]**.
- 5.23 I deal below with alternative boundaries to the SDL, including land north-west of Shinfield and land west of Spencers Wood. I recommend no change to the boundaries on landscape grounds. As with other proposed capacity increases, they are not needed to meet SEP targets, which can be achieved through the Plan provisions as submitted. In these circumstances I recommend no change to the capacity of the SDL.

#### *Sustainability*

- 5.24 There is no real argument from representors that the SDL would not meet sustainability objectives once complete, other than with regard to provision of new employment opportunities within the area. However, the proximity of the area to Reading, which it is intended to serve, together with improved public transport links and the potential location of a Science Park adjoining the north-eastern boundary would provide excellent access to a variety of employment opportunities. The ability to use and develop existing community facilities already in the villages adds weight to the sustainability credentials of this SDL.

#### *Viability*

- 5.25 The consortium for the developers argued that the viability of a larger scheme for 3,000 dwellings would prove more robust than the CS proposal for 2,500. However, it was accepted that despite the current economic downturn, the CS proposals would be viable over the plan period and the appropriate level of infrastructure, including the eastern relief road, bus service improvements, SANG and two primary schools could be supported, together with affordable housing at around 35% of the total. A valuation appraisal submitted by the consortium validated this view. The consortium controls substantial land holdings within the SDL boundary and early delivery of new housing could be achieved to contribute to the five year supply.

## *Transport*

- 5.26 The SDL has the benefit of links to both the A33 and A327 corridors into Reading and there has been detailed investigation of potential bus service improvements; the viability appraisal allows £2m for works in the A327 corridor. The Development Principles contained in Policy CP20 and Appendix 7 place a strong emphasis on improved public transport along these corridors, and through a public transport interchange at Shinfield among other measures. I appreciate residents' concerns about the impact of extra traffic on an already congested network. However, the requirements of Policy CP20 include a number of measures designed to induce a change in modal split from the car, in accordance with government policy, by encouraging walking through the provision of local facilities, easier and safer cycling through designated routes, and better public transport. The traffic modelling presented in the evidence base indicates that provided the measures included in the schedule to Policy CP10 are provided there would be some improvement in traffic flows throughout the Borough, even with the substantial new housing developments proposed.
- 5.27 Although the HA has concerns about the effect of traffic from the SDL on junction 11 of the M4, an £80m improvement scheme is under construction at present. It is accepted that there would be no physical scope to undertake further works once this is complete and any improvements to flows would have to be through traffic management. The demand management measures included within the SDL concept statement would be of benefit. I discuss the HA's concerns further in section 9 below.
- 5.28 The consortium expressed very strong reservations about the need for a link between the A327 and A33, which the Council include as a possibility, subject to further traffic modelling after demand restraint measures have been implemented. The Council has proposed a change requiring the safeguarding of a route for the link, rather than its provision. I agree with the consortium that demand for access to the Mere oak Park & Ride just west of Three Mile Cross is likely to be low, particularly if bus services along the A327 corridor are improved. I support the proposed change deleting this requirement in Appendix 7 and substituting a requirement for a contribution to this Park and Ride scheme **[D55]**. I note that those travelling into Reading along the A327 would be able to gain much easier access to the Park and Ride at the Madejski stadium once junction 11 improvements are complete. I also appreciate that an indicative route put forward by the Council would sever the SANG which would separate Shinfield from Spencers Wood, undermining both its dual functions. A route may require the demolition of buildings and have detrimental visual impact on the landscape and the amenity of existing properties. Any route is likely to be in multiple land ownerships.

- 5.29 At present there are two routes across the SDL along existing highways which fulfil the role of a link, which could be investigated for retention with traffic and environmental improvements. Bearing in mind that the need for the route is far from certain I consider the arguments for the safeguarding requirement would be outweighed by benefits for master planning if it were omitted. Subject to my recommended change to delete this part of the planning obligations schedule, I am satisfied that Policies CP20 and the guidance in Appendix 7 provide a sound basis for the development of the SDL without unacceptable transport effects **[IC 1]**

*Other matters*

- 5.30 I note that the Shinfield and Spencers Wood Consortium does not represent all landowners within the SDL boundary shown on the proposals map. However, the CS provides sufficient flexibility for the future planning of the SDL through a master planning process which is to be approved as SPD. As with other SDLs, which sites within the boundary are to be developed should be determined at that stage and should not be specified in a CS. I make no comment on the merits or other wise of the draft illustrative master plan provided by the consortium. I discuss the science park proposal and its relationship to the SDL in section 11 below. I consider the requirements of CP20 and guidance in Concept statements in Appendix 7 set out in enough detail what needs to be provided, in accordance with #4.7 of PPS12, which does not require site specific detail in core strategies. The Appendix forms part of the Plan and gives an adequate indication of reasonable requirements for infrastructure provision, subject to my recommended changes.
- 5.31 As with other SDLs I recommend a change to the requirement for SANG, to be consistent with the revision to the supporting text of Policy CP8 regarding household size calculations. **[C11, C19-20]**

*Alternative SDL boundaries*

- 5.32 The rural area to the west of Spencers Wood is at a sustainable location, reasonably close to the village shops and post office on Basingstoke Road. However, it offers no greater advantages than the designated SDL areas. SANG would be required but the site could provide an alternative area on the west side of the SDL.
- 5.33 I note that the impact of the 250-300 potential extra traffic movements per day on Junction 11 has not been tested. The gaps between existing settlements would not be affected but the parkland setting gives the area a distinctive rural character. This parcel of land is at the highest point of the ridge separating Spencers Wood from land west of A33, and was rejected as development site at the last Local Plan inquiry on grounds of landscape impact. In these circumstances I see no strong reason to justify any change to the SDL boundary here.

- 5.34 Lambs Lane Business Park is not a strategic site in its own right but could be a potential addition or alternative area for the SDL, to accommodate up to 170 dwellings. While it is unlikely to have an unacceptable traffic impact, the site is rather disconnected from rest of SDL. I agree with the Council that the SDL needs to be a comprehensively planned and integrated development that improves existing settlements, not just a collection of sites. Given the location of this site, which is further from facilities and would extend the SDL further into the open countryside, it would not help to achieve that objective. It offers no real benefits.
- 5.35 Neither of these sites is needed to make up any shortfall in housing numbers. I therefore consider this part of the strategy is justified as the most appropriate when considered against the reasonable alternatives.
- 5.36 The proposed SDL for around 2,500 dwellings is soundly based, subject to provision of adequate infrastructure as detailed in Policy CP20 and Appendix 7 and subject to the changes identified below.

Section : SDLs South of M4	
Changes required:	C11, C19-20, D42, D53, D55, D61, IC1

## *NORTH WOKINGHAM*

### *Sustainability*

- 5.37 As an urban extension to the largest town in the Borough, occupants of the new homes in the SDL would have relatively easy access to a wide range of services. Wokingham is the largest retail centre, which would be within modest walking and cycling distances of all parts of the SDL, along routes which could be improved as part of the master planning of the area. Policy CP21 and the Concept Statement for the SDL provides for the improvement of existing bus services and the railway station is within an easy cycle distance, and a manageable, albeit long, walk. I support the inclusion within the SDL boundary the Toutley Industrial Estate and an adjoining site for expansion employment **[D45, D48]**. This would widen the number and range of employment opportunities in and near the SDL, including those accessible by public transport elsewhere and in Wokingham itself.

### *Capacity*

- 5.38 The projected capacity of about 1,500 dwellings includes two sites at the eastern end of the designated area for 180 homes which already have permission or were allocated in the WDLP. I agree with the Council that the density of the remaining development

should be around 30-35 dph, to reflect the nature of existing estates to which the new SDL would be appended. These areas have been built at between 27 and 41 dph. All modelling and population projections, including contentious traffic forecasting concerning the proposed Northern Relief Road (NRR), have been made on this basis. The density strategy also has received local support. The site suffers from a number of constraints, including the need to provide adequate SANG, attenuate noise and prevent air pollution from the A329(M), avoid flood risk zones and retain a gap at the eastern end of the area near Coppid Beech. The evidence of the Council and North Wokingham Consortium (NWC) indicates that these constraints can be dealt with or avoided, but they also reduce potential dwelling numbers in the SDL, unless unacceptably high densities are proposed for the main development areas.

- 5.39 Some higher density development may be acceptable in certain parts of the SDL, depending on the detailed design process. This may lead to the provision of rather more than 1500 dwellings but I consider any change to the projected capacity of 'around' 1500 would not be justified.

#### *Infrastructure & transport*

- 5.40 The contributions expected from the developers' consortium towards new infrastructure are comparable with other SDLs and new neighbourhoods elsewhere in the country, for example at Milton Keynes. The extent to which the developers should fund a new NRR of the A329 from the M4 overbridge to Coppid Beech roundabout remains in dispute. At the time of the hearings the Council's consultants had not concluded detailed modelling of all traffic options, but the Council's preferred option at the time was the combination of a partial NRR route and a new partial interchange on the A329(M) at Ashridge. I note that a full interchange cannot be accommodated due to the proximity of junction 10 on M4, less than 2km to the west.
- 5.41 The two roads linking the A329 with the western end of the SDL, Old Forest Road and Emmbrook Road, both have one way traffic sections at narrow bridges under and over the railway. From my knowledge of the area and residents' comments, it would be surprising if the addition of a large number of new homes did not put unacceptable pressure on the roads if a full new link to the A329 were not provided.
- 5.42 However, Policy CP21 of the CS includes the NRR as part of the proposed development to be provided. In response to the North Wokingham Consortium (NWC) the Council has suggested changes to Appendix 7 setting out necessary infrastructure for the SDL, which states that the developers should provide 'necessarily and directly related parts' of the new route and other infrastructure

**[D56-59]**. I consider that this is appropriate, to allow further modelling at master planning stage. While the extent of new route will have some impact on the viability of the SDL, the Appendix gives sufficient flexibility, for example through the required level of affordable housing, so that the overall deliverability of the SDL would not be threatened. Without being the subject of a formal recommendation, I consider the Council should undertake further investigation and modelling as an essential pre-requisite to master planning (see section 9).

- 5.43 In response to NWC, the Council has suggested a change **[D59]** which modifies the requirement of the developer to pay a proportionate contribution towards the proposed Park and Ride facility at Coppid Beech roundabout. I consider this provides a reasonable basis on which to plan for a facility which fully accords with the sustainable transport objectives of the strategy.

#### *Education*

- 5.44 On the surface, the suggested relocation of the Emmbrook secondary school, located very close to the SDL, appears somewhat illogical. However, the rationalisation of provision, to achieve a better balance of places throughout the Borough, would achieve efficiency savings through larger schools, together with the opportunity for a wider curriculum at all venues. St Crispin's School, within a reasonable walk of the much of the SDL area, is to be expanded to cater for pupils from both Wokingham SDLs. I agree with the Council that this strategy appears soundly based in town planning terms.

#### *Deliverability/viability*

- 5.45 Although development with a higher number of dwellings would be more robust, the consortium did not dispute that the proposals in the CS would be viable, subject to the length of NRR and the level of affordable housing provision. In order to provide more flexibility in current economic circumstances, the Council has suggested a change which cross references AH provision to the requirements of Policy CP5, with a caveat about viability, without a firm requirement for 35%, which I consider prudent **[D44]**. There appear to be no abnormal costs or problems likely to affect the early deliverability of the first dwellings in the SDL.
- 5.46 Based on the information contained in the SHLAA, I consider the intended trajectory of development to be realistic. The inclusion of sites at the eastern end of the SDL, formerly allocated in the WDLP, should add to the housing to be provided within the first five years of the Plan.

*Other matters*

5.47 The Wokingham Society raised the issue for deliverability of infrastructure through the mechanism of Policy CP21 and Appendix 7. I appreciate their concerns but consider the Council's approach to be appropriate at this stage. The CS is backed by sufficient evidence to show that the infrastructure provision is realistically achievable. The Appendix sets clear parameters for further master planning work, to be taken forward through the mechanism of a SPD, which will subject to a proper degree of public scrutiny.

*Conclusion*

5.48 Taking all these points into account, I have concluded that the concept of the SDL for around 1,500 dwellings to the north of Wokingham is soundly based, subject to provision of adequate infrastructure as detailed in Policy CP21 and Appendix 7 and subject to the changes identified below.

Section : SDLs North Wokingham	
Changes required:	C12-13, C19-22, D44-45, D56-59

SOUTH WOKINGHAM

*Sustainability*

5.49 Most of the comments about the sustainability of North Wokingham SDL also apply to this SDL on the opposite side of the town. The new dwellings would be located reasonably close to a range of services and employment opportunities in the town centre. The western part of the area is close to other employment at Molly Millars Lane and the Tesco store adjoins its boundary. The site scored well in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for all potential SDL locations. The proposals include a new Southern Distributor Road (SDR), which would be used for a new subsidised bus route with services every 15 minutes. Pedestrian and cycle routes would be provided along the SDR and improvements to existing routes made elsewhere.

*Capacity*

5.50 The capacity of the SDL is agreed by the consortium representing some major land holders within the site and another major housebuilder as being capable of development on their land. Other land is also available within the area but detailed proposals for exact densities and parcels of development would have to be finalised at master planning stage. I support the Council's proposed SDL boundary to include two other sites which would form a logical

southern boundary to the SDL, without encroaching further into the gap between the SDL and Finchampstead.

### *Transport*

- 5.51 The Council's traffic modelling shows that the SDR and town centre junctions and roads would satisfactorily accommodate the increased traffic generated by the SDL based on car ownership at a rate of 1.6 per household. Contrary to residents' fears, congestion in Wokingham town centre is projected to decrease slightly, by 2026, as a result of the relief provided by the SDR and accompanying measures, including an improvement to the southern railway bridge on the A321 Finchampstead Road at the western end of the SDL area. The existing level crossing by the station is an acknowledged constraint that would be extremely difficult and expensive to improve.

### *Infrastructure*

- 5.52 In the absence of any firm advice from Network Rail, it is impossible to determine with any certainty whether the new rail halt advocated by the Council would be feasible, practical or viable. Given its relatively close proximity to Wokingham Station in railway terms, even if placed at the eastern end of the site, I find it hard to imagine that it would be worthwhile operationally, especially if bus services within the town were improved. I support the Council's suggested changes **[C24-28]** which reflect the uncertainty about the feasibility and deliverability of the 'intermediate station', but allows for the safeguarding of this desirable objective in the interim.
- 5.53 The consortium has indicated that the SDL would be viable, taking into account major costs such as the SDR, including a new bridge over the Waterloo line railway, removal of the Waterloo Road level crossing, contributions to other works, public transport support and provision of a primary school and SANG. This is based on a full assessment of viability through a supplementary statement. I support the Council's suggested changes clarifying these matters **[C30-36]**.

### *Other matters*

- 5.54 There is a known problem with flooding at the nearby Woodcraze Manor Estate and part of the SDL area lies with flood risk zones 2 and 3, as shown on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). However, the EA has raised no objection to the projected capacity of the SDL, which reflects the need to meet the objectives of Policy CP1 and PPS25 to avoid building new homes in areas at high risk of flooding. There is no dispute that adequate and suitably located areas of SANG can be provided to meet the requirements of Policy CP8, the overarching policy for all SANG provision. As with other SDLs, I suggest revisions to reflect my findings on the supporting

text regarding household size by deleting reference to the exact area likely to be needed **[IC2]**. I consider the requirement in Policy CP22 to retain the gap between Wokingham and Bracknell is soundly based, reflecting the local community's legitimate aspiration to maintain the identity of settlements in a well developed area.

- 5.55 I have concluded that the concept of the SDL for around 2,500 dwellings to the south of Wokingham is soundly based, subject to provision of adequate infrastructure as detailed in Policy CP22 and Appendix 7 and subject to the changes identified below.

Section : SDLs South Wokingham	
Changes required:	C14-15, C24-28, C30-36, D49, IC2

### *ALTERNATIVE SDLS*

#### *Lea Green*

- 5.56 This site considered at the WDLP inquiry under the name of Grazeley, but was not put forward as a potential housing location for the CS in full detail until just before submission in May 2008. the extensive area to the west of the A33 has long term potential for 6,000 dwellings, although at present some 2,500 dwellings in the southern part of the land have been put forward now as an alternative to the South of M4 SDL.
- 5.57 At present the site would fail to score well with regard to sustainability credentials; investment in a full range of facilities would be required. It is within the A33 corridor with good access to employment in Reading but is no better than South of M4 which would have better links to the proposed science park (proposed in Shinfield) and the university. Bus services, a Park and Ride extension, schools and other facilities would all be needed. A free standing settlement could be created but there are no real links to existing villages, unlike the South of M4 area. As an entirely greenfield site it suffers in comparison with Arborfield.
- 5.58 The representors acknowledged that the proposal was several months behind other SDLs with regard to planning. So far no full discussions have been held with the HA about the potential impact of traffic on junction 11 of the M4. As a greenfield site there are unlikely to be any problems of severe delay in site preparation and construction, but a projected trajectory starting in 2012-13 may be optimistic, given the lack of detailed planning so far.
- 5.59 Most of the alternative site lies just outside 5km zone from the nearest SPA but given the possible amount of development some SANG may be required. However, a draft Concept Statement shows that this could easily be provided within the flood zone that

bisects the site. No detailed information about transport has yet been provided but, subject to HA concerns, local issues could be resolved, with investment. Despite the barrier of the M4, there is little separation from Reading to achieve a distinct sense of place. However, the provision of such a large proportion of housing in one location would not meet the objective of having a spread of smaller sustainable communities, on which the CS is based.

- 5.60 There is a potentially highly significant drawback in the proximity of Atomic Weapons Establishment Burghfield, a licensed nuclear site within 1km to the west. Parts of the Lea Green area lie within an emergency planning zone where the Health & Safety Executive recommends deferment of any large scale new residential development. This position may change, pending a proposed programme of engineering improvements in a five to ten year timeframe. Even though some development could take place before then, I consider this to be another drawback of the site.

#### *Airtrack*

- 5.61 This site to the north of the A329(M) is logically more of an extension to Bracknell than Wokingham. Given its separation from the latter, it would undermine the consolidation of Wokingham as focus for sustainable growth. The proposal would be based on a possible new rail station at Amen Corner, which may come forward but is not certain, depending on its business case. The site offers possibilities for self containment but has limited links to the existing settlement at Binfield, and is severed from Wokingham by the A329(M). There are no named development partners and little information about delivery. I consider there would also be an adverse effect on the landscape and the sensitive gap between Wokingham and Bracknell.

#### Overall conclusions on housing and SDLs

- 5.62 Having considered all the representations about the SDLs and the Council's housing strategy, I consider the balance of provision will be appropriate. Reasonable alternatives to the SDLs, including boundary revisions, have been the subject of Sustainability Assessment (SA) [CD 09/25] and investigated properly. The shortcomings of Arborfield Garrison as a sustainable location could be overcome through positive measures to increase accessibility and create a reasonably high level of self-containment. The South of M4 builds on existing communities and would be well linked to Reading along the A327 corridor. Both North and South Wokingham will have good access to improved public transport and a range of facilities.
- 5.63 I appreciate the concerns of residents opposed to development in their locality and their wish to protect their existing amenity. However, the requirements of the SEP for a substantial increase in

housing within the Borough have to be met. Subject to suitable requirements about the provision of necessary services and infrastructure, I consider the strategy will meet the housing objective while maintaining the quality of the environment valued by the local community. In summary, taking into account a wide number of factors such as landscape impact, traffic congestion, sustainability objectives, protection of the SPA, I consider that putting the majority of new housing in the designated SDLs is the most suitable and balanced way forward.

## **6 AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

*Are the targets and thresholds for the provision of affordable housing in CP5 supported by up to date evidence of need and viability? Is the policy consistent with PPS3? Is the expected level of Affordable Housing deliverable? What effect would the requirements have on the viability of housing schemes, including the SDLs?*

- 6.1 The base context for affordable housing (AH) policy in Wokingham is provided by the SHMA which indicated an annual need for between 400 and 550 affordable dwellings. The Council commissioned an Affordable Housing Viability Study (AHVS-CD 10/01), which was carried out in Spring 2008. This indicated that it would be impossible to provide the level of AH advocated by the SHMA, which amounts to some two thirds of the SEP overall annual requirement. The overall target figure in Policy CP5 of up to 50% of in all schemes of over 5 dwellings was supported by evidence from the AHVS, taking into account a number of variables such as house sale prices, building costs, interest rates etc, valid at that time. Subsequently, there has been a dramatic change in the national and local housing market, which has fundamentally affected the assumptions and modelling of the study. An updated evidence base (CD10/01A) was published in March 2009.
- 6.2 The normal minimum size threshold above which affordable housing should be provided is 15 dwellings. However, #29 of PPS3 indicates that a lower threshold may be used, if justified by local circumstances. Bearing in mind the very high level of demand shown in the SHMA, the generally high price levels throughout the Borough compared with the national average, I consider the lower threshold of 5 dwellings is justified. Also, the CS indicates that there is little scope to enlarge the boundaries of some settlements in the Borough, particularly the Reading suburbs north of the M4, and that a substantial proportion of new dwellings (other than the SDLs) are likely to come forward on small sites through the Site Allocations DPD.
- 6.3 The AHVS and its update constructed a number of scenarios for assessing viability as a proportion of Gross Development Value

(GDV). The updated study took full account of the housing downturn up to February 2009 and some reduction in construction costs, although finance costs were assumed to remain at 2008 levels. Future income levels were assumed to continue rising. It included allowances for other Section 106 payments for new infrastructure, schools, SANG etc. The scenarios tested significant falls in sales values of up to 40% from the market peak of 2007 and three different tenure mixes, involving social rent and either shared ownership or intermediate rent.

- 6.4 All the scenarios were tested against the rather complicated matrix of housing development types listed in Policy CP5. The models assumed that no additional public subsidy would be available, in accordance with #29 of PPS3 and #19 of the accompanying Delivering Affordable Housing Guidance note. While the range of development types is large, the initial study indicates that the potential costs and viability of providing AH on different types of site are real and should be taken into account, to ensure a realistic approach is followed.
- 6.5 In summary, the analysis showed that the maximum AH target of 50% is not viable in the majority of development locations using the four testing scenarios. However, provision at the minimum target level in Policy CP5 would be achievable in the two most optimistic scenarios (1 and 2), without grant subsidy, although on PDL some change to the Council's preferred tenure mix of 70:30 social rent: shared ownership would be required. On the more pessimistic scenarios even with much more flexibility with regard to tenure mix, subsidy would be required to meet the targets.
- 6.6 Clearly, making predictions about housing viability in times of significant change is fraught with uncertainty. However, given the possibility that the more pessimistic predictions may come to pass, I consider it essential that the policy incorporates sufficient flexibility to allow a reduced rate of AH to be provided in mixed developments (rather than no housing at all). The Council has suggested a change **[D12]** to provide such flexibility to take into account viability and site specific issues. The ability to vary tenure mix is also suggested. In similar vein, the policy allows for some flexibility in the target of 35% AH provision in the SDLs to take into account the potential viability of the proposals.
- 6.7 In these circumstances I am satisfied that the targets for affordable housing and their qualifications are justified by robust and up to date evidence. The viability studies provide a firm foundation for the detailed thresholds and percentages for different types of housing sites set out in Policy CP5 of the CS. The explanatory text to Policy CP5 and the proposed changes to requirements for the SDLs allow for negotiations to take place, not just on the overall percentage but on the mix of social rent/intermediate housing, where viability is shown to be an issue **[D11-12]**. This acceptable,

pragmatic approach gives a clear indication that the policy will be applied flexibly, especially in a changing economic climate. The amended policy context for affordable housing and financial contributions is realistic and would not frustrate the provision of a range of housing to meet all needs.

Section : 6 Affordable Housing	
Changes required:	D11-12

## 7 COUNTYSIDE POLICY AND GAPS

*Is Policy CP11 sufficiently flexible?*

- 7.1 Policy CP11 seeks to restrict development in the countryside outside defined settlement limits, in line with established practice and the gist of PPS7 and the SEP, with which it conforms. Its broad thrust has been received much support from the local community. The policy has some flexibility in that it allows some types of development, principally those that support the rural economy, as per change [C9]. I agree with the Council that it need go no further.

*Should Policy CP12 be reviewed?*

- 7.2 The evidence base for the CS shows how development needs for the period to 2026 can be accommodated without recourse to use of land within the green belt. Therefore no exceptional circumstances exist to justify a review of the extent of the green belt or its policy context. Although Policy CP12 adds nothing to national or regional policy it is not unsound for that reason.

*Is Policy CP13 consistent with the SE Plan? Is the retention of gaps justified by local circumstances? Are the boundaries of gaps robust and justified?*

- 7.3 Policy CP13 seeks to continue from Policy WCC2 of the WDLP an additional layer of protection for those parts of the countryside between settlements, to protect their identity. Through Policy CC6 the SEP endorses the creation of sustainable and distinctive communities but does not include any policy which specifically allows for gaps; indeed the former Policy CC10b – Strategic gaps was deleted from the final version of the SEP by the SoS. Paragraph 21.9 of the SEP refers to policy in PPS7, which relates to the protection of landscapes rather than the partly different matter of settlement identity. LPAs are advised to review any gap policies in the context of that guidance and to ensure that there is no duplication with policies to protect the green belt. The reason given for the deletion was to ensure that LPAs manage development

needs in a pro-active way rather than rely on restrictive controls which may prevent sustainable development.

- 7.4 The local community and many representors are agreed that the protection of the local identity of the settlements in the Borough is a sound objective. Given the pattern of development that exists in the Borough south of the green belt, where a number of settlements are close together, I recognise that some form of local designation to protect particularly sensitive areas from development that leads to the coalescence of towns and villages may be appropriate. However, I share the concerns of some developers that the CS mechanism of a policy based on the detailed gaps shown on the WDLP, carried forward into the new proposals map, is unduly restrictive. The Council has already recognised that such an approach would not work with regard to land within the SDLs, as indicated in change D29. Although these areas cover some land that should be retained as a gap between settlements, the master planning process will identify which parts of the SDLs should be developed, subject to criteria in Policies CP19-22 and accompanying text in Appendix 7.
- 7.5 While the adjoining Bracknell Forest Borough CS has a policy that refers to the protection of gaps, that was approved before the SEP had been finalised. I note the report of previous WDLP inspector that gaps had not been revised for some time. The Council commissioned a study of all existing gaps and potential new gaps which concluded in 2006 (CBA study CD 10/04), with recommendations for no major changes to the defined areas. A further study (CD10/08) assessed three gaps in the light of a clear need to provide more housing outside the urban areas, to inform the strategy for the SDLs.
- 7.6 Having considered the matter carefully I have come to the conclusion that policy as stated is too restrictive, not just with regard to the SDLs. Some expansion of designated major/modest/limited settlements is likely to be required to provide the 1,000 dwellings from that source. In the interim period while the Housing Sites Allocations DPD is being prepared, the countryside would be protected by the application of Policy CP11, which would prevent any coalescence of settlements. I therefore recommend that Policy CP13 be deleted along with the saved gaps on the Proposals Map and in the SDLs **[IC3]**. I agree that the critical gaps in the SDLs should be shown on the CS key diagram on the lines as originally set out in the Council's proposed change **[D61]**. I recommend that the issue of identifying any other key gaps should be addressed as part of the Site Allocations DPD, when the justification for any gaps and the precise definition of boundaries could be re-examined with proper public scrutiny.

Section : 7 Countryside and Gaps
----------------------------------

Changes required: C9, D61, IC3
--------------------------------

## 8 BIODIVERSITY/ECOLOGY

*Is Policy CP7 consistent with PPS9? Should international/regional/local sites be differentiated in a more specific way?*

- 8.1 The principles of Policy CP7 to protect important nature conservation sites are soundly based and fully in accord with government policy in PPS9. However, the original drafting of the policy appeared to give equal weight to all sites, whatever their significance and level of designation. The Council has accepted that some re-ordering of the policy to bring it into line with the sequential test of PPS9 1(vi) would be appropriate and has suggested changes **[B13, C3, D14]**. I confirm that the change is necessary to make the CS sound, with the addition of the words ' *that would result in less or no harm*' to change B13.

*Will Policy CP8 provide for the proper protection of the SPAs? Is it adequately specific regarding the SANGs size requirements, access management, mitigation requirements? Does CP8 accord with latest case law, regional guidance and national policy?*

- 8.2 The principle that the CS should meet legal requirements for the adequate safeguarding of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA was accepted by all representors. Although covered by the SEP and national guidance, the policy deals with an important issue which has significant local implications.
- 8.3 Dealing with the factors affecting mitigation in turn, the distance thresholds of 400m and 5km, measured as the crow flies, have now been finalised in the SEP and further debate is superfluous. The general prohibition in normal circumstances of any new housing within 400m is now established in Policy NRM6 of the SEP. Although the additional requirement for individual schemes of over 50 dwellings within 7km of the SPA is not part of SEP Policy NRM6, in accordance with #9.33 of the SEP I consider this to be a reasonable measure to ensure that the substantial new housing schemes proposed in the CS do not adversely affect the SPA.
- 8.4 The provision of SANG at a rate of 8 ha per 1,000 population accords with NE advice and regional policy. However, the application of an estimated average household size of 2.55 was disputed. This figure was taken from the 2001 census for Wokingham and compares with a lower average of 2.43 for all authorities in the same year. While in the past household sizes in Wokingham may have been higher than average, reflecting its status as a family housing area, the rather higher proposed densities of the SDLs may well accommodate smaller households. I note the SPA Delivery Framework Document (CD07/16) assumed an average of 2.4 and the Council's survey in 2004 had a figure of

2.43. Bearing in mind that the general trend for household size to fall over time, and that the guideline of 8ha per 1,000 was itself a precautionary figure, I consider a figure of 2.4 would be sufficiently robust to provide adequate mitigation and I recommend accordingly **[IC4, modifying necessary change D21]**. This change would slightly reduce the costs of SANG provision, assisting viability and the provision of other infrastructure, together with affordable housing.

- 8.5 The Council has suggested changes to the wording of the policy and supporting text to reflect the need to take account of the cumulative effect of significant impacts and the effects of other non-residential development**[F7, D20/F9]**. This is essential for the CS to be sound.
- 8.6 I consider the policy sets out reasonable requirements for developers to contribute to SPA access management and habitat measures, in accordance with the SPA Delivery Framework, to mitigate fully the impact of new development, whether SANG is provided on site or not.
- 8.7 With regard to the requirements for SANG in the SDLs, the Council has proposed a change to take into account the likelihood that the exact amount of land needed cannot be ascertained with certainty until full details of development areas, densities and dwelling numbers have been finalised. If the criteria for SANG provision, as modified with regard to assumed household size are clearly spelt out in the CS I see no need for the illustrative figures for the amount of SANG to be set out in Policies CP19-22 and the relevant parts of Appendix 7. Accordingly, I recommend a change deleting these areas **[IC2]**.
- 8.8 A related matter concerns open space standards generally; SANGs are additional to 4.65 ha per 1000 population required for general open space, an updating of old 6 acre standard. I agree that some doubling up of SANG and greenspace would be acceptable at 1 ha per 1,000 population**[D10]**. Allotments appear to be accounted for in addition to this.

Section : 8 Biodiversity	
Changes required:	B13, C3, D10, D14, D20/F9, F7, IC2, IC4/D21

## 9 TRANSPORTATION

*Will CP6 reduce car borne travel in accordance with national policy?  
Is Policy CP10 based on reasonable evidence about future car ownership levels and robust traffic modelling assumptions? Is adequate funding available for delivery?*

- 9.1 The Council's approach is consistent with national policies and the South East Plan insofar as it combines a demand management approach of managing and monitoring travel demands, together with investment in infrastructure and services to mitigate the effects of new development. A number of initiatives were proposed to achieve traffic restraint, including: improvements to footpath and cycle path networks; rail and bus service improvements; and requirements for travel plans for all major schemes. Policy CP6 has received wide support in principle and some element of restraint has been factored into the Council's modelling. Although some representors argued that the assumptions about the likely impact of demand reduction were unrealistic, the Council indicated that these had been refined by incorporating some modal split changes later in the plan period. I consider the quoted underlying figure of 11% for traffic reduction through demand management to be robust.
- 9.2 The projected traffic modelling which informed the transport infrastructure requirements set out in Policy CP10 was based on car ownership levels originating from the 2001 census, the most comprehensive set of data, and TEMPRO data. I agree with a number of professional witnesses who did not dispute that this was a reasonable approach. At present many roads in the Borough are congested at peak times. The Council's modelling suggests that once all expected development has been completed by 2026 the situation would be improved, subject to the range of measures and the infrastructure set out in Policy CP10 being implemented and provided.
- 9.3 The HA maintained an objection to the CS on the basis that the strategy should incorporate wording explaining how any adverse effects of schemes on the SRN would be mitigated, including funding sources for any necessary measures, as advised in PPS12 , #4.8-12. However, I consider the level of detail being sought by the HA at this stage to be unduly onerous; it could well frustrate the recently agreed requirements of the SEP for substantial new housing growth to take place in the Borough if the CS were found unsound for this reason. I consider the suggested changes put forward by the Council to include reference to the Long Term Transport Strategy (LTTS) which will inform any future infrastructure tariff to support any measures to mitigate traffic impact on the SRN would be adequate [C1, C2]. Another necessary change adds improvements to junction 10 of the M4 to the list of required infrastructure in the table in CP10 [C8].

- 9.4 As discussed in the section dealing with North Wokingham SDL, I am not convinced that the traffic modelling has been sufficiently robust in assessing the likely impact on residential streets leading to and from a partial NRR. It is clear to me that extra traffic from 1,500 new dwellings would increase the pressure on already constrained residential roads if no new outlets at each end of a partial NRR were to be provided. At present the CS does not include any firm requirement for a new partial interchange on the A329(M) at Ashridge. This may enable some benefits through the reduction of traffic in Wokingham town centre. However, these benefits and the new housing development should not be achieved at a disproportionate cost to local residents through increased traffic in a residential environment.
- 9.5 The Council's updated modelling did not include an assessment of the partial NRR/ no Ashridge interchange option. It seems to me that this issue should be re-considered as master planning of the SDL develops. However, the requirements of Policy CP21 and Appendix 7 allow for 'necessary and directly related' parts of the NRR to support the development. I consider this requirement for proportionate infrastructure is sufficient to ensure that the Council could ensure that a full or extended partial version of the NRR and/or the A329(M) interchange could be provided if necessary. If a new junction onto the A329(M) is required as a result of the SDL, it would be appropriate to require the developers to mitigate any impact on the SRN.
- 9.6 The Council's position on the A327/A33 link through the S of M4 SDL is ambiguous; Appendix 7.22(a) and 7.28 a)i require a safeguarded route pending further investigation and traffic modelling, taking into account the impact of demand management. As discussed in section 5 above, I can appreciate the difficulties for master planning created by this requirement and recommend its deletion **[IC1]**.
- 9.7 I agree the Council's change that Coppid Beech Park and Ride should be funded through proportionate developer contributions from both North and South Wokingham SDL sites **[D59, C35]**.
- 9.8 I deal with the issue of funding in section 12 below. The schedule in CP10 gives good indication of where expected funding will be obtained. I consider this to be a reasonable hook on which to hang further work, if necessary for a detailed SPD, an infrastructure DPD or CIL schedule of tariffs, any or all of which should be subject to public scrutiny. The SDLs should provide opportunities to improve infrastructure; for example South Wokingham can relieve some town centre congestion, improve a bridge, and provide bus services in a viable development.

Section : 9 Transportation	
Changes required:	C1-2, C8, C35, C38, D59, IC1

## 10 RETAIL & TOWN CENTRES

*Is Policy CP14 consistent with PPS6? Are the primary frontages policy and retail hierarchy justified? What is the delivery mechanism for rejuvenating Wokingham, as in CP15?*

- 10.1 Policy CP14 seeks to protect and maintain the roles of the town centre of Wokingham and designated district and village centres, including (as an essential change) a new district centre at Arborfield Garrison. This is consistent with the 'town centre first' policy of PPS6, which is continued in the emerging guidance in PPS4. The retail hierarchy is based on the WDLP and confirmed as appropriate by the up to date 2007 Retail Study (CD 10/15). Wokingham itself is clearly the main centre in the Borough.
- 10.2 While the Retail Study shows the potential for retail growth, particularly through development of the SDLs, there is no strong need at present to revise the primary retail frontages shown on the WDLP and retained on the saved Proposals Map. I agree with the Council that it would be logical to review these frontages as part of the Development Management and Site Allocations DPD, taking into account further information about the master planning of the SDLs.
- 10.3 The Retail Study indicates that providing extra convenience floorspace in the SDLs to serve new housing would not have an adverse effect on the town and district centres or the hierarchy, subject to floorspace limits identified in Appendix 7. I endorse the Council's suggested change setting out the store sizes and the essential requirement that they be limited to selling primarily convenience goods. **[D52-53]**
- 10.4 Policy CP15 seeks the rejuvenation of Wokingham town centre, one of the key spatial aims of the CS. The Council has produced a draft Town Centre Development Guide (CD09/23) which sets the context for a number of sites. This will be adopted as SPD to inform production of briefs for development sites. Some of these sites, including part of Peach Place on the west side of Peach Street, are owned by the Council. A scheme here is active. **[D31]**

Section : 10 Retail and town centres
--------------------------------------

Changes required: D31, D52-53
-------------------------------

## 11 EMPLOYMENT

*Have the employment areas been identified correctly? Are there omissions? Should Policy CP16 allow for the growth of rural enterprises?*

- 11.1 Core Employment Areas (CEAs) have been identified in Policy CP16, having regard to the employment areas shown on the WDLP and two Employment Land Reviews (CD10/2,3). In accordance with

Policy WCBV2 of the SEP, the Council's approach is to concentrate employment in existing areas, which should meet new employment development needs through more efficient use of the sites. The CEAs lie at sustainable locations within the development limits of the major settlements.

- 11.2 The Council acknowledge that other smaller sites also play a useful role in providing employment elsewhere, including rural areas. However, it would conflict with sustainability objectives of the strategy to designate additional areas that did not meet the minimum size criterion of 4 ha as required by #6.30 of the WDLP. Other smaller established sites, such as the business estate at Lambs Lane, Spencers Wood, could be recognised as having scope for consolidation or limited additional development through the Development Management and Allocations DPD. I do not see this site as a single entity with the nearby Heron Industrial Estate or as a suitable location for significant expansion; it lies outside the clear boundary of an outlying part of Spencers Wood.
- 11.3 The Council has suggested changes to the policy, including an addition which allows for a range of employment opportunities, including start-ups and the expansion of existing businesses. These are needed to meet the general objectives of PPG4 and emerging PPS4 to support the economy **[D32-33]**. Subject to these changes and the cross reference to Policy CP11 with regard to rural enterprises outside the development limits **[D34]**, I consider the CS would satisfactorily support the retention and creation of sustainable employment opportunities in the widest sense. Overall, I find that the CS is sound as regards provision for employment.

*Is the Science Park justified and deliverable? Should a firm location be identified? Is the suggested location as part of the S of M4 SDL sustainable in transportation terms, including the impact on the strategic road network?*

#### *Deliverability*

- 11.4 The Regional Economic Strategy (CD05/07) promotes the development of science and innovation campuses and Reading is identified as one of eight 'diamonds' for investment and growth. The need for a science park to support and expand the local economy was justified by the research carried out as part of the Employment Land Study (CD10/2). Policy CP17 of the CS proposes in general terms a Science Park in Shinfield parish, without identifying a specific site. The wording of the policy is consistent with # 21.13 of the SEP, which encourages the Greater Reading authorities to work together to facilitate the expansion and diversification of Reading University as a promoter of research and development in collaboration with the private sector via the development of a research-based science park within the Greater Reading area that may require the release of greenfield land.

#21.16 states that any housing development in the Shinfield/Spencers Wood/Three Mile Cross area should have regard to the potential development of a science park. However, I read neither of these paragraphs as determinative that the science park has to be located in Shinfield parish.

- 11.5 Nevertheless, the policy is supported by Reading University, which has significant landholdings in the area and is actively promoting a site to the north east of Shinfield at land north of Cutbush Lane. The university has suggested an initial phase of 20,000 sq m to be built up by 2016, with further development later in the Plan period. The floorspace in the first phase would replace a CEA at The Manor, Shinfield, designated in the WDLP; this is proposed for deletion in accordance with #4.72 of the CS and Proposals map change PM24.
- 11.6 The science park could be accommodated here in conjunction with the development of the South of M4 SDL, providing employment within walking and cycling distance of the new housing. However, I agree with the Council and the university that the Science park and SDL are separate identities, even though the detailed masterplanning of each would have to take into account the other. Policies CP4, CP6 and CP10 provide mechanisms to ensure that adequate infrastructure can be delivered to support the proposal. Of critical importance is the proposed Eastern Relief Road for Shinfield, part of which would also serve the science park. The likely site is accessible to the A327 corridor, along which many of the university's buildings are located, which is a significant advantage in securing strong links between the research and development arms/aspects of the collaborative venture.

#### *Other sites*

- 11.7 I have considered whether the policy sets out the best option for the science park, having regard to other potential sites, in particular Green Park in Reading. Although the landowners of that site claim good links with the local business community in Reading and some sites in this newly developed business park are vacant, there appear to be several problems with progressing the proposals here.
- 11.8 Firstly, there is uncertainty that enough premises of a suitable size, type and location would be available for the long term aspirations for a science park of up to 55,000 sq m. Secondly, Green Park lies close to the A33 corridor into Reading, but not the A327 corridor along which much of the university is situated. Critically, the university itself, an essential partner in any scheme, was not keen to progress the scheme in preference to the Shinfield proposal. Finally, the philosophy behind retro-fitting the Park to an already planned development pattern development and existing buildings is likely to be different from a university led scheme which can evolve to meet the specialist needs of different enterprises within the science park. It is far from certain that these B1 premises would

be physically suitable or let on terms to suitable occupiers who would meet the restricted entry requirements for a successful science park concerning research and development operations and strong linkages to the university.

- 11.9 Other sites suggested during the examination all suffered fundamental drawbacks. Suttons Business Park provides valuable industrial floorspace and is poorly linked to the university in accessibility terms. Bulmershe Campus at Woodley has limited scope for transport improvements and is too small. Whiteknights Campus is the main educational facility of the university, which needs to be retained.

*Transportation effects*

- 11.10 As previously mentioned, the location of a science park at Shinfield would have good access to the A327 corridor and occupants could contribute to and take advantage of improved bus services as proposed in the S of M4 SDL proposals. I note that the HA is concerned about the impact on junction 11 of the M4 of development beyond the 20,000 sq m first phase. However, it is too early to provide detailed information about the likely evolution of the proposal beyond 2016 and hence to calculate with any acceptable degree of certainty the likely effects on the strategic road network. However, Junction 11 of M4 has been subject to a very substantial scheme of capacity improvements, which take its physical scope for widening to its limit. Henceforth the only possible improvements are likely to be in traffic and transport management, not increased physical capacity. Nevertheless, other policies in the CS provide adequate foundation to ensure that proper travel plans would be put in place.
- 11.11 Ideally, a very clear direction about such an important strategic proposal as the science park should be included within the CS. However, I appreciate that the timescale for progressing the scheme was not aligned with the CS programme and that the relevant parties were not in a position to undertake full consultation about a detailed site specific proposal before the CS was published. No Regulation 32 consultation had taken place before the examination hearings on the University's proposed site off Cutbush Lane. In these circumstances, the wording of Policy CP17 could not be taken further. From the evidence presented at the examination, I consider there is no better alternative to the development of a science park at Shinfield, which appears to be deliverable. Subject to the Council's suggested change to the explanatory text of #s 4.75 and 4.76 regarding the pace of development, necessary procedures for consultation and the mix of uses, I consider the policy to be justified and effective **[D35-37]** .

Section : 11 Employment and Science Park	
Changes required:	D32-37

## 12 INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS (CP4, CP10)

*Is Policy CP4 consistent with Circular 05/2005? What will be the effect on the deliverability of development in the current economic climate? Is there flexibility to deal with any policy changes, such as the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy?*

- 12.1 Policy CP4 sets out the broad principles for infrastructure requirements, as a peg to enable further guidance to be prepared which will outline detailed requirements. The Council intend to produce an Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Obligations SPD and a Master Plan SPD for each SDL which will give greater clarity. A schedule of projected improvements to the Strategic Transport network is set out in the schedule to Policy CP10, with anticipated funding mechanisms/providers. More specific information about infrastructure to be provided in the SDLs is contained in Policies CP19-22 and Appendix 7.
- 12.2 While the CS does not give detailed costings and programmes, the Council has already prepared a draft Infrastructure Delivery Schedule which provides such information. I consider the approach provides enough information to be consistent with Circular 05/2005, given the strategic nature of the CS. With the exceptions which I have already recommended for deletion, including the A33/A327 link, and subject to other changes concerning proportionality, the items of transport infrastructure listed in CP10 accord with policy tests of 05/2005 in that they are needed to mitigate the effects of the developments proposed in the CS. The Council's approach would allow for some flexibility in phasing through the SPD process, or through the conversion of the SPD if the Community Infrastructure Levy is introduced. Either of these processes would be subject to full consultation or formal examination, depending on the regulatory framework in place at the time.
- 12.3 A substantial proportion of the planned infrastructure, including provision of schools and open space as well as transport programmes, would be delivered through the major development sites, particularly the SDLs. From the evidence base, including representations to the examination hearings, all consortia involved indicated that in broad terms the proposals were viable, notwithstanding the downturn in the housing market during and since 2008. It would be possible to prioritise key infrastructure elements during the Master planning process, which might allow some items to be deferred, depending on economic circumstances. Some flexibility may be needed in the application of requirements for the level of affordable housing, or the provision of open space, for example. In other matters, such as the requirement for affordable housing to contribute towards education facilities, there may be little or no scope for flexibility. However, I have come to the firm conclusion that in general terms adequate infrastructure can be delivered and the strategy is sound. The overall strategy to

concentrate development in the SDLs will help to meet objectives to create balanced communities living in attractive environments, with good access to a range of facilities by a variety of transport modes.

### 13 OTHER MATTERS

*Are the criteria for the selection of gypsy and traveller sites consistent with national policy?*

- 13.1 Policy CP2 sets out criteria for the allocation of sites for additional gypsy and traveller pitches, for site selection in a subsequent DPD. Following discussion at the examination, the Council has proposed a change to the wording to indicate a firm commitment to provide any pitches that are required by any further guidance to be published by the SEP. This is necessary to comply with the advice of Circular 01/2006 and to make the CS sound **[D9]**. Whilst local needs will inform the scale of provision required, there is nothing in Circular 1/2006 which supports limiting the occupation of any permitted sites only to those with local connections and therefore this criterion (i) of CP2 d) should be deleted to be consistent with government policy **[IC5]**.

*Whether the policies dealing with climate change and renewable energy are justified by local evidence and consistent with national policy.*

- 13.2 Elements of Policy CP1 seek to minimise the effects of climate change in the move towards zero carbon growth through energy efficiency, promoting the use of renewable energy sources and green construction methods in accordance with best practice. This is carried forward through the overall strategy which directs development to more sustainable locations, aims to reduce the need to travel and provides for more sustainable travel modes.
- 13.3 Representors queried some aspects of Policy CP1, including the level of detail. The requirements of policy CP1 are not any more onerous than national standards and I consider it forms a satisfactory basis for further guidance to be provided in the Sites and Development Policies DPD.

*Whether the provisions for monitoring the CS are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.*

- 13.4 The monitoring targets and indicators in the CS have been produced following national guidance in Local Development Framework Monitoring – A Good Practice Guide. In general they provide an effective means of monitoring progress through the Annual Monitoring Report of each authority and other programmes such as the LTP. I consider that, overall, the monitoring provisions are justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

*Whether the Proposals Map, Key Diagram and plans are justified and effective.*

13.5 Minor changes to the Proposals Map are included in the Council's schedule of changes; these are acceptable and do not raise issues of soundness.

*Minor changes*

13.6 I have considered all the other points made in the representations and during the examination, including all of the changes suggested by the Council and listed in their schedules of changes, and those put forward by others, but I find no justification for recommending any further changes to the Core Strategy other than those in Annex A of this report. However, I endorse the suggested minor changes as set out in Annex B of this report because, cumulatively rather than individually, they are necessary in the interests of accuracy and clarity. I also endorse the correction of any other spelling or grammatical errors or any minor formatting/numbering changes that do not affect the sense or meaning of the document.

Section : 13 Other matters	
Changes required:	D9, IC5

## **14 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS**

14.1 I conclude that, with the amendments I recommend, the Wokingham Core Spatial Strategy DPD satisfies the requirements of s20(5) of the 2004 Act and is sound in terms of PPS12.

*Geoff Salter*

INSPECTOR

Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

**Appendix A - Schedule of all Necessary Changes to the CS, including Inspector's Changes**

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change
B13	Policy CP7 (page 45) – second part of policy	Will only be permitted if: i) Mitigation measures can be put in place to prevent damaging impacts; or ii) Appropriate compensation measures to offset the scale and kind of losses are provided; or iii) It has been clearly demonstrated that the need for the proposal outweighs the need to safeguard the nature conservation importance, and that no alternative sites is available which will meet the need.	Will only be permitted if it has been clearly demonstrated that the need for the proposal outweighs the need to safeguard the nature conservation importance, that no alternative site that would result in less or no harm is available which will meet the need; and: i) Mitigation measures can be put in place to prevent damaging impacts; or ii) Appropriate compensation measures to offset the scale and kind of losses are provided.
C1	Paragraph 4.27 (page 40) – Insert before last sentence		As part of the preparation of the Planning Obligations SPD, the Council is preparing a Long Term Transport Strategy (LTTS) to inform the calculation of any tariff. Planning Obligations are likely to be superseded by a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). It is anticipated the documents setting CIL will be subject of public examination. This will include background information such as the LTTS. The LTTS will also assist in the consultation on the Infrastructure Delivery SPD.
C2	Policy CP6 (page 43) – criterion e (replaces change B12	Mitigate any adverse effects upon the transport network that arise from the development proposed.	Mitigate any adverse effects upon the local and strategic transport network that arise from the development proposed.
C3	Policy CP7 (page 44) – criterion A	Which may harm county designated sites (Wildlife Heritage Sites in Berkshire in Berkshire), whether directly or indirectly, or	Which may harm county designated sites (Local Wildlife Sites in Berkshire), whether directly or indirectly, or
C8	Policy CP10 (page 51) – insert additional row		22 – Improvements to M4 Junction 10. Include ticks in columns five and seven (National/regional funding) and (S106 and WBC funds).
C9	Policy CP11 (page 52) – criterion 1	It contributes to diverse and sustainable farming enterprises within the borough, or in the case...	It contributes to diverse and sustainable rural enterprises within the borough, or in the case...
C10	Policy CP19 (page 62) -	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of

## Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

	critterion 6	impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area including at least 71.4 ha of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England's latest standards. This will include sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (subject to monitoring of the quality and quantity standards).
C11	Policy CP20 (page 63) - critterion 6	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area including at least 51 ha of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England's latest standards. This will include sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (subject to monitoring of the quality and quantity standards).
C12	Policy CP21 (page 64) - critterion 6	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area including at least 30.6 ha of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England's latest standards. This will include sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (subject to monitoring of the quality and quantity standards).
C13	Policy CP21 (page 65) - critterion 9	Measures to improve access by non-car modes to Wokingham town centre, including the station interchange	Measures to improve access by non-car modes to Wokingham town centre (including the station interchange)
C14	Policy CP22 (page 66) – critteria 6	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area including at least 51 ha of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England's latest standards. This will include sufficient Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (subject to monitoring of the quality and quantity standards).
C15	Policy CP22 (page 66) - critterion 9	Measures to improve access by non-car modes to Wokingham town centre, including the station interchange	Measures to improve access by non-car modes to Wokingham town centre (including the station interchange)

## Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

C16	Paragraph A7.8 (page 96) – criterion b	Any development scheme should accommodate at least 71.4 hectares of land for SANG within the site boundary	Any development scheme should accommodate sufficient SANG in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England's adopted standards. SANG can be delivered in phases provided each one meets the requirements of c below. c) The provision of SANG within any proposed development scheme for Arborfield Garrison will need to reflect Natural England's quality standards and requirements for size, access, character, availability and function
C18	Paragraph A7.13 (page 98) – criterion d, part i	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Protection Area including at least 71.4 hectares of SANG	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Protection Area..
C19	Paragraph A7.23 (page 102) – criterion b	Any development scheme should accommodate at least 51 hectares of land for SANG	Any development scheme should accommodate sufficient SANG in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England's adopted standards. SANG can be delivered in phases provided each one meets the requirements of c below.
C20	Paragraph A7.28 (page 104) – criterion e, point i	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Protection Area including at least 51 hectares of SANG	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Protection Area..
C21	Paragraph A7.36 (page 108) – criterion b	Any development scheme should accommodate at least 30.6 hectares of land for SANG	Any development scheme should accommodate sufficient SANG in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England's adopted standards. SANG can be delivered in phases provided each one meets the requirements of c below.
C22	Paragraph A7.41 (page 110) – criterion d, part i	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Protection Area including at least 30.6 hectares of SANG	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Protection Area.
C24	Paragraph A7.42 (page 112) – criterion f – Insert additional sentence at end		Reservation of a site for a railway station until 2026 is subject to discussions with Network Rail (and the Department of Transport) confirming both its feasibility and deliverability
C25	Paragraph A7.42 (page	This should be located at the site of the potential	This should be located at the site of the potential railway station

## Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

	112) – criterion g – Last sentence	railway station.	(subject to comment in f above).
C26	Paragraph A7.42 (page 112) – criterion g – Second sentence	It should be located to the south of the railway in close proximity to the railway to permit interaction with a future station.	It should be located to the south of the railway in close proximity to the railway to permit interaction with a future station (subject to comment in f above).
C27	Paragraph A7.44 (page 113) – criterion d	To safeguard the opportunity for a future railway station to enhance the integration of land use and public transport	To safeguard the opportunity for a future railway station to enhance the integration of land use and public transport (subject to paragraph A7.42(f)).
C28	Paragraph A7.47 (page 114) – criterion b	The masterplan for the development should indicate safeguarded land for a future railway station at the public transport interchange site.	The masterplan for the development should indicate safeguarded land for a future railway station at the public transport interchange site (subject to paragraph A7.42(f)).
C30	Paragraph A7.48 (page 114) – criterion b	Any development scheme should accommodate at least 51 hectares of land for SANG	Any development scheme should accommodate sufficient SANG in line with Policy CP8 to meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations and in accordance with Natural England's adopted standards. SANG can be delivered in phases provided each one meets the requirements of c below.
C31	Paragraph A7.53 (page 115) - criterion a, part iii	Improvement to A321 Finchampstead Road bridges.	Improvement to A321 Finchampstead Road bridge on the line to Guildford and contribute to the improvement to the bridge on the line to Waterloo.
C32	Paragraph A7.53 (page 115) - criterion a, part iv	Reading Road to Wellington Road (station) link, Wokingham	Contribute to Reading Road to Wellington Road (station) link, Wokingham
C33	Paragraph A7.53 (page 115) - criterion a, part vi	Rebuilding Wokingham station as a transport interchange.	Contribute to rebuilding Wokingham station as a transport interchange.
C34	Paragraph A7.53 (page 116) - criterion a, part viii	Investigation of scope for new railways stations to directly serve the development	Investigation of scope for a new railway station to directly serve the development (subject to paragraph A7.42(f)).
C35	Paragraph A7.53 (page 116) – criterion a, part ix	Provide a Park and Ride near Coppid Beech roundabout on A329 in Wokingham.	Contribute towards Park and Ride near Coppid Beech roundabout on A329 in Wokingham.
C36	Paragraph A7.53 (page 116) – criterion e, part i	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Protection Area including at least 51 hectares of SANG	Necessary measures to avoid and mitigate the impact of development upon the Thames Basin Heaths Protection Area..
D9	Paragraph 4.15 (page 37) – last two sentences.	The initial joint Berkshire work indicates a need for between 14 and 23 additional permanent gypsies pitches in the borough to 2026. If sites are	The meeting of the South East England Regional Assembly on 4 March 2009 agreed recommendations to the Secretary of State regarding permanent pitch requirements to 2016. For

Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

		required in the borough, they will be identified in the Development Management & Allocations DPD.	Wokingham Borough, it was recommended that the requirement is: a) 21 pitches for gypsies and travellers; and b) 2 pitches for travelling showpeople. Once the Secretary of State has confirmed the requirement (through a revision of the SEP), the Council will allocate sites (if necessary) through the Development Management & Allocations DPD.
D10	Paragraph 4.22 (page 39) – insert at end.		Open space is to be delivered in perpetuity. Where open space meets the standards for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), it can also count towards this provision as detailed in paragraph 4.46.
D11	Policy CP5 (page 41) – first sentence after table	Within the Strategic Development Locations in policies CP19-22, at least 35% will be sought.	Insert additional row in the table with the following in each column: First – Any, Second – Strategic Development Location (policies CP19-22), Third - 5 dwellings (net) or more or 0.16 ha (net) or larger) Fourth - 35
D12	Paragraph 4.32 (page 42) – insert additional sentence at end		The Council will use this split as the starting point for negotiations on affordable housing but apply flexibility where there are viability and other site specific issues.
D14	Paragraph 4.40 (page 45) – insert new paragraph numbered 4.39a immediately before		The need for a development that affects a Site of Special Scientific Interest will be deemed to outweigh the need to safeguard the nature conservation interest where the development has clear social or economic benefits of national importance. The need for a development that affects a Local Wildlife Sites, habitats or, species of principle importance in England for nature conservation, ancient woodland, veteran trees or features of the landscape that are of major importance for wild flora and fauna will be deemed to outweigh the need to safeguard the nature conservation interest where the development has clear social or economic benefits of regional or national importance.

Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

D20/ F9	Paragraph 4.45 (page 46) – Insert new paragraph numbered 4.45A		<p>In line with the findings of the Appropriate Assessment, it is recognised that non-residential development could also have a significant effect upon the SPA. This could either be from linked trips including a recreational use of the SPA or from workers employed close to the SPA, using the area during breaks (especially lunch time). Consequently, proposals for non-residential development will also need assessing for whether they are likely to have a significant effect upon the SPA. Where non-residential schemes include appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, the likely significant effects upon the TBH SPA will have been addressed.</p> <p>Insert reference to additional footnote (after 2<sup>nd</sup> SPA reference). This footnote would refer to: See paragraph 4.5.8 of the Assessor's Report.</p>
D21	Paragraph 4.46 (page 46) – replace paragraph (as amended by changes B16, B17, B18 and C6).	<p>The Appropriate Assessment indicates that to ensure residential development that avoids their likely significant impact upon the SPA, the following principals will apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Contributions to on site SPA access management measures and monitoring in line with the Interim Delivery Framework;</li> <li>ii) Provision of SANG at a minimum of 8ha/1,000 population (calculated at a rate of 2.55 persons per household);</li> <li>iii) SANG to be provided in perpetuity in line with the quality and quantity standards advocated by Natural England. The size and location of SANG contributes towards the delivery of healthy communities in line with advice from the Department of Health and NICE;</li> <li>iv) All residential proposals within 5km (linear) of the SPA involving one or more net additional dwelling(s) will require these avoidance measures;</li> </ul>	<p>The Appropriate Assessment indicates that to ensure that development avoids its likely significant impact upon the SPA, the following principals will apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Dwellinghouses and other residential development (including staff accommodation in use class C2) will need to provide avoidance and mitigation measures where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposal involves the provision of one or more net additional residential unit and is within 5km (linear) of the SPA. Contributions to on site SPA access management measures and monitoring in line with the Delivery Framework will be required together with provision of SANG at a minimum of 8ha/1,000 population (calculated at a rate of 2.4 persons per household). This monitoring includes the effectiveness of the SANG;</li> <li>b. The proposal provides 50 units or more residential units within 7km (linear). In this case, the proposal will be individually assessed for whether a significant effect upon the SPA is likely either on its own or in combination with other plans or projects around the site. Where avoidance and mitigation measures are</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

		<p>v) Residential schemes providing 50 units or more dwellings within 7km will be individually assessed for whether a significant effect upon the SPA is likely either on their own or in combination with other plans or projects around the site;</p> <p>vi) In order to maintain access to avoidance sites in perpetuity, the Council's preference is for the authority to own any SANG; and</p> <p>vii) There is a 400m exclusion zone from the SPA for any net additional dwellings</p>	<p>required to address likely significant effects, this is likely to involve SANG together with funding towards monitoring the effectiveness of the solution agreed;</p> <p>c. There is a 400m exclusion zone from the SPA for any net additional dwellings due to the inability to avoid likely significant effects upon the SPA.</p> <p>ii) SANG to be provided and maintained in perpetuity in line with the quality and quantity standards advocated by Natural England. The size and location of SANG contributes towards the delivery of healthy communities in line with advice from the Department of Health and NICE. In order to ensure access to avoidance sites in perpetuity, the Council's preference is for the authority to own any SANG. Where SANG also meets the definition of open space (see Appendix 4), it can also count towards this provision i.e. at least 1 ha/1,000 of the SANG could also contribute towards the Natural Greenspace requirement and vice versa; and</p> <p>iii) Non-residential development will be individually assessed for their likely significant effects. Where avoidance and mitigation measures are required, monitoring of their effectiveness will be necessary.</p>
D22	Policy CP9 (page 47) – second sentence	Development proposals (in addition to the Strategic Development Locations in policies CP19-22) within development limits (as defined on the key diagram) will be acceptable in:	Development proposals (in addition to the Strategic Development Locations in policies CP19-22) within development limits will be acceptable in:
D23	Policy CP9 (page 47) – second criteria.	The modest development locations of Arborfield Garrison, Pinewood (Crowthorne), Finchampstead North, Ruscombe, Shinfield, Spencers Wood, Three Mile Cross and Wargrave where they should generally not exceed 100 dwellings	The modest development locations of Arborfield Garrison, Pinewood (Crowthorne), Finchampstead North, Ruscombe, Shinfield, Spencers Wood, Three Mile Cross and Wargrave
D24	Policy CP9 (page 47) – third criteria.	The limited development locations of Arborfield Cross, Barkham Hill, Charvil, Finchampstead, Hurst, Riseley, Sindlesham, Sonning and	The limited development locations of Arborfield Cross, Barkham Hill, Charvil, Finchampstead, Hurst, Riseley, Sindlesham, Sonning and Swallowfield

## Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

		Swallowfield where they should generally not exceed 25 dwellings.	
D25	Policy CP9 (page 47) – insert additional criterion		4) The boundary of the Science Park proposed under policy CP17 as defined in the Development Management & Allocations DPD.
D26	Paragraph 4.50 (page 48)	Once the significant improvements to facilities and services (including public transport) have been achieved or are programmed (as part of the proposal) in a legal agreement associated with a planning permission to support Core Strategy policies CP19 or CP20, major development would also be acceptable in Arborfield Garrison or in Shinfield, Spencers Wood and Three Mile Cross (South of M4 SDL).	Associated with each SDL, the Council will be producing individual Development Brief (including masterplan) SPD together with an overarching Infrastructure Delivery SPD. The Infrastructure Delivery SPD will detail the phasing of all the associated improvements to infrastructure, facilities and services within each SDL. For the SDL proposed through policies CP19 and CP20, these improvements would enhance the overall sustainability of Arborfield Garrison, Shinfield, Spencers Wood and Three Mile Cross. Consequently, once the following improvements envisaged through policies CP19 and CP20 (respectively) have been achieved or are programmed (as part of the proposal) in a legal agreement associated with a planning permission, major development proposals in line with CP9 would also be acceptable in Arborfield Garrison, Shinfield, Spencers Wood and Three Mile Cross. a) Arborfield Garrison – the secondary school and district centre (in line with CP14); b) Shinfield, Spencers Wood and Three Mile Cross – appropriate additional retail facilities.
D31	Paragraph 4.69 (page 56) – insert additional sentences at the end		The main funding for the regeneration is from the Council's own land interests in the town centre, S106 and regional funding that comes with the LTP and private funding from developers. The indicative timetable for completion of the competitive dialogue process is Spring 2010.
D32	Policy CP16 (page 57) – Text before criteria i and ii, together with these criteria.	Elsewhere the redevelopment, refurbishment or minor extension of buildings to modernise existing designated employment sites: a) Within development limits; or b) At designated employment sites outside defined development limits.	Elsewhere within development limits the redevelopment, refurbishment or minor extension of buildings in employment use will be acceptable in principle

## Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

		will be acceptable in principle provided there is no significant increase in floorspace.	
D33	Policy CP16 (page 57) – penultimate paragraph – insert at end		Provision will be made for a range of sizes, types, quality and locations of premises and sites in order to meet incubator/start up, move on, expansion and investment accommodation needs and having regard to the needs of specific sectors of the business community
D34/ A33	Paragraph 4.73 (page 58) – Delete third and final sentences. Insert additional text at end.		For employment policy for sites outside development limits see Policy CP11. The Development Management and Allocations DPD will include a criteria based policy on the application of this policy outside core employment areas, replacing policy WEM5 of the WDLP
D35	Paragraph 4.75 (page 59) – insert additional sentence at end		It is likely that some 55,000 square metres of floorspace will have been completed by 2026.
D36	Paragraph 4.76 (page 59) – second sentence	Having regard to the scale of development, before any planning applications are submitted to the authority for the development of the Science Park, the following must have taken place	Having regard to the scale of development, before planning permission is granted for the development of the Science Park, the authority should ensure the following have taken place:
D37	Paragraph 4.76 (page 59) – final sentence	Moreover, the site will also be restricted to uses within B1b of the Uses Classes Order: research and development, laboratories and high uses, unless small scale associated activities such as a creche are provided to help mitigate its impact on the demand for labour , etc	The site will be restricted to appropriate uses for a Science and Innovation Park such as research and development, laboratories and high tech together with ancillary and related uses such as a creche provided that they do not undermine its key purpose.
D38	Policy CP18 (page 60) – summary of the list of housing land supply sources (items 3 – 5 in the list	Item 3 – Sites to be identified in Major locations Item 4 – Sites to be identified in Modest locations Item 5 – Sites to be identified in Limited locations	Item 3 – Sites to be identified in Major Development Locations Item 4 – Sites to be identified in Modest Development Locations where they should generally not exceed 100 dwellings Item 5 – Sites to be identified in Limited Development Locations where they should generally not exceed 25 dwellings
D39	Paragraph 4.81 (page 62) – insert new sentence at end		If the Council does not have a five year housing land supply, it will initially consider the scope for extensions to major development locations before assessing ones for modest development locations and finally limited development locations.

Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

			Insert footnote after "supply" stating: Having regard to the advice in PPS3 (paragraphs 68-73) and National Indicator 159 (available at <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/localgovernment/pdf/735143.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/localgovernment/pdf/735143.pdf</a> ). With respect of the latter, this means whether a five year supply is available at the 1 <sup>st</sup> April both preceding and subsequent to the date of determination i.e. for an application determined in June 2010, this would include assessments of 5 year housing land supplies at both 1 April 2010 and 1 April 2011.
D40	Policy CP19 (page 62) – criterion 1	Phased delivery of around 3,500 dwellings, of which at least 35% will be affordable under policy CP5	Phased delivery of around 3,500 dwellings including affordable homes in accordance with policy CP5.
D42	Policy CP20 (page 63) – criterion 1	Phased delivery of around 2,500 dwellings, of which at least 35% will be affordable under policy CP5	Phased delivery of around 2,500 dwellings including affordable homes in accordance with policy CP5.
D44	Policy CP21 (page 64) – criterion 1.	Phased delivery of around 1,500 dwellings, of which at least 35% will be affordable under policy CP5	Phased delivery of around 1,500 dwellings including affordable homes in accordance with policy CP5.
D45	Policy CP21 (page 64) – criterion 3.	Appropriate Employment	Appropriate employment located west of Twyford Road, north of Matthewsgreen Farm and east of Toutley Industrial Estate
D48	Paragraph 4.88 (page 65) – second sentence	If this uplift does not occur, it may need to be delivered elsewhere in the SDL.	If this uplift does not occur, it may be located on an extension within the part of this SDL north of Matthewsgreen Farm, west of the A321 Twyford Road, and east of Toutley Industrial Estate within land owned by Wokingham Borough Council or elsewhere within alternative employment sites within the Borough providing that the tests of CP16 are met. The extension into the SDL should only be within this area so that housing delivery is not hindered.
D49	Policy CP22 (page 66) – criterion 1	Phased delivery of around 2,500 dwellings, of which at least 35% will be affordable under policy CP5	Phased delivery of around 2,500 dwellings including affordable homes in accordance with policy CP5.
D52	Paragraph A7.12 (page 97) - criterion b.	The district centre should include a food store of up to 2500 square metres as well as a range of community facilities and services.	The district centre should include a store of around 4,000 m2 primarily selling convenience goods as well as a range of community facilities and services.

## Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

D53	Paragraph A7.27 (page 102) – criterion d.	This could accommodate up to a 2,000 m <sup>2</sup> food store a store.	This could accommodate a store of around 2,500 square metres primarily selling convenience goods.
D55	Paragraph A7.28 (page 103) – criterion a, part iii.	Provide a park and ride in the vicinity of M4 junction 11	Contribute towards Park and Ride in the vicinity of M4 junction 11
D56	Paragraph A7.41 (page 109) - criterion a, part i.	Reading Road to Wellington Road (station) link, Wokingham	Contribute to Reading Road to Wellington Road (station) link, Wokingham
D57	Paragraph A7.41 (page 109) – criterion a, part ii	Improvements to transport capacity along the A321 and A329 including provision of a new route from the A329 (near the M4 overbridge) to the vicinity of the Coppid Beech roundabout.	Improvements to transport capacity along the A321 and A329 corridors including the provision of the necessary and directly related parts of a new route from the A329 (near the M4 overbridge) to the vicinity of the Coppid Beech roundabout.
D58	Paragraph A7.41 (page 109) - criterion a, part iii	Rebuilding Wokingham station as a transport interchange.	Contribute to rebuilding Wokingham station as a transport interchange.
D59	Paragraph A7.41 (page 109) – criterion a, part iv	Provide a Park and Ride near Coppid Beech roundabout on A329 in Wokingham.	Contribute towards Park and Ride near Coppid Beech roundabout on A329 in Wokingham.
D61	Key diagram		Include diagrammatic illustrations of the settlement separations detailed in policies CP19-22.
E18	Paragraph 3.14 (page 28) – whole paragraph	To ensure economic growth in the sub-region continues, it is vital that the Core Strategy delivers a robust approach to development within the area as recognised by the SEP Panel (paragraph 21.11). Paragraph 2.3 outlines the requirements for housing within the borough in the period 2006 to 2026 in both the SEP and SEP Panel. Table 3.1 compares the housing requirements for the borough, including a resolution of the shortfall at 1 April 2006 against the requirements of the BSP. The resolution of this shortfall by the Core Strategy reflects the approach of the SEP (paragraph 2.1). Table 4.3 provides details of the breakdown of the sources of supply	To ensure economic growth in the sub-region continues, it is vital that the Core Strategy delivers a robust approach to development within the area as recognised by the SEP. Paragraph 2.3 outlines the requirements for housing within the borough in the period 2006 to 2026 in the SEP. Table 3.1 explains the housing requirements for the borough taking account of the shortfall at 1 April 2006 against the requirements of the then BSP. The resolution of this shortfall by the Core Strategy reflects the approach of the SEP (Policy H2). Table 4.3 provides details of the breakdown of the sources of supply
E20	Paragraph 3.15 (page 29) – first sentence	The Council in the Core Strategy has therefore considered the most appropriate mechanisms for ensuring the delivery of at least either the 11,232 dwellings required by the SEP or the 13,232 of the SEP Panel.	The Council in the Core Strategy has therefore considered the most appropriate mechanisms for ensuring the delivery of 13,232 dwellings required.

Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

E22	Paragraph 3.17 (page 29) – third and fourth sentences	The SEP Panel (paragraph 7.86) also recognises that the need to ensure adequate mitigation measures are in place to avoid impacts upon the TBH SPA may support an emphasis in delivery to the period post 2016. The authority will expedite the delivery of housing to meet the overall requirements of the SEP Panel, although due to the issues above, it does not consider it appropriate to achieve the annual targets every year.	The SEP (Policy WCBV3) also recognises that the need to ensure adequate mitigation measures are in place to avoid impacts upon the TBH SPA may require careful consideration of any phasing of housing delivery. The authority will expedite the delivery of housing to meet the overall requirements of the SEP, although due to the issues above, it does not consider it appropriate to achieve the annual targets every year.
E49	Paragraph 4.77 (page 60) – whole paragraph	The housing targets for the Borough are based on achieving the overall requirements of the SEP (10,460 dwellings) together with the backlog against the requirements of the BSP (772 dwellings) at April 2006. The Council accepts that the backlog must be eliminated by 31 March 2016 and has therefore increased the annual requirement to 2016 to address this. As required under soundness, the Council recognises the need to provide flexibility in the event that the Secretary of State (through changes to the South East Plan) endorses the SEP Panel. Having regard to the comments in paragraphs 3.14 to 3.20, the Council has considered the opportunity for further increasing delivery early in the Plan period. To ensure the delivery of sustainable communities and recognising the lead in times for development following adoption of the Housing Site Allocations DPD in March 2010, the Council considers that flexibility to accommodate the SEP Panel should be dealt with after 1 April 2011. The housing requirements after this date are therefore a minimum of the SEP Panel target. In order to address the potential shortfall due to delivery in the period 2006-11, the authority has increased the target to 723 dwellings per annum in the	The housing targets for the Borough are based on achieving the overall requirements of the SEP (12,460 dwellings) together with the backlog against the requirements of the former BSP (772 dwellings) at April 2006 (see table 3.1). The Council accepts that the backlog must be eliminated by 31 March 2016 in line with SEP Policy H2 (criterion viii). In considering the opportunities for this, paragraphs 3.14 to 3.20 indicate that there are risks to the both the achievement of sustainable communities and the overall vision if targets were increased before 2011. The Council also recognises the implications of the lead in times for development following adoption of both the Core Strategy (with its allocated SDL (Policies CP19-22) and the subsequent Housing Site Allocations DPD together with the need to deliver mitigation for the TBH SPA (SEP Policy WCBV3). Consequently, the Council considers that the phasing targets in policy CP18 are the most appropriate means of requiring the delivery of the overall target (based upon table 3.1).

Schedule of all Necessary Changes, including Inspector's Changes

		period 2016-21.	
F7	Policy CP8 (page 45) – (as amended by change D16)	Development which alone or in combination is likely to have a significant effect on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures to avoid and mitigate any potential adverse effects are delivered for their impact upon the Special Protection Area.	Development which alone or in combination is likely to have a significant effect on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area will be required to demonstrate that adequate measures to avoid and mitigate any potential adverse effects are delivered.
IC1	Appendix 7, A7.22 a) & A7.28 a) i)	road link between the A327 and the A33	Delete
IC2	various	References to the area of SANG likely to be needed at the time of CS submission	Delete, as shown in changes above
IC3	Policy CP13 Gaps		Delete policy, text in # 4.60 & 4.61 and associated changes to Proposals Map. Update Appendix 1 to indicate that Policy CP11 has superseded WDLP Policy WCC2. Policy CP11 to read In order to protect <i>the separate identity of settlements and maintain</i> the quality of the environment... '. # 4.55 to read 'development limits helps <i>protect the separate identity of settlements and maintain..</i> '
IC4	Para 4.46	.. at a rate of 2.55 persons per household)	...at a rate of 2.4 persons per household)
IC5	Policy CP2, d) i)		Delete

## Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

### A: Changes to correct typographic errors or reflect progress of document – approved 18/2/09

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
A1	Paragraphs 1.5-1.9 (pages 2-3) (Submission of comments section)		Delete paragraphs	Paragraphs gave guidance on how to respond to consultation on document. This information is not required in the final document.
A2	Paragraph 2.13 (page 9) – last sentence.	The adopted Wycombe Core Strategy (July 2007....	The adopted Wycombe Core Strategy (July 2008....	To correct date of adoption of Wycombe District's Core Strategy.
A3	Paragraph 3.14 (page 29) - last sentence.	Table 4.4 provides details of the breakdown of the sources of supply.	Table 4.3 provides details of the breakdown of the sources of supply.	To correct error
A4	Paragraph 3.26 (page 32) – second sentence	This reflects the findings of the SHLAA (See paragraph 3.19).	This reflects the findings of the SHLAA (See paragraph 3.18).	To correct error
A6	Policy CP10 (page 49) – scheme 1 (footnote 47)	Measures to be developed to provide alternatives for north-south movement across the river with Reading Borough, South Oxfordshire District and Oxfordshire Country	Measures to be developed to provide alternatives for north-south movement across the river with Reading Borough, South Oxfordshire District and Oxfordshire County	To correct spelling mistake.
A8	Paragraph 4.91 (page 66) – third sentence	...on the A321 Finchapmstead Road.	...on the A321 Finchampstead Road.	To correct spelling mistake
A9	Policy CP20 (page 63) – criterion 4	...likely expansion of existing primary provision together with children's centre and youth facilities.	...likely expansion of existing primary provision together with existing children's centre and youth facilities.	To clarify that that a children's Centre opens in 2009 in Shinfield.
A10	Monitoring CP6 (page 73) – target	Standards to be identified in the Site Allocations & Management DPD and having regard to Manual for Streets.	Standards to be identified in the Development Management & Allocations DPD and having regard to Manual for Streets.	To correct name of the DPD.
A11	Monitoring CP19 (page 76)	Table 4.4 indicates that there is...	Table 4.3 indicates that there is...	To correct error.

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
	– comments (first sentence)			
A12	Appendix 6 (page 90)		Berkshire Structure Plan line should not cover period 2016-2021	To correct error as the Structure Plan only lasts until 2016.
A13	Appendix 7, paragraph A7.28, criterion d iii	Children's centre and youth facilities	Expansion of existing children's centre and youth facilities	To clarify that that a children's Centre opens in 2009 in Shinfield.

**A: Changes to correct typographic errors or reflect progress of document – agreed 29/4/09**

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
A14	Summary (page vii) – Second paragraph, first sentence	In late 2008, the Council will start deciding which sites are necessary for these uses following submission of the Core Strategy.	In late 2009, the Council will start deciding which sites are necessary for these uses following submission of the Core Strategy.	Update regarding timing for progressing the sites DPD
A15	Summary (page viii) – last paragraph – delete			Contents of paragraph are now out of date.
A16	Paragraph 4.44 (page 46) – Second sentence	The Council is working with the National Trust to deliver an impact avoidance site at Simons Wood, Wellingtonia Avenue, Finchampstead.	The Council is working with the National Trust to deliver an impact avoidance site at Simons Wood, Wellingtonia Avenue, Crowthorne.	To correct location of site.
A17	Paragraph 4.78 (page 60) – first sentence	Table 4.3 provides a summary of the elements of housing land supply in line with the phasing requirements of policy CP16.	Table 4.3 provides a summary of the elements of housing land supply in line with the phasing requirements of policy CP18.	To correct the cross-reference
A18	Paragraph A7.7 (page 96) – criterion d.	Measures to improve non-car travel along the B3408 to facilitate improved public transport.	Measures to improve non-car travel along the B3349 to facilitate improved public transport.	To correct inaccuracy.

Note – there does not appear to be a change A19.

**A: Changes to correct typographic errors or to ensure consistency with earlier changes – agreed 16/7/09**

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
A20	Summary (page viii) – first paragraph, last sentence	Development will therefore be primarily located at Arborfield Garrison, Earley, Shinfield, Shinfield (North of M4), Spencers Wood, Three Mile Cross, Twyford, Winnersh, Wokingham and Woodley.	Development will therefore be primarily located at Arborfield Garrison, Earley, Green Park, Shinfield, Shinfield (North of M4), Spencers Wood, Three Mile Cross, Twyford, Winnersh, Wokingham and Woodley.	To ensure consistency with change D2 and policy CP9.
A21	Figure 1.1 (page 1)	Update diagram with timetable post submission		To correct timing information
A22	Paragraph 1.3 (page 2) – last sentence	Upon adoption (expected July 2009), the Core Strategy will replace the policies of the Wokingham District Local Plan (WDLP) (March 2004) detailed in appendix 1.	Upon adoption (expected November 2009), the Core Strategy will replace the policies of the Wokingham District Local Plan (WDLP) (March 2004) detailed in appendix 1.	To correct timing information
A23	Paragraph 1.4 (page 20) – web address	<a href="http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/ldf/corestrategy">www.wokingham.gov.uk/ldf/corestrategy</a>	<a href="http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/corestrategy">www.wokingham.gov.uk/corestrategy</a>	To correct web address
A24	Paragraph 2.12 (page 9) – footnote 10 (second sentence)	The Secretary of State for Transport (6 February 2008) indicated that the route from Maidenhead to Reading should be safeguarded, so that an extension to Crossrail could occur.	The Secretary of State for Transport (29 April 2009) has safeguarded the route from Maidenhead to Reading so that an extension to Crossrail could occur – see <a href="http://www.crossrail.co.uk/construction/safeguarding/maidenhead-to-reading">http://www.crossrail.co.uk/construction/safeguarding/maidenhead-to-reading</a> .	To update information
A25	Paragraph 2.14 (page 10) - criterion e	Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership – joint working on implementing the Interim Delivery Framework (IDF) between the affected authorities, South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) and Natural England on measures to protect the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA).	Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership – joint working on implementing the Delivery Framework between the affected authorities, SEERA and Natural England on measures to protect the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA).	To ensure consistency with change D17
A26	Paragraph 2.19 (page 11) – penultimate sentence	The information in the Council's AMR's from 2005 to 2007 indicates that most of the borough is not accessible by public transport to the acute hospitals.	The information in the Council's AMR's from 2005 to 2008 indicates that most of the borough is not accessible by public transport to the acute hospitals.	To take account of information in the 2008 AMR
A27	Paragraph 2.21 (page 12) – criterion c (xii)	Wokingham Borough Affordable Housing Viability Study (June 2008)	Wokingham Borough Affordable Housing Viability Study (June 2008 and March 2009)	Update information

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
A28	Paragraph 2.21 (page 12) – criterion g (Footnote 20)		Correct web address to: <a href="http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/council-meetings-democracy/plans/community-strategy/">http://www.wokingham.gov.uk/council-meetings-democracy/plans/community-strategy/</a>	Update information
A29	Paragraph 2.78 (page 25) – third sentence	Whilst expansion of Wargave through a review of the Green Belt might support the limited range of shops, there are no significant other facilities (see appendix 3).	Whilst expansion of Wargrave through a review of the Green Belt might support the limited range of shops, there are no significant other facilities (see appendix 3).	To correct spelling mistake
A30	Paragraph 3.7 (page 27) – first sentence	This vision which has regard to the outcome of public consultation is based on locating the majority of he new housing in high quality Strategic Development Locations with excellent infrastructure provision and protecting the character of the Borough.	This vision which has regard to the outcome of public consultation is based on locating the majority of the new housing in high quality Strategic Development Locations with excellent infrastructure provision and protecting the character of the Borough.	Correct typographical error (change “he” to “the”).
A31	Paragraph 3.9 (page 28)	Having regard to the scale of existing facilities and services together with the current distribution of the borough’s population, Earley, Shinfield (N of M4), Twyford, Winnersh, Wokingham and Woodley are the most appropriate locations for growth.	Having regard to the scale of existing facilities and services together with the current distribution of the borough’s population, Earley, Green Park, Shinfield (N of M4), Twyford, Winnersh, Wokingham and Woodley are the most appropriate locations for growth.	To ensure consistency with change D2 and policy CP9.
A32	Paragraph 4.68 (page 56) – first sentence	Further information on how the proposals in Wokingham town centre will contribute towards this policy will be set out in both the Development Management & Allocations DPD and the Town Centre Strategy SPD.	Further information on how the proposals in Wokingham town centre will contribute towards this policy will be set out in both the Development Management & Allocations DPD and the Wokingham Town Centre Development Guide SPD.	To correct name of the SPD
A34	Targets for policy CP2 (page 71) – third comment box	Amount of new community facilities provided 3-5 yearly reporting. Main agencies will be developers and the Site Allocations & Management DPD.	Amount of new community facilities provided 3-5 yearly reporting. Main agencies will be developers and the Development Management & Allocations DPD.	To correct name of document
A35	Glossary (page 119) – information on Interim		Relocate information under new name “Delivery Framework”	To update information

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
	Delivery Framework			
A36	Glossary (page 119) – information on “Inclusive communities” (first sentence)	Communities that promote intergration and aim to tackle the exclusion of marginalised groups.	Communities that promote integration and aim to tackle the exclusion of marginalised groups.	To correct spelling mistake
A37	Glossary (page 119) – information on “Infrastructure”	Permanent resources service society’s needs including: roads, sewers, schools, hospitals, railways, communications.	Permanent resources service society’s needs including: roads, sewers, schools, hospitals, railways and communications (see also paragraph 4.27).	To insert cross-reference to further guidance.
A38	Glossary (page 124) – information on “Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area” – second sentence	It was classified under the European Community Directive on Wild Birds to protect internationally important bird species on 9 March 2005 for the populations of three Annex 1 bird species – Nightjar, Woodlark and Dartword Warbler.	It was classified under the European Community Directive on Wild Birds to protect internationally important bird species on 9 March 2005 for the populations of three Annex 1 bird species – Nightjar, Woodlark and Dartford Warbler.	To correct spelling of species

**B: Changes in response to representations received on the submission Core Strategy – approved 18/2/09**

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
B1	Paragraphs 2.15-20 (pages 10-11)		<p>Insert new paragraph after 2.19: Wokingham Borough is a safe area to live with crime rates lower than other parts covered by the Thames Valley Police Authority, including both Bracknell Forest and Reading Boroughs. It is important to address anti-social behaviour within the borough as it affects the fear of crime.</p> <p>Insert footnote – Additional information on crime and anti-social behaviour is included in paragraphs 4.1-4.39 of the</p>	<p>Thames Valley Police (1798/1/2.15/1/LC/US/E). To include appropriate base data for crime and anti-social behaviour in the Core Strategy, having regard to the Community Strategy and Local Area Agreement.</p> <p>No targets to be included as need to await collection of baseline data through the Local Area Agreement.</p>

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
			Local Area Agreement.	
B2	Paragraph 2.77 (page 25) – first sentence.	Land to the west...	Most of the land to the west...	Barton Willmore on behalf of Hurstlane (1305/1/2.77/1/LC/US/J). To clarify extent of floodplain to west of Twyford.
B3	Paragraph 3.24 (page 31)	...to avoid impacts upon the TBH SPA.	....to avoid impacts upon the TBHSPA where required.	Bircham Dyson Bell for Mr J. Harai (Greenfields Farm, Edneys Hill) (1555/1/3.24/4/LC/US/J). To clarify that parts of Finchampstead North are more than 5km from the TBH SPA.
B4	Paragraph 4.1 (page 34) – third sentence.	Proposals would therefore need to comply with all of these policies, together with other parts of the Development Plan.	Proposals would therefore need to comply with relevant policies, together with other parts of the Development Plan.	Broadway Malyan on behalf of South Wokingham (1853/1/4.1/2/LC/US/J, 1853/1/4.1/3/LC/US/E and 1853/1/4.1/4/LC/US/NCP). To clarify paragraph and ensure consistency with legislation.
B5	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed
B7	Paragraph 4.13 (page 36) - criterion c	Private sector development – particularly....	Private and public sector development – particularly....	Millgate Homes (1802/1/4.13/1/LC/US/J and 1802/1/4.13/2/LC/US/E). To recognise role of public sector in implementation.
B8	Policy CP2 (page 37) – criterion d (second sentence)	Proposals (including allocations...	Proposals for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople (including allocations....	Friends, families & travellers (1638/1/CP2/4/LC/US/NCP) and Government Office for the South East (1801/1/CP2/8/LC/S). To clarify that the further criterion in part d only relate to gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople proposals.
B9	Paragraph 4.22 (page 39) – insert new sentence at end and an additional footnote.		The delivery of green infrastructure (including Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) under policy CP8) also contributes towards the delivery of healthy communities, including safe	South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) (1778/1/CP3/15/LC/S). To include further information on the role of green infrastructure for ensuring

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
			access to facilities and opportunities for exercise/recreation.  Insert additional footnote: This reflects the advice of the Department of Health and National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE), available at <a href="http://www.nice.org.uk/newsevents/infocus/Newguideforlocalauthorities.jsp">http://www.nice.org.uk/newsevents/infocus/Newguideforlocalauthorities.jsp</a> .	healthy communities arise from development.
B10	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed
B11	Paragraph 4.36 (page 44) – ninth sentence	During the plan period, opportunities for the improvement of existing railway stations and the possibility of new railway stations will be explored.	During the plan period, opportunities for the improvement of existing railway stations and the possibility of new railway stations will be examined.	Broadway Malyan for South Wokingham (1853/1/4.36/1/LC/S). To correct meaning of sentence.
B15	Paragraph 4.45 (page 46) – third sentence	In the review of Natura 2000 sites expected between 2008 and 2010, Natural England may conclude that Gorrick Plantation should be included within a Special Protection Area.	In the review of Natura 2000 sites expected between 2008 and 2010, the Joint Nature Conservation Committee may conclude that Gorrick Plantation should be included within a Special Protection Area.	Natural England (1800/1/4.45/7/LC/S). To correct role of JNCC in designation Natura 2000 sites.
B20	Policy CP11 (page 52)		Insert additional criterion (7): Affordable housing on rural exception sites in line with CP9.	Government Office for the South East (1801/1/CP11/11/LC/S). For ease of reference and ensure consistency.
B21	Policy CP16 (page 57) – criterion ii	Within the Strategic Development Locations (Policies CP19-22);	Within the Strategic Development Locations as detailed within the proposed SDL Masterplan SPDs (Policies CP19-22);	North Wokingham Consortium (1852/1/CP16/28/LC/US/J, 1852/1/CP16/29/LC/US/E and 1852/1/CP16/30/LC/US/NCP). To provide clarity on how development will be fully inclusive and planned in a comprehensive and mixed use way.
B22	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed	Draft change not agreed
B23	Section 5 – monitoring policy CP1 (second target)	Proposed target – Reduction over time	Proposed target – No loss	English Heritage (1333/1/MON/1/LC/US/NCP). To

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
				reflect national policy.
B24	Key diagram (page 125)		Insert names and boundaries of adjoining authorities and give more prominence to major areas.	Government Office for the South East (1801/1/KD/5/LC/S). To improve clarity
B25	Tables		Ensure tables in final document do not spread over more than one page, unless this is impractical due to their size (e.g. CP10).	Government Office for the South East (1801/1/Whole Document/13/LC/S). To improve clarity
B26	Maps/diagrams		Improve quality of printing/legibility in final document.	Government Office for the South East (1801/1/Whole Document/13/LC/S). To improve clarity
B27	Sustainability Appraisal		Insert in final document summary of the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal	Government Office for the South East (1801/1/SA/3/LC/S). To improve clarity

**C: Further changes in response to representations received on the submission Core Strategy – Approved 12/3/09**

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
C4	Paragraph 4.40 (page 45) – amended third sentence (change B14)  <b>See also change D15</b>	... contribute towards their achievement and the Council has identified a number of Conservation Target Areas (CTA) that are a priority for positive conservation action.	... contribute towards their achievement and the Council has identified a number of Conservation Target Areas (CTA) that are a priority for the maintenance, restoration and creation of priority habitats.	Natural England. To clarify types of action likely.
C5	Paragraph 4.41 (page 45) – amended second sentence (change A5)	The Berkshire Nature Conservation Forum advises on the boundaries of Wildlife Heritage Sites, including deletions, additions and amendments.	The Berkshire Nature Conservation Forum advises on the boundaries of Local Wildlife Sites (formerly Wildlife Heritage Sites), including deletions, additions and amendments.	The Berkshire Nature Conservation Forum has agreed to change the term for county sites to be consistent across Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire
C7	Policy CP10 (page 49) – table header (1 <sup>st</sup> column in Funding section)	National/regional funding in place	National/regional funding	Highways Agency
C17	Paragraph A7.13 (page 98)	A secondary school to serve the	A secondary school to serve the south	Updated information from WBC

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
	– criterion b, part ii	south of the Borough (up to 1200 pupils)	of the Borough (up to 1,500 pupils)	Children Service's
C23	Paragraph A7.42 (page 112) – criterion e	The planning of the site should acknowledge the need to connect the site to the A329 (M) affording access to park and ride facilities. Consideration of junction improvements to achieve this will; be required	The planning of the site should acknowledge the need to connect the site to the A329 London Road to the west of the A329 (M) Coppid Beech junction. This would afford access to any future park and ride facilities in the vicinity of Coppid Beech junction. Consideration of junction improvements to achieve this will be required	Broadway Malyan for South Wokingham Consortium (1853/1/CP22/252/LC/US/J) and Turley Associates for David Wilson Homes (Buckhurst Farm) (1627/1/CP22/44/LC/US/J). To clarify the text.
C29	Paragraph A7.47 (page 114) – criterion d	The design of the road should embrace the latest Manual for Streets guidance.	The design of the road will have regard to the latest Manual for Streets guidance.	Broadway Malyan for South Wokingham Consortium (1853/1/A7/34/LC/US/J)

**D: Changes provisionally agreed/suggested during the course of the Hearing sessions – formally agreed 29/4/09**

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
D1	Paragraph 2.24 (page 14) – first sentence	The Core Strategy also needs to ensure that the wider needs for service delivery are addressed through:	The Core Strategy also needs to ensure that the wider needs for service delivery and the needs of all sectors of the community are addressed, in particular through:	To reflect discussion at session 1.
D2	Insert new heading and paragraph after 2.73		Green Park 2.73A The Green Park Business Park lies in South Reading and is partly within Wokingham Borough. The remainder of the business park is split between Reading Borough and West Berkshire District. An additional railway station has been approved by West Berkshire Council adjoining Green Park.	To include text on Green Park to ensure consistency with policy CP9.

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
			2.73B The Berkshire Brewery lies to the east of Green Park and is split between Reading and Wokingham Borough's. Since the brewery is scheduled to close in 2010, the two authorities will need to assess any redevelopment proposal.	
D3	Paragraph 2.74 (page 24) – delete last sentence	It is likely that during the plan period, the brewery north of the M4 (split between Reading and Wokingham boroughs) will become available for development		This information is covered by the additional text inserted after paragraph 2.73 (change D2).
D4	Paragraph 3.19 (page 30) – first sentence	Before any planning applications are submitted to the authority for the development of the SDL, the following must have taken place:	Before granting planning permission for the development of the SDL, the authority should ensure the following have taken place:	To reflect further consideration of the matter by the Council.
D5	Paragraph 3.23 (page 31) – amend heading before paragraph	Earley, Shinfield (North of M4) and Woodley	Earley, Green Park, Shinfield (North of M4) and Woodley	To ensure consistency with change D2.
D6	Paragraph 4.8 (page 36) – last sentence (amended from change B6)	The Council will seek over and above the minimum targets as laid out in the national and regional targets.	The Council will seek over and above the minimum national and regional targets through the Development Management & Allocations DPD.	As discussed at session 1.
D7	Paragraph 4.13 (page 36) – criterion a	Preparation of a SPD on Sustainable Development	Preparation of the Development Management & Allocations DPD and a SPD on Sustainable Development.	As discussed at session 1.
D8	Paragraph 4.15 (page 37) – first two sentences	In order to achieve sustainable development, it is important that the needs of all sections of the population are met through development. Proposals for any specific part of the community should take account of relevant	In order to achieve sustainable development, it is important that the needs of all sections of the population are met through development. All proposals should take into account relevant equality and diversity legislation. Additionally, proposals for	To reflect discussion at session 1.

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
		legislation.	any specific part of the community should take account of other relevant legislation.	
D13	Paragraph 4.35 (page 43) – second sentence	This will include the provision of “Lifetime Homes”.	This will include the provision of “Lifetime Homes” and other accommodation for the elderly and the vulnerable	Red Kite Development Consultancy.
D15	Paragraph 4.40 (page 45) (amended by change B14)	CTA are the areas that have the highest concentration of existing ecological sites e.g. Wildlife Heritage Sites.	CTA are the areas that have the highest concentration of existing ecological sites e.g. Local Wildlife Sites.	To correct terminology and ensure consistency with changes C3 and C5.
D18 F8	Paragraph 4.43 (page 46) – insert additional sentence at end		Where residential schemes include appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, the likely significant effects upon the TBH SPA will have been addressed.	As discussed at session 7.
D19	Paragraph 4.44 (page 46) – last sentence	The Simons Wood SANG may be complimented by other sites identified in the Housing Site Allocations DPD to avoid the impacts of development on the TBH SPA.	The Simons Wood SANG will be complimented by other sites identified in the Housing Site Allocations DPD to avoid the impacts of development on the TBH SPA.	As discussed at session 7.
D27	Table 4.1 and paragraph 4.52 (pages 48 and 49) – relocate all text to follow paragraph 4.79			To reflect the Council's clarification of policy CP9 as detailed in its briefing paper.
D28	Policy CP10 (pages 49 and 51) criterion 4 and 18		Insert tick in national/regional funding column	To reflect Council's advice in evidence on session 14.
D30	Policy CP14 (page 54) - criterion b	Lower Earley district centre, Shinfield Road district centre, Twyford Village centre, Winnersh village centre and Woodley town centre are designated as small town/district centres.	Arborfield Garrison district centre (proposed through policy CP19), Lower Earley district centre, Shinfield Road district centre, Twyford Village centre, Winnersh village centre and Woodley town centre are designated as small	To ensure consistency with Appendix 7

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
D41	Policy CP19 (page 62) – insert at end		<p>town/district centres.</p> <p>The development will be guided by a Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document produced with the involvement of stakeholders including all interested landowners in the area covered by the Strategic Development Location as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>A co-ordinated approach to the development of the Strategic Development Location will be required to deliver the necessary infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs of the expanded community.</p>	For consistency with Boyer Planning for College of Estate Management comments on policy CP20
D43	Policy CP20 (page 63) – insert at end		<p>The development will be guided by a Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document produced with the involvement of stakeholders including all interested landowners in the area covered by the Strategic Development Location as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>A co-ordinated approach to the development of the Strategic Development Location will be required to deliver the necessary infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs of the expanded communities.</p>	Boyer Planning for College of Estate Management (1594)
D46	Policy CP21 (page 65) – insert at end		The development will be guided by a Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document produced with the involvement of stakeholders including all interested landowners in the area	For consistency with Boyer Planning for College of Estate Management comments on policy CP20

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
			<p>covered by the Strategic Development Location as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>A co-ordinated approach to the development of the Strategic Development Location will be required to deliver the necessary infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs of the expanded community.</p>	
D47	Paragraph 4.88 (page 65) – first sentence (amendment to change A7)	The Council's Employment Land Study indicates that there is scope to increase floorspace within the existing boundaries of the Toutley Industrial Estate which is within this SDL by around 22,100m2.	The Council's Employment Land Study indicates that there is scope to increase floorspace within the existing boundaries of the Toutley Industrial Estate by around 22,100m2.	Correction of text as discussed with North Wokingham consortia.
D50	Policy CP22 (page 66) – insert at end		<p>The development will be guided by a Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document produced with the involvement of stakeholders including all interested landowners in the area covered by the Strategic Development Location as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>A co-ordinated approach to the development of the Strategic Development Location will be required to deliver the necessary infrastructure, facilities and services to meet the needs of the expanded community.</p>	For consistency with Boyer Planning for College of Estate Management comments on policy CP20
D51	Paragraph A7.2f (page 94) – criterion f (last sentence).	Additionally the former School of Electrical Engineering provides an opportunity for a mixed use area comprising an employment	Delete	In accordance with submissions by GVA Grimley discussed at session 3 including new information on condition of buildings

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No.	Location in document	Original text	Suggested change	Related response/reason for change
		campus involving the re-use and adaptation of the existing buildings.		
D60	Arborfield Garrison Concept plan (page 99) – change boundary and designations		Extend area in accordance with original MoD submission. Delete existing Employment Designation and shade affected area green.	In accordance with submissions by GVA Grimley discussed at session 3 including new information on condition of buildings. This is consequential on change D51.
D62	Proposal Map Change PM25 (Designation of Strategic Development Location at Arborfield Garrison		Amend boundary of SDL	In accordance with submissions by GVA Grimley discussed at session 3. This is consequential on change D51.

**E: Changes to updated Core Strategy following publication of final South East Plan on 6 May 2009 – agreed 16/7/09**

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
E1	Paragraph 1.14 (page 4) – whole paragraph  <b>See also change F1</b>	The Council anticipates that the approach to development outlined in this document will last until 31 March 2026. This is to ensure consistency with the draft South East Plan (SEP) (March 2006) which also covers the same period. Whilst, this Core Strategy has been produced to deliver the development anticipated through the SEP, it also takes account of the changes advocated by the Panel who Examined the South East Plan (August 2007) (the SEP Panel). This	The Council anticipates that the approach to development outlined in this document will last until 31 March 2026. This is to ensure consistency with the Approved South East Plan (SEP) (May 2009) <sup>1</sup> (the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the Region) which also covers the same period. Whilst, this is subsequent to the submission of the Core Strategy, this document nevertheless had regard to the development requirements for the borough in the earlier stages. This includes the draft South East Plan (March 2006) <sup>2</sup> (draft SEP), the changes advocated by the Panel who Examined the South East Plan (August 2007) (the SEP Panel) <sup>3</sup> and those suggested by the Secretary of State in the Proposed Changes (July 2008) (SEP Changes) <sup>4</sup> . The former South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA)

<sup>1</sup> Available at <http://www.gos.gov.uk/gose/planning/regionalPlanning/815640/>.

<sup>2</sup> Available at [www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan](http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan).

<sup>3</sup> Available at <http://www.gos.gov.uk/gose/planning/regionalPlanning/southEastPlan/>.

<sup>4</sup> Available at <http://gose.limehouse.co.uk/portal>.

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
		accommodation of the findings of the SEP Panel demonstrates flexibility within the Core Strategy.	(now South East England Partnership Board (SEEPB)) on 29 September 2008 confirmed that the submitted Core Strategy was in general conformity with the draft SEP. Following publication of the SEP, the Council contacted the SEEPB to confirm that the submitted Core Strategy (including clarifications proposed through the examination process) was still in general conformity.  That appropriate footnotes with weblinks are included in the text (these are shown).
E2	Paragraph 1.17 (page 5)		Delete whole paragraph
E3	Paragraph 2.1 (page 6) – last sentence	The SEP recognises (section E6, paragraphs 1.3-1.5) that the sub-region is economically successful and this needs to be managed to ensure that the area's infrastructure and the environment can cope with development.	The SEP recognises (paragraphs 21.2-21.4) that the sub-region is economically successful and this needs to be managed to ensure that the area's infrastructure and the environment can cope with development.
E4	Paragraph 2.2 (page 6) – whole paragraph	The SEP advocated 28,900 additional dwellings annually within the region between 2006 and 2026. In order to support economic growth whilst considering the implications of commuting, the SEP Panel advocates increasing this by 3,100 dwellings annually. Within the sub-region, the SEP had proposed 4,476 dwellings per annum which the Panel have recommended increasing by 904 dwellings annually.	The SEP (Policy H1) requires 32,700 additional dwellings annually within the region between 2006 and 2026 of which 5,105 are to be delivered annually within the Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley sub-region.
E5	Paragraph 2.3 (page 6) – whole paragraph	In the period 2006-16, the Berkshire Structure Plan (BSP) requires 516 additional dwellings annually in the borough. This is increased to 523 dwellings in the SEP and 623 dwellings in the SEP Panel report. Therefore, to meet the	In the period 2006-16, the former Berkshire Structure Plan (BSP) <sup>5</sup> required 516 additional dwellings annually in the borough. This is increased to 623 dwellings in the SEP. Therefore, to meet the requirements of the SEP over the period 2006-26, 12,460 additional dwellings are required within the borough. Parts of the borough are within

<sup>5</sup> Replaced as part of the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough by the approval of the SEP

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
		requirements of the SEP over the period 2006-26, at least 10,460 additional dwellings are required within the borough. This increases to 12,460 under the recommendations of the SEP Panel. The SEP Panel (paragraphs 21.71 and 21.73) recognises the importance of Wokingham borough in meeting the wider needs of both Bracknell Forest and Reading boroughs and to plan accordingly. These requirements and pressures for development have informed the Core Strategy.	the extent of Greater Reading as referred to in paragraph 21.8 of the SEP <sup>6</sup> . The Borough also lies between the Regional hub of Reading and the Sub-Regional hub of Bracknell defined in the SEP (policies SP2 and WCBV1 respectively). The requirements of these and other pressures for development from cross-boundary effects (including those from the SEP summarised in paragraphs 2.4-2.14) have informed the Core Strategy.  Insert footnotes as detailed.
E6	Paragraph 2.4 (page 7) – whole paragraph	The approaches to development and movements between the authorities around Wokingham (see map 2.2) influence the Core Strategy.	The approaches to development arising from the SEP and movements between the authorities around Wokingham (see map 2.2) influence the Core Strategy.
E7	Paragraph 2.5 (page 7) – second and third sentence	The western part of Wokingham Borough lies on the transport corridor (railway/A33) between the SEP hubs of Basingstoke and Reading. It may be necessary to consider the impacts of any measures to improve accessibility between these hubs on this part of the borough.	The western part of Wokingham Borough lies on the transport corridor (railway/A33) between the SEP Regional Hubs of Basingstoke and Reading (Policy SP2). It may be necessary to consider the impacts of any measures to improve accessibility between these Regional Hubs (SEP Policy T8) on this part of the borough. Basingstoke town is also a Primary Regional Centre (Policy TC1) in the SEP and is a Regional Diamond for Investment & Growth in the Regional Economic Strategy (RES) <sup>7</sup> and a New Growth Point. The SEP (Policy WCBV3) requires 915 dwellings per annum in the part of Basingstoke & Deane Borough within the Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley sub-region.  Include footnote as detailed
E8	Paragraph 2.6 (page		Bracknell is a Secondary Regional Centre and a Sub-Regional hub in the

<sup>6</sup> The parts of Wokingham Borough which comprises the existing and planned future built up area of Greater Reading (including areas functionally reliant upon this area). The former BSP (paragraph 4.14) defined the contiguous urban area as only relating to those areas north of the M4. Given the timing of the adoption of the SEP, the boundary of Greater Reading in Wokingham Borough will be defined through the Housing Site Allocations DPD.

<sup>7</sup> Available at [http://www.seeda.org.uk/RES\\_for\\_the\\_South\\_East\\_2006-2016/docs/RES\\_2006-2016.pdf](http://www.seeda.org.uk/RES_for_the_South_East_2006-2016/docs/RES_2006-2016.pdf).

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
	8) – insert text at end		SEP (Policies TC1 and WCBV1 respectively). The SEP (Policy WCBV3) requires 639 dwellings per annum in Bracknell Forest Borough.
E9	Paragraph 2.7 (page 8) – insert text at end		The SEP (Policy WCBV3) requires 215 dwellings per annum in the part of Hart District within the Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley sub-region.
E10	Paragraph 2.8 (page 8) – third sentence	Wokingham Borough Council recognises the approved Reading Borough Core Strategy (February 2008) further enhances the provision of homes, shops, employment and related services within its administrative area inline with its hub and diamond for growth designation within the SEP and Regional Economic Strategy (RES) respectively.	Wokingham Borough Council recognises the approved Reading Borough Core Strategy (February 2008) further enhances the provision of homes, shops, employment and related services within its administrative area inline with its Regional Diamond for Growth and Investment designation within the RES and its New Growth Point Status.
E11	Paragraph 2.9 (page 9) – insert text at end		Reading is a Centre for Significant Change in the SEP (Policy TC1). The SEP (Policy WCBV3) requires 611 dwellings per annum in Reading Borough.
E12	Paragraph 2.10 (page 9) – insert text at end		South Oxfordshire District is not within the Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley sub-region in the SEP. The SEP (Policy H1) requires 547 dwellings per annum in South Oxfordshire District. Within South Oxfordshire, there is a New Growth Point at Didcot for which 6,000 dwellings are to be delivered 2006-2026 (SEP Policy CO3). Furthermore, 4,000 dwellings are to be delivered south of Oxford for which further work is required regarding the apportionment between South Oxfordshire District and Oxford City (SEP Policy CO1).
E13	Paragraph 2.11 (page 9) – second sentence	If proposals for development in the Kennet Valley (north of the M4) take place (suggested by the SEP Panel, paragraph 21.68), Wokingham Borough will need to work closely with both West Berkshire and Reading to ensure sustainable transport solutions are delivered.	The SEP (Policy WCBV3) requires 475 dwellings per annum in the part of West Berkshire District within the Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley sub-region. Newbury is a defined Sub-Regional hub and Secondary Regional Centre (SEP Policies WCBV1 and TC1 respectively). Parts of West Berkshire are also within the extent of Greater Reading defined in the SEP (see paragraph 2.3 above).
E14	Paragraph 2.12 (page 9) – insert text at end		The SEP (Policy WCBV3) requires 346 dwellings per annum in Windsor & Maidenhead Borough. Both Maidenhead and Windsor are defined Secondary Regional Centres in the SEP with the former a designated

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
			Sub-Regional hub (policies TC1 and WCBV1 respectively).
E15	Paragraph 2.13 (page 9) – insert text at end		The SEP (Policy WCBV3) requires 350 dwellings per annum in the part of Wycombe District within the Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley sub-region. High Wycombe is both a Regional Hub and Primary Regional Centre in the SEP (Policies SP2 and TC1 respectively).
E16	Paragraph 2.37 (page 17) – second sentence (updating to ensure consistency with change E32)	The HMA indicates that at least 55% of annual dwelling completions should be of affordable units.	The HMA indicates that at least 64% of annual dwelling completions should be of affordable units (see paragraph 4.34 below).
E17	Paragraph 3.13 (page 28) – first sentence	Whilst the Community Renaissance approach within the Core Strategy Initial Options (June 2005) was based upon the more efficient use of currently developed land, the authority cannot identify (with certainty of delivery through the SHLAA) enough previously developed land to meet the requirements set out in the SEP, let alone those of the SEP Panel.	Whilst the Community Renaissance approach within the Core Strategy Initial Options (June 2005) was based upon the more efficient use of currently developed land, the authority cannot identify (with certainty of delivery through the SHLAA) enough previously developed land to meet the requirements set out in the SEP (Policy SP3).
E19	Table 3.1 (page 29)		Delete column labelled “Draft SEP” and delete “Panel” from heading of last column.
E21	Table 3.2 (page 29)		Insert footnotes after both CP19 and CP20 SDL referring to footnote 4 in SEP Policy WCBV3.
E23	Paragraph 3.21 (page 31) – insert text at end		Change not agreed
E24	Paragraph 3.25 (page 31) – insert text at end		SEP Policy WCBV3 indicates that some 2,500 dwellings are to be delivered to serve the needs of Greater Reading which could be located in the Shinfield/Spencers Wood/Three Mile Cross area (paragraph 21.16).
E25	Paragraph 4.8 (page 36) – last sentence (amended by change D6)	The Council will seek over and above the minimum national regional targets through the Development Management & Allocations DPD.	The Council will seek over and above the minimum national regional targets (SEP Policy NRM11) through the Development Management & Allocations DPD.
E26	Paragraph 4.9 (page 36) – insert text at end		The regional target for reducing carbon dioxide emissions is detailed in SEP Policy CC2.

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
E27	Paragraph 4.11 (page 36)	The Council will need to make provision for implementing the renewable energy generation targets which will be set out in the SEP.	The Council will need to make provision for implementing the renewable energy generation targets and strategy set out in the SEP (Policies NRM11-NRM16).
E28	Paragraph 4.14 (page 36) – first sentence	The community and Government policy (PPG24) recognise the need for proposals to avoid areas of noise.	The community, Government and regional policy (PPG24 & SEP Policy NRM10 respectively) recognise the need for proposals to avoid areas of noise.
E29	Paragraph 4.21 (page 39) – first sentence	The SEP Panel (paragraphs 12.39-12.42) highlight the regional significance of the River Thames	The SEP (Policy C7) highlights the regional significance of the River Thames Corridor
E30	Paragraph 4.22 (page 39) – fifth sentence	This policy will also aid the delivery of green infrastructure within the borough as encouraged in the SEP Panel Report (paragraph 5.74) and PPS12 (paragraph 2.4).	This policy will also aid the delivery of green infrastructure within the borough as encouraged in the SEP (Policy CC8) and PPS12 (paragraph 2.4).
E31	Paragraph 4.34 (page 42) – second sentence (the percentages have been revised to reflect both the information in change E32 and the amendment to the Borough's housing requirement between the draft SE Plan and the final document)	This indicates that between 55% and 84% of the Borough's annual housing completions would need to be affordable dwellings.	This indicates that between 64% and 88% of the Borough's annual housing completions would need to be affordable dwellings.
E32	Paragraph 4.34 (page 42) – footnote 37	See figure 7.34 and Appendix B of the Berkshire HMA. The figures are a minimum of 290 units and a maximum of 440 units per annum in comparison to the SEP requirement.	See figure 7.37 of the Berkshire HMA. The figures are a minimum of 400 units and a maximum of 550 units per annum in comparison to the SEP requirement.
E33	Insert new paragraph immediately after policy CP7		SEP Policy NRM5 (criterion iii) recognises that the need to protect European sites from likely significant effects could mean that housing targets in Policy H1 are not achievable. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (see paragraph 2.65) indicates that the development currently envisaged through the Core Strategy can be delivered without

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
			likely significant harm upon any European sites (either on their own or in-combination with other plans or projects). However, the Council will assess each plan or project in line with NRM5 to confirm that they can be delivered without likely significant harm (either on their own or in-combination with other plans or projects).
E34	<p>Paragraph 4.40 (page 45) – whole paragraph (as amended by changes)</p> <p><b>See also change F6</b></p>	<p>The conservation of sites designated as important to nature conservation, habitats or species of principle importance in England for nature conservation and features of the landscape that are of major importance for wild flora and fauna are essential for the maintenance of the area’s biodiversity and the quality of life of the borough’s residents. All developments should take account of the biodiversity, and where possible developments should contribute to the enhancement of the borough’s biodiversity. The Wokingham District Biodiversity Action Plan highlights targets where proposals can contribute towards their achievement and the Council has identified a number of Conservation Target Areas (CTA) that are a priority for the maintenance, restoration and creation of priority habitats. CTA are the areas that have the highest concentration of existing ecological sites e.g. Local Wildlife Sites. Consequently, in these areas, measures to support and enhance biodiversity are most likely to deliver benefits. Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre surveyed the borough for potential CTA during the 2007/08 financial year. Information on biodiversity within the Borough can be obtained from the Thames Valley Environmental Records</p>	<p>The conservation of sites designated as important to nature conservation, habitats or species of principle importance in England for nature conservation and features of the landscape that are of major importance for wild flora and fauna are essential for the maintenance of the area’s biodiversity and the quality of life of the borough’s residents. All developments should take account of the biodiversity, and where possible developments should contribute to the enhancement of the borough’s biodiversity. The Wokingham District Biodiversity Action Plan highlights targets where proposals can contribute towards their achievement and the Council has identified a number of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (in line with SEP Policy NRM5) that are priorities for the maintenance, restoration and creation of priority habitats. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas have the highest concentration of existing ecological sites e.g. Local Wildlife Sites. Consequently, in these areas, measures to support and enhance biodiversity are most likely to deliver benefits. Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre surveyed the borough for potential Biodiversity Opportunity Areas during the 2007/08 financial year. Information on biodiversity within the Borough can be obtained from the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC). Further details on the level of protection appropriate to international, national and local sites are detailed in PPS9 (including the accompanying Good Practice Guide), ODPM Circular 06/2005 and SEP Policy NRM5. Where a proposal is likely to have a significant effect upon a Natura 2000 site, the authority will expect the applicant to supply it with sufficient information to demonstrate how these impacts will be avoided.</p>

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
		Centre (TVERC). Further details on the level of protection appropriate to international, national and local sites are detailed in PPS9 (including the accompanying Good Practice Guide) ODPM Circular 06/2005. Where a proposal is likely to have a significant effect upon a Natura 2000 site, the authority will expect the applicant to supply it with sufficient information to demonstrate how these impacts will be avoided.	
E35	Paragraph 4.42 (page 46) – last sentence	This approach is also consistent with the Appropriate Assessment.	This approach is also consistent with the Appropriate Assessment and SEP Policy NRM6.
E36	Paragraph 4.43 (page 47) – first sentence (as amended by change D17)	Having regard to the findings of Natural England’s visitor surveys and the Delivery Framework, the authority (in the Appropriate Assessment) concludes that residential proposals involving increases of one or more net additional dwelling within 5km (linear) of the SPA will need to be assessed for whether there is likely to be significant impacts.	Having regard to the findings of Natural England’s visitor surveys, SEP Policy NRM6 and the Delivery Framework, the authority (in the Appropriate Assessment) concludes that residential proposals involving increases of one or more net additional dwelling within 5km (linear) of the SPA will need to be assessed for whether there is likely to be significant impacts.
E37	Paragraph 4.45 (page 46) – last sentence (as amended by change B15)	Pending the Joint Nature Conservation Committee’s review of Natura 2000 sites, the Council in line with the requirements of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 will consider the impacts of development on the Habitats Directive Annex 1 birds (Nightjar and Woodlark) at Gorrick Plantation under policy CP7.	Pending the Joint Nature Conservation Committee’s review of Natura 2000 sites, the Council in line with the requirements of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 will consider the impacts of development on the Habitats Directive Annex 1 birds (Nightjar and Woodlark) at Gorrick Plantation under policy CP7 and SEP Policy NRM5.
E38	Paragraph 4.47 (page 47) – first sentence	The Council has had regard to the advice in SEP Policies CC8a & H3, BSP Policies DP1, DP2, H3, S1, S4 & E1 and the information on facilities and services detailed in appendix 3 (as to be enhanced by proposals in the Core Strategy).	The Council has had regard to the advice in SEP Policies SP2, SP3, CC6, RE3, H1, H2, T1, C4, C5, BE1, BE4, BE5, TC2, WCBV1, WCBV2 & WCBV3 and the information on facilities and services detailed in appendix 3 (as to be enhanced by proposals in the Core Strategy).
E39	Paragraph 4.48 (page		(see also SEP Policy T8)

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
	48) – insert at end		
E40	Policy CP10 (page 49) – Sub-regional column		Insert footnote: See SEP paragraphs 8.46-8.47, 8.52 (including tables 2 & 3), paragraphs 21.21 & 21.22
E41	Policy CP10 (page 51) – criterion 16 (footnote 48)	Funding only on place for route east from Maidenhead, however the SEP Panel (paragraph 21.106) advocate a western extension through the borough to Reading	Funding only in place for route east from Maidenhead, however the route from Maidenhead to Reading was safeguarded with effect from 29 April 2009 – see <a href="http://www.crossrail.co.uk/construction/safeguarding/maidenhead-to-reading">http://www.crossrail.co.uk/construction/safeguarding/maidenhead-to-reading</a> .
E42	Paragraph 4.57 (page 53) – whole paragraph	In line with the guidance in PPG2, one of the key features of Green Belts is their permanence. SEP Policy CC10a indicates that Green Belts in the region will be supported. BSP policy DP9 indicates that changes to Green Belt boundaries should only be made in exceptional circumstances. The Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to warrant changes to the Green Belt during the Plan period as all the development needs for the Borough can be accommodated sustainably elsewhere. This is consistent with the findings of the SHLAA.	In line with the guidance in PPG2, one of the key features of Green Belts is their permanence. SEP Policy SP5 indicates that Green Belts in the region will be supported. PPG2, paragraph 2.6 indicates that changes to Green Belt boundaries should only be made in exceptional circumstances. The Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to warrant changes to the Green Belt during the Plan period as all the development needs for the Borough can be accommodated sustainably elsewhere. This is consistent with the findings of the SHLAA and SEP paragraph 21.6 which does not indicate that a review of the Green Belt is required at any locations within Wokingham Borough.
E45	Paragraph 4.68 (page 56) – last sentence	BSP Policy S1 recognises that Wokingham town centre is a major centre.	The former BSP (Policy S1) recognised that Wokingham town centre was a major centre.
E46	Paragraph 4.74 (page 58) – third and fourth sentences	BSP policy E2 promotes a more holistic approach to employment development consistent with this policy. RPG9 calls on local authorities in the Western Policy Area to work with the private sector to secure improvements in transport and housing (Policy RE8).	SEP (Policies RE5 and RE6) recognise the importance of smart growth within the Western Corridor & Blackwater Valley sub-region. Policy RE6 recognises the need to maximise the productive capital of the sub-region's resources including human capital, land and natural resources whilst addressing transport and skill constraints. Furthermore, SEP paragraph 21.10 recognises the status of Reading within the sub-region and the challenges posed by issues such as congestion, labour shortages and a globalised economy. To address these issues, there are a variety of measures.

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
E47	Paragraph 4.74 (page 58) – last sentence (including footnote 51)		Delete
E48	Paragraph 4.75 (page 58) – second to fourth sentences	Its provision would also overcome an issue identified in the Audit Report concerning the need to maintain and enhance the highly skilled and knowledgeable workforce in the borough which is recognised in work undertaken by the Thames Valley Economic Partnership. The BSP recognises the role of universities and other higher education institutions in encouraging knowledge based industries. This approach is consistent with that in the RES.	Its provision would also overcome an issue identified in the Audit Report concerning the need to maintain and enhance the highly skilled and knowledgeable workforce in the borough. The RES (page 25) recognises the role of universities and other higher education institutions in encouraging knowledge based industries and it identifies the potential for nationally important innovation cluster to be developed in the Thames Valley. The SEP (paragraph 21.13) recognises that the Greater Reading authorities should work together to facilitate the expansion and diversification of the University of Reading as a promoter of research and development in collaboration with the commercial sector via the development of a research-based science park within this area. The identification of a location within Shinfield Parish south of the M4 is consistent with the SEP (paragraph 21.16).
E54	Table on page 93		Insert “former” before Berkshire Structure Plan requirement heading
E55	Glossary (page 118) – information on Berkshire Structure Plan – insert text at end		It was replaced by the South East Plan (the RSS) following its approval by the Secretary of State on 6 May 2009.
E56	Glossary (page 122) – insert section for “Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)”		Text to read: See South East Plan
E57	Glossary (page 122) – South East Plan item	The Regional Spatial Strategy for South East England covering the period 2006-26. It was submitted to the Government by the South East England Regional Assembly (SEERA) on 31 March 2006. An Examination into the Plan was undertaken from 28 November 2006 until 30 March 2007. The Report of the Panel was	The Regional Spatial Strategy for South East England covering the period 2006-26. It was approved by the Secretary of State on 6 May 2009.

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
		published on 29 August 2007.	
E58	Glossary (page 123) – Structure Plan item	An old-style development plan, which sets out strategic planning policies and forms the basis for detailed policies in local plans. These plans will continue to operate for a time after the commencement of the new development plan system, due to transitional provisions under planning reform.	An old-style development plan, which set out strategic planning policies and formed the basis for detailed policies in local plans. The Structure Plan for Berkshire has been replaced by the South East Plan.

**F: Further changes to updated Core Strategy following receipt of South East England Partnership Board letter regarding publication of final South East Plan on 6 May 2009 – agreed 23/7/09**

All the changes are based upon the matters raised in Schedule attached to the Partnership Board's letter.

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
F1	Paragraph 1.14 (page 4) – last sentence (update to change E1)	Following publication of the SEP, the Council contacted the SEEPB to confirm that the submitted Core Strategy (including clarifications proposed through the examination process) was still in general conformity.	Following publication of the SEP, the Council contacted the SEEPB. They confirmed (25 June 2009) that the submitted Core Strategy (including clarifications proposed through the examination process) was still in general conformity.
F5	Paragraph 3.17 (page 29) – (updated by change E22) last sentence	The authority will expedite the delivery of housing to meet the overall requirements of the SEP, although due to the issues above, it does not consider it appropriate to achieve the annual targets every year.	The authority will expedite the delivery of housing to meet the overall requirements of the SEP, although due to the issues above, it does not consider it appropriate to achieve the annual average figure every year.
F6	Paragraph 4.40 (page 45) – updated by change E34) penultimate sentence	Further details on the level of protection appropriate to international, national and local sites are detailed in PPS9 (including the accompanying Good Practice Guide), ODPM Circular 06/2005 and SEP Policy NRM5.	Further details on the level of protection appropriate to international, national and local sites are detailed in PPS9 (including the accompanying Good Practice Guide), ODPM Circular 06/2005 and SEP Policies NRM5 and NRM7.
F13	Table 4.3 (page 61) – last row	Update phased requirements in line with changes to policy CP18	Update phased requirements in line with changes to policy CP18
F14	Paragraph 4.83 (page 63) – (updated by change E50)	The need to maintain the separation of settlements reflects SEP Policy CC6.	The need to maintain the separation of settlements reflects the Core Strategy's Spatial Issues (paragraph 2.66) and Spatial Vision (paragraphs 3.1 and 3.5).

Appendix B - Schedule of all endorsed Minor Changes to the Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (August 2008)

No	Location in document	Original text (as amended through earlier changes)	Suggested change
	penultimate sentence		
F15	Paragraph 4.86 (page 64) – (updated by change E51) penultimate sentence	The need to maintain the separation of settlements reflects SEP Policy CC6.	The need to maintain the separation of settlements reflects the Core Strategy's Spatial Issues (paragraph 2.66) and Spatial Vision (paragraphs 3.1 and 3.5).
F16	Paragraph 4.90 (page 65) – (updated by change E52) first and second sentence	The need to maintain separation of Wokingham from Binfield/Bracknell and Winnersh reflects SEP Policy CC6 together with the adopted Bracknell Forest Core Strategy (policies CS4 and CS9 together with paragraph 123). The maintenance of the separation of Wokingham from the other settlements reflects the approach of the SEP (Policy CC6).	The need to maintain separation of Wokingham from Binfield/Bracknell and Winnersh reflects the Core Strategy's Spatial Issues (paragraph 2.66) and Spatial Vision (paragraphs 3.1 and 3.5) together with the adopted Bracknell Forest Core Strategy (policies CS4 and CS9 together with paragraph 123). The maintenance of the separation of Wokingham from the other settlements reflects the Core Strategy's Spatial Issues and Spatial Vision.
F17	Paragraph 4.92 (page 66) – (updated by change E53) second to fourth sentence	Development further south and east of this location would encroach into the gaps separating Wokingham from Binfield/Bracknell, Finchampstead North and Pinewood (Crowthorne) contrary to SEP Policy CC6. The former and latter gaps also accord with the adopted Bracknell Forest Core Strategy (policies CS4 and CS9 together with paragraph 123).	Development further south and east of this location would encroach into the gaps separating Wokingham from Binfield/Bracknell, Finchampstead North and Pinewood (Crowthorne) contrary to the Core Strategy's Spatial Issues (paragraph 2.66) and Spatial Vision (paragraphs 3.1 and 3.5). The former and latter gaps also accord with the adopted Bracknell Forest Core Strategy (policies CS4 and CS9 together with paragraph 123).