Issues & Options Consultation – The main issues raised

The Issues and Options consultation ran between 4 August and 30 September 2016. This represented the first formal consultation stage of the Local Plan Update and opened discussion about what the local plan should contain. We asked a number of questions about different planning issues that should be dealt with in the update and what people saw as the future for Wokingham Borough.

This report summarises the main issues which have arisen through the consultation, based around the different topic areas. Where relevant, the level of response and agreement to continued policy approaches have been shown.

1. Vision and Objectives

Main ideas for consideration in the LPU vision and objectives:

- Thriving businesses with flexible employment options and a highly skilled, innovative workforce
- Strong communities that are lively, diverse and healthy
- Open space for leisure and nature
- Ease of movement and strong connections including cycle and pedestrian routes and sustainable transport
- Housing for all and the appropriate infrastructure to support it
- Achieving a work life balance
- Digital connectivity
- Agreement of a balance of the environmental, social and economic pillars to guide objectives within the LPU

2. Plan period

- Agreement for the LPU to cover the period up to 2036
- Need to ensure consideration of issues and opportunities beyond the plan period also
3. Where should development go?

The Options Identified...

**Option 1**: Continue the approach of a small number of large developments that provide for their own infrastructure needs based on garden town/village principles

**Option 2**: A large number of smaller developments around the Borough

**Option 3**: Do nothing and let the market dictate when and where development will take place

**Option 4**: Focus development at existing larger settlements

**Option 5**: Focus development at existing smaller settlements

**Option 6**: A combination of some / all of the above approaches

Which option should the Council use for where development should go (its spatial strategy)?

- Option 1: 21%
- Option 2: 1%
- Option 3: 2%
- Option 4: 43%
- Option 5: 4%
- Option 6: 1%
- N/A: 25%
- Option 1 or 4 and 5: 0%
- Option 2 and 4: 0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Option 1 or 4 and 5</th>
<th>Option 2 and 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The majority of developer responses were Option 6
- Resident responses were split between Options 1 & 6

Main issues:
- Infrastructure should be provided alongside development
- Brownfield developments in areas of Green Belt should be utilised
- Consider development at existing settlements where there is a shortage of infrastructure in order to warrant new infrastructure
- Consideration of lead in times for different types of developments will need to be considered
- Settlement boundaries should be reviewed
4. Housing

Housing need

Do you agree that we should plan to provide for the existing and future housing needs of people, as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment?

Main issues:
- We should provide for the need as set out in the Berkshire (including South Bucks) SHMA 2016
- Ensure diversity in the housing provided – social, affordable, sizes
- Ensure mitigation of effects of large developments on smaller settlements and ensure positive impact on existing communities
- Identify a range of sites in order to meet the need
- Views expressed that the SHMA is not fully robust and the Objectively Assessed Housing Need identified is too low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>New OAN</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mix of housing

Do you think we should have a policy to ensure that a range of homes are provided? If not, what approach should we take?

Main issues:
- The market should be left to naturally dictate the mix of housing in the borough
- An appropriate dwelling mix is needed in order to provide smaller, more affordable properties suitable for older and younger people
- Any policy introduced should be flexible to reflect locations of developments; certain developments will be better suited to accommodate a mix of housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes and No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affordable housing

Main issues:
- Flexibility needed in mix of tenure, size, etc. of affordable housing
- Promotion of social integration and cohesion across developments and areas
- Realistic targets for provision, taking into consideration viability

Gypsies & Travellers

Main issues:
- We should meet the need identified for gypsies and travellers
- Maximise the potential of existing sites
- Further understanding is required of the appropriate size, location etc. of sites
- Different views expressed about whether sites should be close to services and infrastructure, or away from settlements
**Starter Homes**

In March 2015, the Government introduced the concept of Starter Homes, which are homes for first-time buyers aged under 40, and which are sold at a minimum 20% discount below market value for the first occupier only. This discounted sale price is capped at £250,000 outside of London.

The Government is currently proposing that developments of 10 homes or more should provide 20% Starter Homes. If local authorities are given some discretion do you agree with this threshold or should we be looking to provide a different standard?

- **Agree**: 30%
- **Disagree**: 45%
- **N/A**: 25%

If there is discretion for local authorities to set their own Starter Home policy, should land be allocated for Starter Homes or should they be integrated within new developments?

- **Yes - they should be allocated**: 12%
- **No - they should be integrated within new developments**: 50%
- **N/A**: 38%

**Main issues:**
- General support for starter homes, although not enough information currently regarding the introduction of them to provide full comments
- Developers’ view that starter homes should form part of the provision for affordable housing
- Support for allocation of plots for self-build integrated into larger developments
- Further understanding of the self-build need and government requirements necessary
**Self-build and custom build**

The Government published new planning legislation and guidance for providing for people who wish to build their own homes. This can include building a home yourself, getting others to build it for you or part of a community project (see the Self Build Portal for further information).

**Should specific land be allocated for self-build plots or should they be integrated within new developments?**

- **Yes** - they should be allocated: 43%
- **No** - they should be integrated within new developments: 30%
- **N/A**: 27%

**Should specific land be allocated for affordable self-build plots or should they be integrated within new developments?**

- **Yes** - they should be allocated: 27%
- **No** - they should be integrated within new developments: 25%
- More Information needed: 4%
- **N/A**: 44%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes - they should be allocated</th>
<th>No - integrated within new developments</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main issues:**
- The allocation of areas for self-build and custom build within SDLs would encourage architectural variety
- Flexibility in whether to allocate in large developments or ad-hoc outside settlements
- Potential timeframe for allocated plots not built out to revert back to conventional housing
Housing for older people and other vulnerable groups

Should the Council have a specific policy about accommodating Older People’s Housing Need?

- Yes: 55%
- No: 6%
- N/A: 39%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should the Council have a specific policy which supports proposals for accommodation for other vulnerable groups?

- Yes: 52%
- No: 6%
- N/A: 42%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main issues:

- Consideration should be given to smaller units, rather than only care homes and sheltered accommodation
- Choice of type and tenure should not be too limited
5. Employment & Retail

Employment

The current policy approach is very focussed on preserving certain types of employment uses based around offices, industry and warehousing (known in planning as ‘B’ Use Classes). However, other types of uses, that don’t fall within the ‘B’ Use Classes, also create jobs and could complement such uses, i.e. a café.

Should the Council be more flexible in its approach to where employment growth should occur and the types of jobs that are considered to be employment uses?

Main issues:
- Employment and working habits are changing and we need to adapt and be flexible
- Employment must be supported by e.g. sustainable transport, improved broadband, etc.
- Further focus on - Innovation hubs, communal space, starter businesses
- Include other community and leisure uses within employment areas if appropriate rather than limiting to B uses
- Flexibility should not mean unsustainable locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you think we should continue to apply the same policy approach to retail development?

- **Yes**: 51% (37 responses)
- **No**: 16% (12 responses)
- **N/A**: 33% (48 responses)

**Main issues:**
- Need to understand that shopping habits are changing and improve flexibility of the retail experience
- Support of local, independent businesses
6. Infrastructure and Community

Infrastructure planning

Do you consider that the Council should require developers to contribute towards maintaining infrastructure and over what time period?

Main issues:
- Provision of infrastructure to meet both the physical and social needs of the community
- New infrastructure should be provided before/during housing being built, rather than after
- Necessary infrastructure suggested includes: health, sports and leisure, transport, education, retail, community facilities, broadband access, green infrastructure
- Various views were expressed towards the proposed time for developers to contribute to maintenance of infrastructure ranging from not at all, to forever, with a number of respondents stating 10 years
- Consideration of renewable energy opportunities – wind turbines, solar power
- Safe cycling
- Need for a more consistent approach to cross-border issues regarding development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The majority ‘Yes’ responses were from Residents and Town & Parish Councils
- The majority of developers did not answer the question regarding maintenance
Open space

Should the Council continue the policy approach of allowing the loss of open space, sports and recreational buildings and land as long as a suitable alternative is provided? If not, what approach should we take?

Main issues:
- Open space should only be lost if it is not fit for purpose
- Any alternative provided should be better rather than equivalent to that provision lost
- Any alternative must be local and accessible
- Where respondents said no to a continued policy approach, views expressed were largely that all open space should be retained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Flooding and Sustainable Drainage Systems

Do you agree with the current approach to flooding; minimising the risk of flooding and guiding development towards areas of lowest flood risk first?

- Yes: 47%
- No: 10%
- N/A: 43%

Do you think that the implementation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems should be required on all residential development including Minor applications for 1-9 dwellings? If not, what approach should we take?

- Yes: 49%
- No: 8%
- N/A: 43%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main issues:
- Views expressed were largely in agreement with a continued approach, so long as it is applied with sufficient rigor
- Take a more positive approach to flood mitigation
- Utilise green infrastructure
8. Countryside

**Should we continue to use our existing approach to managing development in the countryside?**

- **Yes**: 36%
- **No**: 25%
- **N/A**: 39%

**Main issues:**

- Development in the countryside should be restricted and sensitively handled
- Retain separation between settlements with green gaps
- Consideration at a local level needed based on sustainability of locations and sympathetic to local area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Green Belt

Are there locations within the Green Belt for sustainable development that would warrant us looking at altering the Green Belt boundaries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main issues:

- Allow development of brownfield sites within the Green Belt
- Continue to protect the Green Belt
10. Natural Environment

Do you agree with the Council continuing this approach to protecting designated nature conservation sites? If not, what approach should we take?

Main issues:
- Protection should be afforded to areas with no designation which support biodiversity, rather than only those with local designations
- Policies should positively impact the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Heritage & Historic Environment

Do you agree that we have got the right level of protection for our heritage assets?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main issues:
- Take account of significant assets through the plan making process
- Give communities the opportunity to submit features for inclusion in the Buildings of Traditional Local Character register
- Ensure protection without being too restrictive eg. To allow improvements
12. Sustainable Design

Should we ‘opt in’ to the tighter Building Regulations requirement for water efficiency?

- Yes: 41%
- No: 12%
- N/A: 47%

Should we specify what proportion of new housing should be within Categories 2 accessible and adaptable dwellings and 3 wheelchair user dwellings?

- Yes: 34%
- No: 19%
- N/A: 47%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Should we ‘opt in’ to central government’s minimum living space standards?

Main issues:
- There is a national standard – ensure consideration of viability and affordability if tighter restrictions will be used
- An incentive may be more appropriate
- Will need evidence to support any changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Response</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>