

Wokingham Borough Council

# **The Neighbourhood Plan for Charvil 2024 – 2040**

## **Independent Examiner's Report**

By Ann Skippers BSc (Hons) MRTPI FRSA FHEA AoU

23 January 2026

<b>Contents</b>		
	<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>The role of the independent examiner and the examination process</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Neighbourhood plan preparation</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Compliance with matters other than the basic conditions</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>The basic conditions</b>	<b>9</b>
	<i>National policy and advice</i>	9
	<i>Sustainable development</i>	10
	<i>The development plan</i>	11
	<i>European Union (EU) obligations</i>	12
	<i>European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)</i>	14
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Detailed comments on the Plan and its policies</b>	<b>14</b>
	1. <i>The Role and Scope of the Neighbourhood Plan</i>	15
	2. <i>Charvil Parish in Profile</i>	15
	3. <i>A Clear Vision and Objectives</i>	15
	4. <i>Building a Sustainable Community (Policy 1)</i>	16
	5. <i>Housing Requirements (Policy 2)</i>	18
	6. <i>Design and Development Form (Policies 3, 4 and 5)</i>	19
	7. <i>Local Heritage (Policy 6)</i>	22
	8. <i>Green and Blue Infrastructure (Policies 7, 8, 9 and 10)</i>	24
	9. <i>Sustainable Travel (Policies 11 and 12)</i>	30
	10. <i>Flood Risk (Policies 13 and 14)</i>	31
	11. <i>Monitoring</i>	33
	<i>Appendix A</i>	33
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>33</b>
	<b>Appendix 1 List of key documents</b>	<b>34</b>
	<b>Annex 1 Schedule of Proposed Modifications</b>	<b>35</b>

## Summary

I have been appointed by Wokingham Borough Council to carry out the independent examination of the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Charvil.

Charvil is located about a mile to the west of Twyford in the Thames Valley south and west of the confluence of the River Thames and the River Loddon. Charvil village has many attributes and local services and facilities and is set in attractive countryside. One of its most striking features is the abundance of trees and hedgerows.

The Plan contains 14 policies covering a variety of topics from Local Green Spaces to trees to community facilities and heritage.

A number of modifications have been recommended; in the main these are intended to ensure the Plan is clear and precise providing a practical framework for decision-making as required by national policy and guidance.

Subject to those modifications, I have concluded that the Plan does meet the basic conditions and all the other requirements I am obliged to examine. I am therefore pleased to recommend to Wokingham Borough Council that the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Charvil can go forward to a referendum.

In considering whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Neighbourhood Plan area I see no reason to alter or extend this area for the purpose of holding a referendum.

Ann Skippers MRTPI  
Ann Skippers Planning  
23 January 2026



## 1.0 Introduction

This is the report of the independent examiner into the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Charvil (the Plan).

The Localism Act 2011 provides a welcome opportunity for communities to shape the future of the places where they live and work and to deliver the sustainable development they need. One way of achieving this is through the production of a neighbourhood plan.

I have been appointed by Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) with the agreement of Charvil Parish Council to undertake this independent examination. I have been appointed through the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS).

I am independent of the qualifying body and the local authority. I have no interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan. I am a chartered town planner with over thirty years experience in planning and have worked in the public, private and academic sectors and am an experienced examiner of neighbourhood plans. I therefore have the appropriate qualifications and experience to carry out this independent examination.

## 2.0 The role of the independent examiner and the examination process

### *Role of the Examiner*

The examiner must assess whether a neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

The basic conditions<sup>1</sup> are:

- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the neighbourhood plan
- The making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development
- The making of the neighbourhood plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area
- The making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, retained European Union (EU) obligations<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Set out in paragraph 8 (2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and paragraph 11(2) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

<sup>2</sup> "EU obligation" was substituted for "retained EU obligation" by the Environmental Assessments and Miscellaneous Planning (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2018/1232 which came into force on 31 December 2020

- Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the neighbourhood plan and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the neighbourhood plan.

Regulations 32 and 33 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) set out two additional basic conditions to those set out in primary legislation and referred to in the paragraph above. Only one is applicable to neighbourhood plans and was brought into effect on 28 December 2018.<sup>3</sup> It states that:

- The making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

The examiner is also required to check<sup>4</sup> whether the neighbourhood plan:

- Has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body
- Has been prepared for an area that has been properly designated for such plan preparation
- Meets the requirements to i) specify the period to which it has effect; ii) not include provision about excluded development; and iii) not relate to more than one neighbourhood area and that
- Its policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I must also consider whether the draft neighbourhood plan is compatible with Convention rights.<sup>5</sup>

The examiner must then make one of the following recommendations:

- The neighbourhood plan can proceed to a referendum on the basis it meets all the necessary legal requirements
- The neighbourhood plan can proceed to a referendum subject to modifications or
- The neighbourhood plan should not proceed to a referendum on the basis it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

If the plan can proceed to a referendum with or without modifications, the examiner must also consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the neighbourhood plan area to which it relates.

If the plan goes forward to referendum and more than 50% of those voting vote in favour of the plan then it is made by the relevant local authority, in this case WBC. The

---

<sup>3</sup> Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018/1307

<sup>4</sup> Set out in sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act and paragraph 11(2) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

<sup>5</sup> The combined effect of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), Schedule 4B para 8(6) and para 10 (3)(b) and the Human Rights Act 1998

plan then becomes part of the 'development plan' for the area and a statutory consideration in guiding future development and in the determination of planning applications within the plan area.

### ***Examination Process***

It is useful to bear in mind that the examiner's role is limited to testing whether or not the submitted neighbourhood plan meets the basic conditions and other matters set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and paragraph 11 of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).<sup>6</sup>

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that the examiner is not testing the soundness of a neighbourhood plan or examining other material considerations.<sup>7</sup>

The fact that a modification would be of benefit is not a sufficient ground in itself to recommend it. So, for example, the fact that a policy could be added to or strengthened does not justify a modification unless this is necessary for the reasons given above.

In addition, PPG is clear that neighbourhood plans are not obliged to include policies on all types of development.<sup>8</sup> Often representations suggest new policies on different topics or suggest amendments to the policies or the supporting text or different approaches. As explained above, where I find that policies do meet the basic conditions, it is not necessary for me to consider if further amendments or additions are required. Sometimes representations ask for additions that fall outside the remit of the planning system.

PPG<sup>9</sup> explains that it is expected that the examination will not include a public hearing. Rather the examiner should reach a view by considering written representations. Where an examiner considers it necessary to ensure adequate examination of an issue or to ensure a person has a fair chance to put a case, then a hearing must be held.<sup>10</sup>

After consideration of all the documentation and the representations made, I concluded that it was not necessary to hold a hearing.

In 2018, the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS) published guidance to service users and examiners. Amongst other matters, the guidance indicates that the qualifying body will normally be given an opportunity to comment upon any representations made by other parties at the Regulation 16 consultation stage should they wish to do so. There is no obligation for a qualifying body to make any comments; it is only if they wish to do so. The Parish Council made

---

<sup>6</sup> Paragraph 11(3) of Schedule A2 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and PPG para 055 ref id 41-055-20180222

<sup>7</sup> PPG para 055 ref id 41-055-20180222

<sup>8</sup> Ibid para 040 ref id 41-040-20160211

<sup>9</sup> Ibid para 056 ref id 41-056-20180222

<sup>10</sup> Ibid

comments on the Regulation 16 stage representations and I have taken these into account.

I am grateful to everyone for ensuring that the examination has run so smoothly and in particular James McCabe at WBC.

I made an unaccompanied site visit to familiarise myself with the Plan area on 13 January 2026.

### ***Modifications and how to read this report***

Where necessary for the Plan to meet the basic conditions and other legal requirements, modifications have been recommended. These appear in this report as Modification Number (MN) MN1, MN2, MN3 and so on. For ease of reference, the modifications are shown in the Schedule of Proposed Modifications Annex attached to this report on page 35. Where I have suggested specific changes to the wording of the policies or new wording these appear in *italics*.

As a result of some modifications consequential amendments will be required. These can include changing policy numbering, section headings, amending the contents page, renumbering paragraphs or pages, ensuring that supporting appendices and other documents align with the final version of the Plan and so on.

I regard these issues as primarily matters of final presentation and do not specifically refer to all such modifications, but have an expectation that a common sense approach will be taken and any such necessary editing will be carried out and the Plan's presentation made consistent.

## **3.0 Neighbourhood plan preparation**

A Consultation Statement has been submitted.

Work began on the Plan when a Steering Committee was established consisting of volunteers and Parish Councillors. Themed Working Groups were also set up later as a response to the issues that were emerging from the community engagement. A variety of events to encourage input to, and feedback on, the Plan were held including a Residents Survey in the Summer of 2021 with a good response rate, a Young Persons Survey, an Open Day in 2022, a Green Corridor workshop in 2023 and attendances at the annual Summer Fete and updates to the Annual Parish meetings.

In addition, there is a dedicated Neighbourhood Plan website and regular use was made of social media, local media and banners and noticeboards.

Pre-submission (Regulation 14) consultation took place between 3 March and 15 April 2025. Copies were available online and in person. The consultation was publicised through banners and notices, social media and two drop-in events.

I consider that the consultation and engagement carried out is satisfactory.

Submission (Regulation 16) consultation was carried out between 1 September and 13 October 2025.

The Regulation 16 stage resulted in 12 representations. I have considered all of the representations and taken them into account in preparing my report.

## **4.0 Compliance with matters other than the basic conditions**

### ***Qualifying body***

Charvil Parish Council is the qualifying body able to lead preparation of a neighbourhood plan. This requirement is satisfactorily met.

### ***Plan area***

The Plan area is coterminous with the administrative boundary for the Parish Council. WBC approved the designation of the area on 23 September 2020. The Plan relates to this area and does not relate to more than one neighbourhood area and therefore complies with these requirements. The Plan area is shown on page 4 of the Plan.

### ***Plan period***

The Plan period is 2024 – 2040. This is confirmed in the Plan itself and the Basic Conditions Statement. The requirement is therefore satisfactorily met.

### ***Excluded development***

The Plan does not include policies that relate to any of the categories of excluded development and therefore meets this requirement. This is also helpfully confirmed in the Basic Conditions Statement.

### ***Development and use of land***

Policies in neighbourhood plans must relate to the development and use of land. Sometimes neighbourhood plans contain aspirational policies or projects that signal the community's priorities for the future of their local area, but are not related to the development and use of land. If I consider a policy or proposal to fall within this category, I will recommend it be clearly differentiated. This is because wider community aspirations than those relating to development and use of land can be



included in a neighbourhood plan, but actions dealing with non-land use matters should be clearly identifiable.<sup>11</sup>

## 5.0 The basic conditions

### *Regard to national policy and advice*

The Government replaced previous versions of the NPPF with a new NPPF which was published in December 2024. This was amended in February 2025 to correct some cross-references to footnotes and to clarify the intent of paragraph 155.

The NPPF is the main document that sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

In particular it explains that the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will mean that neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies in local plans or spatial development strategies and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.<sup>12</sup>

Non-strategic policies are more detailed policies for specific areas, neighbourhoods or types of development.<sup>13</sup> They can include allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level, establishing design principles, conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment as well as set out other development management policies.<sup>14</sup>

The NPPF also makes it clear that neighbourhood plans give communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area.<sup>15</sup> However, neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than that set out in strategic policies or undermine those strategic policies.<sup>16</sup>

The NPPF states that all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence; evidence should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying policies and take into account relevant market signals.<sup>17</sup>

Policies should be clearly written and unambiguous so that it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. They should serve a clear purpose and avoid unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area including those in the NPPF.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> PPG para 004 ref id 41-004-20190509

<sup>12</sup> NPPF para 13

<sup>13</sup> Ibid para 29

<sup>14</sup> Ibid

<sup>15</sup> Ibid para 30

<sup>16</sup> Ibid

<sup>17</sup> Ibid para 32

<sup>18</sup> Ibid para 16

On 6 March 2014, the Government published a suite of planning guidance referred to as Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). This is an online resource available at [www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance) which is regularly updated. The planning guidance contains a wealth of information relating to neighbourhood planning. I have also had regard to PPG in preparing this report.

PPG indicates that a policy should be clear and unambiguous<sup>19</sup> to enable a decision maker to apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. The guidance advises that policies should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence, reflecting and responding to both the planning context and the characteristics of the area.<sup>20</sup>

PPG states there is no 'tick box' list of evidence required, but proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken.<sup>21</sup> It continues that the evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies.<sup>22</sup>

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement clearly sets out how the Plan's policies have regard to the NPPF.

### ***Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development***

A qualifying body must demonstrate how the making of a neighbourhood plan would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

The NPPF confirms that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>23</sup> This means that the planning system has three overarching and interdependent objectives which should be pursued in mutually supportive ways so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives.<sup>24</sup>

The three overarching objectives are:<sup>25</sup>

- a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;
- b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe

---

<sup>19</sup> PPG para 041 ref id 41-041-20140306

<sup>20</sup> Ibid

<sup>21</sup> Ibid para 040 ref id 41-040-20160211

<sup>22</sup> Ibid

<sup>23</sup> NPPF para 7

<sup>24</sup> Ibid para 8

<sup>25</sup> Ibid

places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

- c) an environmental objective – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

The NPPF confirms that planning policies should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but should take local circumstances into account to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.<sup>26</sup>

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement sets out how the Plan helps to achieve each of the objectives of sustainable development as outlined in the NPPF and contains a robust discussion of how the Plan contributes.

### ***General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan***

The development plan consists of:

- Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (CS) adopted 29 January 2010
- Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD) adopted 21 February 2014
- South East Plan Policy NRM6 (relating to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area)
- Central and Eastern Berkshire Joint Minerals and Waste Plan adopted 19 January 2023 and
- Other made neighbourhood plans.

Whilst this has formed part of my own assessment, the Basic Conditions Statement sets out how the policies in the Plan conform to the LP.

### ***Emerging Local Plan***

Work is underway on a new Local Plan to 2040. This will replace the CS and MDD local plans once it has been adopted. The proposed submission plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination on 28 February 2025 and is currently at the hearings stage.

There is no legal requirement to examine the Plan against emerging policy. However, PPG<sup>27</sup> advises that the reasoning and evidence informing the local plan process may be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which the Plan is tested.

Furthermore Parish Councils and local planning authorities should aim to agree the relationship between policies in the emerging neighbourhood plan, the emerging local

---

<sup>26</sup> NPPF para 9

<sup>27</sup> PPG para 009 ref id 41-009-20190509

plan and the adopted development plan with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance.<sup>28</sup>

It is important to minimise any conflicts between policies in the neighbourhood plan and those in the emerging local plan because the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that any conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan.<sup>29</sup>

PPG advises that where a neighbourhood plan has been brought into force, the local planning authority should take its policies and proposals into account when preparing the local plan. Local plan policies should not duplicate those in the neighbourhood plan, and do not need to supersede them unless changed circumstances justify this. It is important for local plans to make appropriate reference to neighbourhood plan policies and similarly for neighbourhood plans to acknowledge local plan policies that they relate to.<sup>30</sup>

I will refer to the emerging local plan in this report where I feel it relevant to do so.

### ***Retained European Union Obligations***

A neighbourhood plan must be compatible with retained European Union (EU) obligations. A number of retained EU obligations may be of relevance for these purposes including those obligations in respect of Strategic Environmental Assessment, Environmental Impact Assessment, Habitats, Wild Birds, Waste, Air Quality and Water matters.

With reference to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) requirements, PPG<sup>31</sup> confirms that it is the responsibility of the local planning authority to ensure that all the regulations appropriate to the nature and scope of the draft neighbourhood plan have been met. It states that it is the local planning authority who must decide whether the draft plan is compatible with relevant retained EU obligations when it takes the decision on whether the plan should proceed to referendum and when it takes the decision on whether or not to make the plan.

### ***Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment***

The provisions of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the 'SEA Regulations') concerning the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment are relevant. The purpose of the SEA Regulations, which transposed into domestic law Directive 2001/42/EC ('SEA Directive'), are to provide a high level of protection of the environment by incorporating environmental considerations into the process of preparing plans and programmes.

---

<sup>28</sup> PPG para 009 ref id 41-009-20190509

<sup>29</sup> Ibid

<sup>30</sup> Ibid para 006 ref id 61-006-20190723

<sup>31</sup> Ibid para 031 ref id 11-031-20150209

The provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations'), which transposed into domestic law Directive 92/43/EEC (the 'Habitats Directive'), are also of relevance to this examination. They constitute retained EU law under the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 and section 5 of the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023.

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 were amended by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019/579 but they were not intended to introduce any change in policy<sup>32</sup>.

Regulation 63 of the Habitats Regulations requires a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to be undertaken to determine whether a plan is likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects. The HRA assessment determines whether the Plan is likely to have significant effects on a European site considering the potential effects both of the Plan itself and in combination with other plans or projects. Where the potential for likely significant effects cannot be excluded, an appropriate assessment of the implications of the Plan for that European Site, in view of the Site's conservation objectives, must be carried out. Case law has established that article 6(3) requires a strict "precautionary approach" and the Habitat Regulations should be interpreted "purposively".

On 28 December 2018, the basic condition prescribed in Regulation 32 and Schedule 2 (Habitats) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) was substituted by a new basic condition brought into force by Regulation 3(2) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018/1307 which provides that the making of the plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

A Determination Statement for both Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) dated March 2025 and prepared by WBC, has been submitted.<sup>33</sup>

This concludes that the Plan is not predicted to have likely significant effects, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects and therefore 'screens out' SEA. The Determination Statement includes the responses from the consultation with the statutory consultees. Both Natural England and Historic England agreed with the conclusion, whilst the Environment Agency did not respond.

I have treated the Determination Statement to be the statement of reasons that the PPG advises must be prepared and submitted with the neighbourhood plan proposal and made available to the independent examiner where it is determined that the plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> CG Fry & Son Limited V Secretary of State for Housing< Communities and Local Government (formerly known as SoS for LU, H&C) & anor [2025] UKSC 35at para 32

<sup>33</sup> Included as an appendix to the Basic Conditions Statement

<sup>34</sup> PPG para 028 ref id 11-028-20150209

Taking account of the characteristics of the Plan, the information put forward and the characteristics of the areas most likely to be affected, I have no reason to disagree with the conclusions of the Determination Statement and consider that the requirements in respect of SEA have been met.

With regard to HRA, the Determination Statement details five sites; the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA) about 11km from the Plan area, the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) around 9km northeast, the Windsor Forest and Great Park SAC about 13km away, Hartlocks SAC about 15km away and the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC around 18km away.

The Determination Statement concludes that no likely significant effects are predicted, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Consultation with Natural England has taken place and they concur that significant effects are unlikely, either alone or in combination.

Taking into account the distance from, the nature and characteristics of the European sites and the nature and contents of the Plan, I have no reason to disagree with the conclusion of the Determination Statement and consider that the prescribed basic condition relating to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 is complied with.

#### ***European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)***

The Basic Conditions Statement contains a statement in relation to human rights and equalities. Having regard to the Basic Conditions Statement, there is nothing in the Plan that leads me to conclude there is any breach or incompatibility with Convention rights.

## **6.0 Detailed comments on the Plan and its policies**

In this section I consider the Plan and its policies against the basic conditions.

The Plan is presented to a high standard and contains 14 policies. There is a helpful and comprehensive contents page and a foreword that sets the scene well, at the start of the Plan.

WBC has rightly commented that Table 2 is missing from the contents page with consequential effects throughout the document. This is something that can be remedied as final editorial checks are carried out once any modifications have been executed.

I have noticed that one or two of the references to paragraphs of the NPPF are based on an older version of that document. These can be checked and any necessary updates made as part of the final editorial checks.

In addition, whilst the policies are clearly shown with a green background and called CHARVIL 1, CHARVIL 2 and so on, I feel it would be beneficial to insert the word “Policy” before each policy for the avoidance of any doubt. Modification **MN1** deals with this point which applies throughout the Plan.

## **1. The Role and Scope of the Neighbourhood Plan**

The first section of the Plan is well written and well presented and contains a wealth of information about the Plan.

It will need some natural updating to reflect the latest position regarding the emerging Local Plan (paragraph 1.12) as the Plan progresses. This wording can be agreed between WBC and the Parish Council to reflect the most up to date position at the relevant stage.

Paragraph 1.16 contains information about the work undertaken to support the Plan and a list of supporting documents. The list appears to miss off the Biodiversity Report of August 2023 produced by the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC) which has been submitted to me and refers to a “Valued Landscape Definitions” which has not been included in the suite of documents provided. In the interests of accuracy, this paragraph should be reviewed and corrected. Modification **MN2** is therefore made.

## **2. Charvil Parish in Profile**

This section sets out the planning context for the area. It contains a wealth of information about the characteristics of the Parish in an informative and accessible way. There is an emphasis on the carbon footprint of Charvil and how this might be reduced.

WBC has suggested some amended wording for paragraph 2.14 to update the references on landscape. Modification **MN3** is therefore made.

## **3. A Clear Vision and Objectives**

The vision for the area is:

“In 2040, the village of Charvil will be a stronger local community with an improved quality of life for all its residents. It will have high quality, sustainable housing. The semi-rural nature of the village will remain and local green space and heritage assets will be protected and enhanced. People will walk and cycle more using new and improved cycling and pedestrian routes in a safer road network. Charvil will be a resilient sustainable community which mitigates the effects of climate change and flooding. Delivery of the Vision will result in a stronger and more cohesive community.”

The detailed and distinctive vision is underpinned by five objectives.

Both the vision and the objectives are clearly articulated and relate to the development and use of land putting sustainable development at the heart of the Plan.

Two policy maps, also identified as Figures 11 and 12 on pages 20 and 21 of the Plan, then follow in this section. WBC make the point that “policy maps” should show the full extent of the Plan area and that these maps show information such as the location of domestic solar panels which would not usually appear on a policy map. WBC recommend repositioning these maps as informational and with updated information on flood zones. In addition, I understand that the land shown as “LPU Proposed Allocation Site” on Figure 11 now has the benefit of outline planning permission for residential development. Taking all these points together, modification **MN4** is made.

#### **4. Building a Sustainable Community**

The Parish Council has requested some changes to Tables 3 and 4 and to paragraph 4.10. Modifications **MN5**, **MN6** and **MN7** cover these points which are essentially factual updates.

#### **Policy CHARVIL 1 – Sites in Local Community Use and Other Community Infrastructure**

A particular aspiration of the Plan is to ensure that housing growth is accompanied by a requisite level of local community services and infrastructure. This chapter of the Plan sets out detailed and comprehensive information showing the range of facilities available within the Parish and those further afield. It considers the facilities needed in the future to provide a more self contained and sustainable community.

Policy CHARVIL 1 is a long and detailed policy that seeks to achieve these aims. It begins by requiring any development that would increase demand on community facilities to support and enhance such facilities. It then supports new facilities.

The policy goes on to identify 16 Sites in Local Community Use including the Village Hall, car parks and sports ground as well as the Village Stores. Four other important community assets are identified; these are the primary school, the two public houses and the service station. In relation to the Sites in Local Community Use, the policy only supports the loss of these facilities if equivalent facilities exist or are proposed within reasonable walking distance and/or the site is no longer needed or suitable for alternative community uses.

New commercial or institutional development is then supported in principle. The loss of such development is only supported if robust evidence demonstrates that the alternative uses of the site are no longer economically viable.

Whilst the principle of retaining and encouraging new community facilities and services is supported, I consider the policy as it is currently worded could be clearer and more precise. For example, the policy refers to a reasonable walking distance but does not specify from which location in the village. I also note the comments from WBC about unintended consequences. Taking these points together, I recommend **MN8** which



reorders the policy and adds to its precision and clarity.

With the suggested MN8, the policy will have regard to the NPPF which, to support a prosperous rural economy, expects planning policies to enable the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.<sup>35</sup> It also states that policies should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services as part of its drive to promote healthy and safe communities, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet day-to-day needs.<sup>36</sup>

The NPPF cites open space and sports venues as part of the local services and community facilities which planning policies should retain and enable.<sup>37</sup> In addition, the NPPF recognises that planning policies should help to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which enable and support healthy lifestyles.<sup>38</sup> It recognises that access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for health and wellbeing and can also deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change.<sup>39</sup> It states that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields and formal play areas, should not be built on unless surplus to requirements or replacement by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location or the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.<sup>40</sup>

CS Policy CP3 sets out general principles for development. Amongst other things, it specifically refers to the provision of an appropriate sustainable network of community facilities. It resists proposals that would lead to a loss of such facilities unless alternative provision is available.

MDD Policy TB17 supports the retention of day-to day shopping facilities.

Finally, Figure 13 on page 27 of the Plan shows some of the Sites in Local Community Use and the Important Community Assets in Charvil and is referred to in Policy CHARVIL 1. I could not readily find all of the numbered assets. Therefore **MN9** seeks to address this.

With these modifications, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, being in general conformity with strategic policies and CS Policy CP3 and MDD Policy TB17 in particular and helping to achieve sustainable development.

---

<sup>35</sup> NPPF para 88

<sup>36</sup> Ibid para 98

<sup>37</sup> Ibid para 88

<sup>38</sup> Ibid para 96

<sup>39</sup> Ibid para 103

<sup>40</sup> Ibid para 104

## 5. Housing Requirements

### Policy CHARVIL 2 – Meeting Local Housing Needs

The policy supports housing development within the Settlement Boundary where a mix of housing including small, open market homes for sale and rent and social housing, is provided. It seeks to ensure that any new development responds to evidence of local housing need, demand and the demographic profile of the Parish; all of which are discussed in detail in the Plan. The aim is to have a balanced and mixed community.

Policy CHARVIL 2 therefore has regard to the NPPF which states that to help support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land comes forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.<sup>41</sup> It continues that the overall aim should be to meet as much of an area's identified housing need as possible, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community.<sup>42</sup>

Within this context, it is clear that size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in policy.<sup>43</sup> These groups include affordable housing, families with children, older people and those with disabilities and people wishing to commission or build their own homes.<sup>44</sup>

In rural areas, the NPPF explains that policies should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs.<sup>45</sup>

The CS recognises that Charvil has a limited range of facilities and does not have access to good quality public transport services as well as being in areas with risk of flooding issues. Therefore significant development is not considered to be appropriate, but smaller proposals that support the local community and meet local needs may be acceptable.

CS Policy CP5 seeks a mix and balance of housing density, dwelling type, tenure and size.

MDD Policy TB05 refers to housing mix.

Similar to the comments made by WBC in their representation, I have considered whether the inclusion of three bed dwellings in the policy to help meet local needs is appropriate.

---

<sup>41</sup> NPPF para 61

<sup>42</sup> Ibid

<sup>43</sup> Ibid para 63

<sup>44</sup> Ibid

<sup>45</sup> Ibid para 82

I note that the information provided in the Plan points to a younger and more family oriented population, that Charvil has a slightly higher people per household figure than Wokingham and England and that 60% of households contain at least three people.

However, the Plan explains that around 95% of homes are 3 or 4 bed and of these around 88% have one or more spare bedrooms. In addition, affordability is a key concern. Smaller dwellings and entry level housing is more likely to be affordable and it is recognised that this tends not to be provided in new build schemes. The lack of available smaller properties available for downsizing is also a constraint. In general terms three bedroomed properties are not considered to be small.

Taking all these matters together, on balance, the policy should be amended to support the smaller units needed and identified in the Plan's discussion of the pertinent issues and be future proofed.

Modification **MN10** addresses these points. With modification MN10, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to national policy and guidance, being in general conformity with strategic policies and CS Policy CP5 and MDD Policy TB05 in particular and helping to achieve sustainable development.

A representation from Stantec<sup>46</sup> objects to a statement in the supporting text that Charvil is not a sustainable location for significant housing development. However, this reflects the stance in the CS and the emerging Local Plan. The Local Plan Update identifies Charvil as a minor settlement with limited services and facilities where an appropriate level of planned housing growth to support the evolution of the community may be acceptable and that development is limited to exception sites. The Plan does not preclude appropriate development and the paragraph 5.2 specifically refers to "significant" housing development.

## **6. Design and Development Form**

The Plan explains that Charvil has evolved over the course of many years from around the nucleus of buildings associated with the Great West Road tollgate through estate development. There is no obvious centre to the village. Work on the Plan has included the production of the Charvil Design Guidance and Codes document produced by AECOM. This document identifies six Character Areas. A summary of the features of each Character Area is included in the Plan alongside the guidelines and codes for each area.<sup>47</sup>

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.<sup>48</sup> Being clear about design expectations is essential for achieving this.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> On behalf of the University of Reading

<sup>47</sup> The Plan, page 44 onwards

<sup>48</sup> NPPF para 131

<sup>49</sup> Ibid

It continues that neighbourhood planning groups can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of an area and explaining how this should be reflected in development.<sup>50</sup> It refers to design guides and codes to help provide a local framework for creating beautiful and distinctive places with a consistent and high quality standard of design.<sup>51</sup>

It continues that planning policies should ensure developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive, are sympathetic to local character and history whilst not preventing change or innovation, establish or maintain a strong sense of place, optimise site potential and create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.<sup>52</sup>

With regard to density, the NPPF supports the efficient use of land taking into account, amongst other things, the availability and capacity of local infrastructure and services which in this area is limited, and the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting which has been, in this case, identified through AECOM's work.<sup>53</sup>

CS Policy CP1 seeks to deliver sustainable development. This includes maintaining and enhancing the high quality of the environment, providing attractive, accessible and safe schemes, reducing the need to travel and avoiding increasing the risk of, and from, flooding.

CS Policy CP3 sets out general principles for development. This includes references to high quality of design that is appropriate to the character of the area and the contribution to a sense of place in the buildings and space themselves and how they integrate with their surroundings.

There is a small syntax correction to make in paragraph 6.20 that can be made as part of the final editorial work on the Plan.

### **Policy CHARVIL 3 – Design of New Development**

This policy provides criteria for the consideration of development proposals with a view to ensuring that the distinctiveness, character and sense of place is conserved and that the highest standard of development is achieved. It refers to, and incorporates, some of the work in the Design Guidance and Codes document. I agree with WBC that the policy could be made simpler and more robust by referring to the Design Guidance and Codes document as a whole rather than only focusing on some of the issues. I understand the Parish Council's concern that this might mean specific design code elements are not specified in the policy, but as the policy is currently written it highlights some of the codes and not others and to me this detracts from the work carried out as whole.

---

<sup>50</sup> NPPF para 132

<sup>51</sup> Ibid para 133

<sup>52</sup> Ibid para 135

<sup>53</sup> Ibid paras 129, 130

Modification **MN11** therefore simplifies the policy to make it clearer and more robust. It will ensure the whole Design Guidance and Code document is taken into account and used.

With this modification, Policy CHARVIL 3 will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, being in general conformity with the development plan policies referred to above and helping to achieve sustainable development.

#### **Policy CHARVIL 4 – Housing Density and Development Form**

Policy CHARVIL 4 seeks to ensure that new residential development has regard to the character and area features outlined in the Design Guidance and Codes document and the prevailing density of each area.

A potential inconsistency between the aims of the policy and the encouragement to smaller dwellings has been pointed out by WBC. There is no doubt that the work carried out on prevailing housing densities and shown in Figure 23 on page 50 of the Plan is extremely useful.

With modification **MN12** to alter the nuance of the policy to make it a little clearer, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, being in general conformity with strategic policies and especially CS Policies CP1 and CP3 and helping to achieve sustainable development.

#### **Policy CHARVIL 5 – Environmental Performance of Buildings**

This policy supports the Plan's aspiration to reduce carbon footprint and to encourage both new and existing buildings to achieve high standards of environmental performance.

In relation to meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change, the NPPF states that the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future.<sup>54</sup> The planning system should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure.<sup>55</sup>

It continues that plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> NPPF para 161

<sup>55</sup> Ibid

<sup>56</sup> Ibid para 162

The Government introduced national technical standards for housing in 2015. A Written Ministerial Statement (WMS)<sup>57</sup> explains that neighbourhood plans should not set out any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings.

That WMS is now effectively moot in this respect following a Government Statement on Planning – Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update.<sup>58</sup> This embeds a general rule of thumb that policies which propose standards or requirements that go beyond current or proposed standards should be rejected at examination if they do not have a well-reasoned and robustly costed rationale. I consider the principle is applicable here.

Having carefully considered the wording of the policy I consider it does not set a standard and therefore is acceptable in principle.

WBC has made a number of detailed suggestions relating to the third paragraph of the policy and its supporting text. These amendments would align the policy with WBC's position more closely and also help to future proof the Plan. Modifications **MN13** and **MN14** are therefore recommended.

With these modifications, Policy CHARVIL 5 will meet the basic conditions by encouraging new development to meet and take the opportunity to achieve a high level of sustainable design and has regard to national policy, be in general conformity with strategic policies and CS Policy CP1 in particular and will help to achieve sustainable development.

## 7. Local Heritage

### Policy CHARVIL 6 – Charvil Parish Buildings of Traditional Local Character and Areas of Special Character

The NPPF is clear that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.<sup>59</sup> It continues that plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.<sup>60</sup>

The Plan area contains a number of listed buildings and registered monuments. Policy CHARVIL 6 turns its attention to non-designated heritage assets and seeks to identify the Heron on the Ford Public House as a local heritage asset and the area around it, including the Public House, the Giddy Bridge and the Ford Crossing, as an Area of Special Character.

Non-designated heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes which have heritage significance, but do not meet the criteria for designated

---

<sup>57</sup> Written Ministerial Statement 25 March 2015

<sup>58</sup> Statement made on 13 December 2023

<sup>59</sup> NPPF para 202

<sup>60</sup> Ibid para 203

heritage assets. PPG advises there are various ways that such assets can be identified including through neighbourhood planning.<sup>61</sup>

However where assets are identified, PPG advises that it is important decisions to identify them are based on sound evidence.<sup>62</sup> There should be clear and up to date information accessible to the public which includes information on the criteria used to select assets and information about their location.<sup>63</sup>

The Plan and a supporting document, Non-Designated Heritage Assets, includes extensive information to support the two proposed designations. It is clear to me that the Heron on the Ford Public House, the Giddy Bridge and the Ford Crossing provide local historic and community interest including through architecture and archaeology interests. I note that around half of Giddy Bridge falls within the Plan area and that the Area of Special Character contains a car park. Nevertheless the area identified is coherent, joining the various elements together and could be the catalyst for enhancement.

I consider both designations have been appropriately identified and supported.

In relation to non-designated heritage assets, the NPPF explains that a balanced judgment will be needed having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.<sup>64</sup>

MDD Policy TB26 refers to buildings of traditional local character and areas of special character. Permission will only be granted for proposals affecting these designations where the character is retained or enhanced.

Table 9 shows the proposed area, but identifies it as a Local Heritage Area. I consider it would be clearer if the same terminology was used. Accordingly **MN15** makes this small change.

Policy CHARVIL 6 designates the local heritage assets and indicates special consideration should be given to their heritage value. The policy meets the basic conditions by having regard to national policy. It is in general conformity with strategic policies and will help to achieve sustainable development.

---

<sup>61</sup> PPG para 040 ref id 18a-040-20190723

<sup>62</sup> Ibid

<sup>63</sup> Ibid

<sup>64</sup> NPPF para 216

## 8. Green and Blue Infrastructure

Paragraph 8.4 on page 59 of the Plan would benefit from small 'sense' amendments. This is subject to **MN16**.

### Policy CHARVIL 7 – Green Corridors

Policy CHARVIL 7 identifies a number of green corridors in the Parish in Figure 27 on page 64 of the Plan. These are based on habitats, woodland and wetland corridors. The policy seeks to ensure that habitats are protected and enhanced and that connections can be made. It supports development where opportunities are taken to protect, improve and extend the corridors.

The policy is supported by work carried out by the Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre (TVERC). A comprehensive report from TVERC is submitted as part of the suite of supporting evidence for the Plan. This explains that the green corridors are defined where habitat networks for wildlife and public rights of way coincide so that they are corridors for the movement of both wildlife and people. Wetland and woodland was identified as being of most importance in this locality.

The NPPF requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment including through the protection of valued landscapes and sites of biodiversity value, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and, minimising impacts on, and providing net gains for, biodiversity.<sup>65</sup>

To protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF encourages plans to identify and map and safeguard local wildlife rich habitats and ecological networks, wildlife corridors and promote priority habitats as well as pursuing net gains for biodiversity.<sup>66</sup>

CS Policy CP1 seeks to maintain the high quality of the environment. CS Policy CP3 sets out general principle for development including the importance of maintaining or enhancing flora and fauna.

MDD Policy CC03 enhances these policies by setting out criteria to show how green corridors in development can be provided for. MDD Policy TB23 refers to biodiversity and development.

It seems to me that the policy has particular regard to the NPPF. It is in general conformity with strategic policies and especially CS Policies CP1, CP3 and CP7 which refers to biodiversity and MDD Policies CC03 and TB23. It will help to achieve sustainable development. It therefore meets the basic conditions and no modifications to the policy are recommended.

However, Figure 27 comprises three separate diagrams taken from the work by TVERC on green corridors. Maps 5 and 6 in the supporting document show the green

---

<sup>65</sup> NPPF para 187

<sup>66</sup> Ibid para 192



corridors. These two maps should be reproduced and inserted into the Plan. Modification **MN17** addresses this point and is made in the interests of clarity.

### **Policy CHARVIL 8 – Local Green Space Sites**

This policy seeks to designate seven areas of Local Green Space (LGS). They are shown on Figure 28 on page 66 of the Plan. More information and detailed maps of each proposed LGS is contained in Appendix A of the Plan.

The NPPF explains that LGSs are green areas of particular importance to local communities.<sup>67</sup> The designation of LGSs should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services.<sup>68</sup> It is only possible to designate LGSs when a plan is prepared or updated and LGSs should be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.<sup>69</sup>

The NPPF sets out three criteria for green spaces.<sup>70</sup> These are that the green space should be in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves, be demonstrably special to the local community and hold a particular local significance and be local in character and not be an extensive tract of land. Further guidance about LGSs is given in PPG.

1. St Patrick's Wood is an area of woodland partly covered by an area tree preservation order. It is roughly triangular in shape. Although there seems to be no formal public access (which is not a factor in LGS assessment), the details submitted with the Plan indicate the area is valued for its recreational value next to the Recreation Ground and because of the variety of trees and woodland. This space has been assessed as part of a larger area, broadly the same as proposed LGS3 by WBC which has not taken forward by WBC as a proposed LGS in the Local Plan Update. However, WBC point out that there has been no assessment at WBC level of St Patrick's Wood as a separate entity. I note the landowner does not object to the proposed designation.
2. St Patrick's Recreation Ground is a recreation ground with a defined boundary and contains a level playing area, play equipment and benches. WBC advises that this open space has been put forward as a LGS in the Local Plan Update. I note the landowner does not object to the proposed designation.
3. Land to the east and north of Park View Drive North is an irregular shaped area of land described as agricultural in Appendix A. The associated map shows the inclusion of St Patrick's Wood which has been put forward as a separately identified LGS. WBC advises that a similar area was assessed as part of work on the Local Plan Update and it was not taken forward as a LGS. The landowner objects to this

---

<sup>67</sup> NPPF para 106

<sup>68</sup> Ibid

<sup>69</sup> Ibid

<sup>70</sup> Ibid para 107

proposed designation.

4. Charvil Meadows forms part of a wildlife reserve. It is valued for its wildlife and flora and fauna and for its recreation with many footpaths traversing the area as well as its natural beauty. WBC advises that a similar, but smaller site has been proposed as a LGS in the Local Plan Update. There is no objection from WBC to the wider area.
5. Charvil Country Park is some 44 hectares in size, and forms part of the wildlife reserve. It has a number of walking routes across it. TVERC confirms flora and fauna and wildlife. It is valued for its recreation opportunities, beauty and wildlife. WBC advises that a similar, but smaller site has been proposed as a LGS in the Local Plan Update. WBC confirm there is no objection to the extended area shown in the Plan.
6. Hawthorns Park is a park and play area near to the Village Hall and otherwise surrounded by housing. It contains the community orchard and has play equipment. It is valued for its recreational function. WBC advises that this open space has been put forward as a LGS in the Local Plan Update.
7. Simmons Wood is an elongated woodland park and play area close to the Margaret Gimblett pavilion. It is particularly valued for its recreational attributes. I saw at my site visit this is an impressive and unusual space. Interestingly, Appendix A of the Plan indicates that this open space is not suitable as a LGS. This is presumably an error. WBC also advise that a larger area, LGS164, has been put forward as a LGS in the Local Plan Update confirming then the area would, as far as WBC are concerned, meet the criteria for LGSs. WBC suggest that the larger area is recognised in the Plan; this would be useful although the character of the wider area is different to Simons Wood, but would require further consultation given the proposed LGS is larger than that currently proposed in the Plan.

Based on the information in the Plan and my site visit, in my view, all except for one of the proposed LGSs meet the criteria in the NPPF satisfactorily.

The proposed LGS which I consider does not meet the criteria is LGS 3 Land to the east and north of Park View Drive North. I saw at my site visit that this is an area of land on the village edge largely in agricultural use. Whilst it has a relationship with St Patrick's Recreation Ground and I could see well-trodden paths and there are a number of important trees and hedgerows and it is pleasant countryside as well as having some historic interest, I could not find any discernible difference with surrounding land. I am not persuaded that the evidence put forward for this proposed LGS is fully met. Modification **MN18** therefore recommends deletion of this space from Policy CHARVIL 8.

The other proposed LGSs are demonstrably important to the local community, are capable of enduring beyond the Plan period, meet the criteria in paragraph 107 of the NPPF and their designation is consistent with the local planning of sustainable

development and investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services given other policies in the development plan and this Plan.

Turning now to the wording of the policy, it designates the LGSs and refers to “very special circumstances”. The NPPF states that development in the LGSs will be consistent with national policy for Green Belts.<sup>71</sup> I recommend a modification to Policy CHARVIL 8 to ensure it has regard to the NPPF and can therefore meet the basic conditions. Modification **MN18** also deals with this recommendation.

With these modifications, Policy CHARVIL 8 will meet the basic conditions by having regard to national policy, being in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan and helping to achieve sustainable development.

### Policy CHARVIL 9 – Trees

The NPPF is clear that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change.<sup>72</sup>

The NPPF recognises that planning policies should contribute to, and enhance, the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland.<sup>73</sup>

Development that would result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.<sup>74</sup>

CS Policy CP7 refers to biodiversity.

MDD Policy CC03 specifically refers to the protection of existing trees and other landscape features. MDD Policy TB21 refers to landscape character and seeks the retention or enhancement of landscape features and character.

The Plan emphasises the importance of trees and woodland including veteran trees. The Design Guidance and Codes document also recognises the contribution trees make to the character of Charvil as well as the benefits including biodiversity, air quality improvement and wellbeing. It sets out a design code to preserve street trees.<sup>75</sup> I saw at my site visit there were a plethora of important, mature trees and hedgerows throughout the Parish that are a critical component of the area’s character and are a feature that should be treasured.

---

<sup>71</sup> NPPF para 108

<sup>72</sup> Ibid para 136

<sup>73</sup> Ibid para 187

<sup>74</sup> Ibid para 193

<sup>75</sup> Design Guidance and Codes document page 59

Policy CHARVIL 9 sets out a requirement on sites of 0.5 hectares or more to provide about 40% tree canopy cover through the retention of existing trees and new ones. This applies to sites within or adjacent to the Settlement Boundary. The policy has in-built flexibility where this is not practicable by referring to other green infrastructure opportunities.

I consider this to be an innovative policy. It deals with an issue that is gaining increased recognition in local plan policies. There is clearly support for increased tree canopy cover at national and local levels. In my experience, there is no 'golden' number for the percentage required, but any percentages are usually based on existing tree canopy cover figures. I note that WBC's Climate Emergency Action Plan of September 2025 references a Tree Strategy of 2022 which in turn suggests that canopy cover in the Borough is approximately 22%. Tree planting forms an integral part of the Action Plan to increase tree cover and Tree City of the World status has also been achieved.

Therefore it is right, in my view, the policy is ambitious particularly given the importance of trees and woodlands I have identified in the Plan area. These matters can be assessed using tree survey methods.

Some modifications to this first paragraph of the policy are recommended; the policy refers to "Charvil Village Centre", but this is not defined or shown on a map. The policy would work well without this reference and so it is proposed for deletion in the interests of clarity. Then the policy makes a reference to "similar benefits to trees" at the end of its first paragraph. This is a little ambiguous and so a modification is made to help with clarity.

The policy then requires a tree management plan to be provided that includes a provision for a like for like replacement of any trees lost within five years. This is precise, but little justification has been put forward for this time period. Usually the time period for landscape maintenance and management is assessed on a site-by-site basis. Reference to the protection of existing trees should be included. A modification is therefore made to increase flexibility to help with the practical application of the policy.

The third paragraph of the policy refers to a 10 metre frontage. This would not apply to all types of development such as householder schemes and so a modification is made to make this part of the policy's applicability more practical.

Finally, proposals which enhance natural features and connectivity with existing green infrastructure will be supported.

WBC makes a number of points about the supporting text; I have incorporated these in relation to paragraph 8.18 in the interests of completeness. With regard to WBC's comment on native trees, this reference is taken from the Design Guidance and Codes work and so relies on this supporting text.

With modification **MN19** to Policy CHARVIL 9 that reflects my comments above and modification **MN20** to its supporting text, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to national policy and guidance, being in general conformity with strategic policies especially those policies referred to above and help to achieve sustainable development.

### **Policy CHARVIL 10 – Valued Local Views**

This policy identifies five views that are of importance to the local community. These views are described in Table 10 on page 73 of the Plan and identified on Figure 31 on page 74 of the Plan. A supporting document, Charvil Valued Views, has also been produced although this seems to include a sixth viewpoint.

One issue that arises with this policy is that three of the identified views are long distance views towards hills or other features which lie outside the Plan area. As the Plan can only deal with development and use of land in its approved area, Figure 31 should be modified to only show the viewpoint to the edge of the Plan area. I believe this modification will also address a concern from Oxfordshire County Council in respect of a Minerals Safeguarding Zone that falls just outside the Plan area. This is subject to modification **MN21**.

Table 10 can be retained as it describes the rationale and reasons for the views. It is important that any new development on the land associated with the view within the Plan area enables the longer distance view to be respected. It is clear from Table 10 that it is not the intention to prevent development per se.

I considered each of the proposed five views shown on Figure 32 at my site visit. For those views I was not able to see, I was able to understand the extent and context of these views. View a) From Charvil to Bowsey Hill looks out over fields towards the hill in the distance. View b) Views across the valley towards Shiplake is another long distance view to the horizon across the valley towards distant hills. View c) to Sonning is a long distance view across fields towards hills on the other side of the valley. There is a treeline in view. View d) is a view of the lakes at the Country Park. View e) is a view of the Ford.

I consider all but one of the views have been appropriately identified. The three longer distance views form part of the character and uniqueness of this Parish and I have already discussed the merits of the local area around View e) in my discussion of Policy CHARVIL 6. However, View d) cannot be retained as it is on the edge of the Plan area and looks out over land that falls outside the Plan area. This recommended deletion is dealt with through MN21 above in relation to Figure 31, modification **MN22** which deals with Table 10 and the modification I recommend which amends the policy wording which I turn to now.

I propose amendments to the policy's wording to make it more precise and flexible and clear that it only applies to those parts of the views within Charvil Parish. Modification **MN23** addresses the deletion of View d) and the changes to the policy's wording.

I acknowledge the concern of, and information submitted from, Stantec about Views a), b) and c). However, many neighbourhood plans up and down the country have identified views that the local community value. The identification of a view with a carefully worded policy that does not prevent development per se but rather ensures new development respects local character features and distinctiveness is, to my mind, precisely one of the issues neighbourhood plans can do well. Whilst I accept the information could be more organised, it is sufficient at neighbourhood level given the nature of the views in this locality. I consider the modifications to the policy I have recommended will assist to alleviate some concerns.

With these modifications, Policy CHARVIL 10 will meet the basic conditions by having regard to national policy and guidance, being in general conformity with strategic policies and CS Policy CP1 and MDD Policies CC03 and TB21 in particular and helping to achieve sustainable development

## **9. Sustainable Travel**

This section has two policies. Both are aimed at encouraging more walking and cycling. The Plan explains that Charvil is a car-based community with high car and van ownership and relatively poor cycling and walking links given the rail station some 2 km away in nearby Twyford. The Parish is 'cut in half' by the A4 and A3032 in an east west direction. In the south, the railway acts as a barrier between the south of Charvil village and the southern part of the Parish. There is significant local concern about safety. This leads to a desire to both reduce traffic speeds and volumes on the roads. Improved and new walking and cycling routes, including a direct cycle route along the existing railway track to connect Charvil to Twyford is supported.

The NPPF indicates that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals so that, amongst other things, opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued.<sup>76</sup> It continues that planning policies should provide for attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks with supporting facilities such as secure cycle parking.<sup>77</sup>

The NPPF is clear that planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way (PROW) and access including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including National Trails.<sup>78</sup> Such networks can also help with providing opportunities and options for sustainable transport modes.<sup>79</sup> There are also many health and wellbeing benefits of a strong network.

The CS recognises the high car ownership in the Borough. CS Policy CP1 on sustainable development refers to CS Policy CP6. CS Policy CP6 seeks to manage travel demand including through schemes that provide for sustainable forms of transport and improve

---

<sup>76</sup> NPPF para 109

<sup>77</sup> Ibid para 111

<sup>78</sup> Ibid para 105

<sup>79</sup> Ibid para 109

the existing infrastructure network that includes road, rail and public transport, facilities and provision for pedestrians and cyclists and the enhancement of road safety.

#### **Policy CHARVIL 11 – Pedestrian and Cycling Environment**

This policy expects new development to maintain or improve highway and pedestrian safety. It sets out a number of priorities for improvements to the pedestrian or cyclist environment offering support to development that enables such improvements.

WBC has suggested an amendment in the interests of clarity which the Parish Council has accepted and I agree this would help with clarity. Modification **MN24** is therefore made.

With this modification, Policy CHARVIL 11 will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, be in general conformity with strategic policies and CS Policy CP6 in particular and helping to achieve sustainable development.

#### **Policy CHARVIL 12 – Bus Services**

The Plan explains that although there are four services offering routes through Charvil, improvements would be welcomed. Policy CHARVIL 12 gives in principle support to development that provides day and evening bus services to Twyford and other services within the Parish.

A modification **MN25** is made to ensure that the policy does not inadvertently support otherwise unacceptable development. With this modification, Policy CHARVIL 12 will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, being in general conformity with strategic policies and CS Policy CP6 in particular and helping to achieve sustainable development.

### **10. Flood Risk**

The Plan explains that the Parish suffers from both fluvial and surface water flooding which has become a regular occurrence. As the River Loddon flows into the River Thames, if the River Thames is in flood then this affects the River Loddon. The Meadows form an important floodplain function.

As part of the work on the Plan, a Flood Working Group was established and has produced the supporting document, A Review of Flooding History and Risk in Charvil. This Report considered previous flooding in the area including a February 2014 flood and recommended actions to improve flood risk mitigation. The Working Group liaised with the Environment Agency about the Report's conclusions.

The NPPF is clear that plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, including taking into account the long-term implications for

flood risk.<sup>80</sup>

It continues that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future).<sup>81</sup>

Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment and should manage flood risk from all sources. They should consider cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as lead local flood authorities and internal drainage boards.<sup>82</sup>

MDD Policy CC09 refers to development and flood risk. MDD Policy CC10 refers to sustainable drainage.

### **Policy CHARVIL 13 – Local Flood Risk Information**

This policy supports development where it complies with national and local policies on flood risk. It specifically sets out that this information should also include documentary information at Parish level. Helpfully, it sets out that developers are encouraged to engage informally with the Parish Council.

WBC makes two points in the representation. Firstly, that the policy refers to material considerations. Secondly, that it is unclear whether the sole engagement with the Parish Council should relate to flooding matters. Modification **MN26** is recommended to address both issues in the interests of clarity.

With this modification, the policy will meet the basic conditions by having regard to the NPPF, being in general conformity with strategic policies, especially CS Policy CP1 and MDD Policy CC09 and helping to achieve sustainable development.

### **Policy CHARVIL 14 – Development to Support Integrated Delivery of Improved Flood Resilience and Nature Recovery**

Work on the Plan in relation to blue and green infrastructure, identified the potential for habitat expansion and connectivity. There is the opportunity to connect the aims of local nature recovery and wetland habitat restoration with flood resilience.

Policy CHARVIL 14 supports proposals that directly or indirectly enable the restoration, expansion or creation of wetland and woodland habitats and improve resilience.

The policy has regard to national policy and guidance, is in general conformity with strategic policies, in particular CS Policy CP1 and MDD Policies CC03, CC09 and CC10 and

---

<sup>80</sup> NPPF para 162

<sup>81</sup> NPPF para 170

<sup>82</sup> Ibid para 171



will help to achieve sustainable development. As such, no modifications are recommended.

## **11. Monitoring, Delivery and Review**

This section indicates that the Plan will be reviewed regularly and I welcome this even though monitoring and review of neighbourhood plans is not currently mandatory.

## **Appendix A Local Green Space Sites Assessment**

There is one appendix which can be separated from the Plan as it progresses towards being made as it will remain one of the suite of supporting documents and is now out of date given the modifications made to Policy CHARVIL 8 earlier in this report. **MN27** addresses this point.

## **7.0 Conclusions and recommendations**

I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan for Charvil, subject to the modifications I have recommended, meets the basic conditions and the other statutory requirements outlined earlier in this report.

I am therefore pleased to recommend to Wokingham Borough Council that, subject to the modifications proposed in this report, the Neighbourhood Plan for Charvil can proceed to a referendum.

Following on from that, I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Neighbourhood Plan area. I see no reason to alter or extend the Plan area for the purpose of holding a referendum and no representations have been made that would lead me to reach a different conclusion.

I therefore consider that the Neighbourhood Plan for Charvil should proceed to a referendum based on the Neighbourhood Plan area as approved by Wokingham Borough Council on 23 September 2020.

*Ann Skippers* MRTPI  
Ann Skippers Planning  
23 January 2026

## Appendix 1 List of key documents specific to this examination

The Neighbourhood Plan for Charvil 2024 – 2040 Submission Plan May 2025 Version  
APL.Charvil.100.B

Basic Conditions Statement May 2025 Version APL.Charvil.102.B 30 May 2025 (Andrea Pellegram Ltd) includes the Determination Statement on the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment March 2025 (WBC)

Consultation Report May 2025 Version APL.Charvil.101.B May 2025 (Andrea Pellegram Ltd)

Biodiversity Report 2023-08-14 (Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre)

Green Corridors in Charvil February 2024 (TVERC)

Protected and Notable Species Records (Thames Valley Environmental Records Centre)

A Review of Flooding History and Risk in Charvil Final Report March 2023

Local Green Space Sites Assessment [also Appendix A of the Plan]

Green Space Audit January 2024

Non-Designated Heritage Assets

Residents Survey Results April 2022 (including results from the Young Persons Survey)

Charvil Valued Views

Active & Public Transport Maps

Carbon Footprint Report 01/12/2024 (Centre for Sustainable Energy)

Wokingham Borough Core Strategy (CS) adopted 29 January 2010

Managing Development Delivery Local Plan (MDD) adopted 21 February 2014

South East Plan Policy NRM6 (relates to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA)

RIGHT HOMES, RIGHT PLACES Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update 2023 - 2040  
Proposed Submission Plan

Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update 2023 – 2040 Local Green Spaces Assessment  
Detailed Assessment Appendix 8 September 2024

**List ends**

## **Annex 1 Schedule of Proposed Modifications**

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	Recommended Modification
		Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
MN1	Throughout the Plan	Insert the word “ <i>Policy</i> ” before each policy throughout the Plan i.e. “Policy CHARVIL 1” and so on
MN2	Page 7, paragraph 1.16	Check the bullet point list in paragraph 1.16 for accuracy particularly in relation to adding the Biodiversity Report produced by TVERC and removing the “Valued Landscape Definitions” reference
MN3	Page 9, paragraph 2.14	<p>Amend paragraph 2.14 to read:</p> <p>“Wokingham Borough Council’s Local plan update <i>Valued Landscapes Assessment (2024)</i> provided background evidence and justification for the designation of Valued Landscapes under Policy NE6 of the Proposed Submission Plan. <i>This provides an update to the Valued Landscape Topic Paper (2020) published alongside the Draft Plan (2020). These documents have informed</i> the development of the Local Plan Update and demonstrate how evidence has been applied to formulate policies designating Valued Landscapes in Wokingham Borough. Two valued landscapes have been identified in Charvil.”</p> <p>[retain the two existing bullet points that detail the two Valued Landscapes at end of paragraph]</p>
MN4	Pages 19, 20 and 21, Paragraph 3.7, Figures 11 and 12	<p>Delete the sub-heading on page 19 that reads “Policy Maps”</p> <p>Amend paragraph 3.7 to read:</p> <p><i>“Figure 11 overleaf shows a number of environmental designations in Charvil Parish. Figure 12 overleaf shows a number of community, housing and transport designations.”</i></p> <p>Change the titles of Figures 11 and 12 to read “<i>Figure 11 – Environmental Information</i>” and “<i>Figure 12 – Community, Housing and Transport Information</i>” and remove any and all references to “policy maps” on Figures 11 and 12.</p>

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	Recommended Modification Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
		Update Figure 11 to show the most recently available information on flooding and to reflect the LPU Proposed Allocation Site which now has planning permission
MN5	Page 24, Table 3	Update Table 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete Prince Brothers Garage and KVT Fitness Studio entries</li> </ul>
MN6	Page 25, Table 4	Update Table 4 to reflect corrections from the Parish Council and most up to date information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete references to Tesco One Stop Network and mobile post office service in entry 1</li> <li>Update references to Village Hall floors and car park which have been resurfaced in entry 2</li> <li>Delete reference to sink hole in entry 9</li> <li>Update reference to playground upgrade date in entry 11</li> <li>Update primary school capacity in entry 17</li> </ul>
MN7	Page 30, paragraph 4.10	Amend paragraph 4.10 to read: <p>“As noted in Table 4, the only educational establishment within the village is Charvil Piggott primary school and, as described in the table, this <i>has</i> limited scope for expansion. Figure 16 shows the location of local state schools in the wider area.”</p>
MN8	Page 32, Policy CHARVIL 1	Revise Policy CHARVIL 1 to read: <p><b><i>“New and Improved Community Facilities</i></b></p> <p>Applications for new development that would <i>increase demand on</i> existing community facilities and other community assets in Charvil should include proposals to support and improve them <i>subject to viability and site-specific considerations</i>.</p> <p><i>New mixed use development which includes the</i></p>

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	<b>Recommended Modification</b> Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
		<p><i>provision of new community facilities will be welcomed in principle in appropriate locations.</i></p> <p><i>Planning applications which propose to provide new community facilities within the defined settlement of Charvil will be supported in principle. Development proposals for new community uses within designated countryside will only be supported where they cannot be located within the settlement boundary and where they are demonstrated to be appropriate for a countryside location in terms of use, scale and ease of access.</i></p> <p><b>Sites in Local Community Use</b></p> <p><i>A number of Sites in Local Community Use have been identified and are shown on Figure 13 and described in Table 4. These are:</i></p> <p>[list 16 sites]</p> <p>The loss of Sites in Local Community Use in the parish will only be supported where <i>robust</i> evidence has been provided to demonstrate one or more of the following requirements are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Equivalent or better</i> alternative provision exists <i>or is proposed</i> within reasonable walking distance <i>from the Village Hall; or,</i></li> <li>b. It can be clearly demonstrated that a Site in Local Community Use is no longer needed or <i>viable and is not</i> suitable <i>for</i> alternative community uses. <i>Evidence to support this criterion may include robust marketing evidence over a period of six months.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Commercial and institutional development</b></p> <p>Planning applications for new commercial or institutional development which helps to achieve the vision and objectives of the neighbourhood plan will be supported in principle.</p>

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	Recommended Modification Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
		<p><i>Four Important Community Assets have been identified and are shown on Figure 13 and described in Table 4. These are:</i></p> <p>[list 4 sites]</p> <p>The loss of <i>the Important Community Assets</i> will only be supported where <i>robust</i> evidence is presented to demonstrate that <i>the use is no longer viable and that</i> alternative commercial or institutional uses of the site are <i>not viable or otherwise desirable.</i>"</p>
MN9	Page 27, Figure 13	<p>Ensure that all Sites in Local Community Use and the Important Community Assets referred to in Policy CHARVIL 1 are clearly shown and identified on Figure 13</p> <p>Ensure that Figure 13 only refers to these two designations and any other language is removed</p>
MN10	Page 40, Policy CHARVIL 2	<p>Amend Policy CHARVIL 2 to read:</p> <p>"Proposals for housing development within the Settlement Boundary of Charvil Village will be supported in principle where they provide an appropriate mix of homes which delivers the following identified housing needs on site within the parish (<i>or reflects the most up to date housing needs information available for the parish</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Small open market flats and houses (one <i>and</i> two bedrooms) for sale and for rent.</li> <li>b) Social housing provision of one <i>and two</i> bedroomed homes.</li> </ul> <p><i>A reasonable and proportionate number of three bedroomed dwellings may be allowed in exceptional or site-specific circumstances for the purpose of making a proposed development financially viable.</i></p> <p>Proposals for the provision of affordable homes for</p>

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	<b>Recommended Modification</b> Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
		sale and rent through discounted sale prices, shared ownership products or affordable rent products must demonstrate their affordability to local households in Charvil based on the latest house price and household income data.”
MN11	Page 48, Policy CHARVIL 3	Amend Policy CHARVIL 3 to read:  <i>“All development must be of a high quality design. Development proposals must demonstrate the way in which they have responded positively to the features and key characteristics of the Character Area in which they are located and how they have taken account of, and positively responded to, the design guidance and codes set out in the Charvil Design Guidance and Codes document.”</i>
MN12	Page 50, Policy CHARVIL 4	Amend Policy CHARVIL 4 to read:  <i>“New housing development in Charvil should be designed having regard to, and taking into account, the important character features of the settlement set out in Table 7.</i>  Key aspects of development including building heights, building line, boundary treatments, plot depths should be consistent with the street patterns proposed and complement existing development character in Charvil.  Proposed housing densities should <i>respond to the site’s characteristics, location and local context and be appropriate to the character of the area in which it is located including taking into account and respecting the existing housing densities in Charvil shown in Figure 23.”</i>
MN13	Page 52, Policy CHARVIL 5	Amend the third paragraph of Policy CHARVIL 5 to read:  <i>“In the first instance, new development in Charvil</i>



Modification Number	Page number/other reference	<b>Recommended Modification</b> Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
		Parish should be designed to support the achievement of lower carbon emissions <i>and operating costs</i> through improved energy efficiency <i>through the use of passive design measures, followed by the use of energy efficient equipment and low and zero carbon energy and heating technologies."</i>
MN14	Page 51, Paragraphs 6.26, 6.27, 6.28	<p>Amend paragraph 6.26 to read:</p> <p><i>"Charvil Parish wants to support the development of new sustainable buildings and encourage existing development to become more sustainable. In order for Charvil to deliver net zero development to align with local and national carbon reduction trajectories, this Neighbourhood Plan encourages development which is designed to reduce energy demand from the outset. This approach involves taking advantage of design decisions such as building orientation and form to first reduce energy demand, then ensuring energy and heat are supplied efficiently from low and zero carbon sources. This is known as the energy hierarchy which is set out below:</i></p> <p><i>The energy hierarchy states that the below steps should be followed in order:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>A. Reduce the need for energy – site layout and orientation of buildings can reduce the energy demand of buildings by capitalising on passive solar gain which utilises the energy from the sun to heat and provide light while avoiding unwanted thermal gains by effective use of solar shading;</i></li> <li><i>B. Use energy efficiently – there are many measures available to ensure that buildings use energy efficiently. These include thermally efficient building elements, high levels of airtightness and insulation and energy efficient appliances (light fittings etc.);</i></li> <li><i>C. Supply energy efficiently – by using existing supplies more efficiently, including taking</i></li> </ul>

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	<b>Recommended Modification</b> Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in <i>italics</i> . Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
		<p><i>opportunities to connect to any available local heat / cooling and / or power networks, greenhouse gas emissions can be significantly reduced (also termed low carbon sources) e.g. Combined Heat and Power (CHP) networks;</i></p> <p>D. <i>Use renewable energy – by incorporating technologies that obtain energy from flows that occur naturally and repeatedly in the environment, such as from the wind (wind turbines), the fall of water (hydroelectric), from the sun (photovoltaics), from the thermal energy in the ground (ground source heat) and from latent thermal energy in air and water (air source and water source heat respectively);</i></p> <p>E. <i>Monitor performance – in order to ensure transparency around true building performance it is important that performance is monitored, verified and reported.</i></p> <p><i>Opportunities for existing dwellings to incorporate low carbon and renewable energy technologies will be encouraged.</i> It is important that new buildings in Charvil Parish are built ready for renewable or low carbon heat technologies and should incorporate renewable energy generation to reduce fossil fuel energy demands and improve energy efficiency.</p> <p>Delete paragraph 6.27</p> <p>Amend paragraph 6.28 to read:</p> <p><i>“The occupants of new housing built to Building Regulations minimum performance standards can be left with significant costs and difficulties in adapting newly built homes to meet future requirements or take advantage of government initiatives to support change. In addition to promoting the use of the energy hierarchy, the Neighbourhood Plan encourages new homes to be built with low and zero carbon energy and heating technologies such as roof</i></p>

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	Recommended Modification Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
		top solar panels and with heat pumps (or space for them designed in)."
MN15	Page 55, Table 9	Amend the wording on Table 9 to reflect wording of Policy CHARVIL 6 i.e. Special Character Area
MN16	Page 59, Paragraph 8.4	Amend paragraph 8.4 to read:  "The Neighbourhood Plan is focused on ensuring that green infrastructure connections and functions of value to local people, and its strategic role, are maintained <i>or enhanced</i> . New development in Charvil should maintain <i>and</i> incorporate green infrastructure of the right type within developments to maintain <i>and enhance</i> local character within settlements and setting in relation to the countryside."
MN17	Pages 63, 64 and 65, Figure 27	Reproduce and insert Maps 5 and 6 from TVERC's supporting document "Green Corridors in Charvil" of February 2024 to replace the existing set of three maps
MN18	Page 66, Policy CHARVIL 8	Delete proposed LGS 3 Land to the North and East of Park View Drive North from Policy CHARVIL 8 and any associated maps including Figure 28  Amend the wording of Policy CHARVIL 8 to read:  "The following sites, shown on Figure 28 <i>are</i> designated as Local Green Spaces:  [list the six retained LGS sites]  <i>Development in the Local Green Spaces will be consistent with national policy for Green Belts.</i> "
MN19	Page 70, Policy CHARVIL 9	Amend Policy CHARVIL 9 to read:  "Development proposals on sites of 0.5 ha or more within or adjacent to the <i>defined</i> settlement boundary of <i>Charvil</i> should achieve a future canopy

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	<b>Recommended Modification</b> Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
		<p><i>tree cover of around 40% of the site area principally through the retention of existing trees and the planting of new trees. Where such an approach would be impracticable for viability, layout or design reasons, the use of other green infrastructure (such as green roofs and walls) should be used where they can offer similar benefits to trees.</i></p> <p><i>Existing trees, woodland, hedges and hedgerows should be retained in new developments and protected during the construction of development.</i></p> <p>Planning proposals that affect existing trees, <i>woodland and hedgerows</i> or introduce new trees, <i>woodland or hedgerows</i> will be accompanied by an <i>appropriate and proportionate</i> tree management plan which <i>assesses their health, value and potential impact of development</i> and will include provision for the like for like replacement of any trees <i>or other features</i> lost within an <i>agreed time period</i> from the completion of the development.</p> <p>All planning proposals (<i>except for householder or minor development</i>) that have more than 10 metres of road frontage will <i>usually</i> be required to provide at least one <i>street</i> tree where there are no overriding reasons why this will not be possible. One tree will be required for every additional 10 metre length of roadside. Where it is not possible to provide a roadside tree planted in the ground, it will be necessary to contribute towards off site provision within Charvil.</p> <p>Schemes that seek to enhance natural features and connectivity with existing green infrastructure will be supported.”</p>
MN20	Page 67, Paragraph 8.18	Add a reference to the Woodland Trust’s Ancient Tree Inventory in paragraph 8.18

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	<b>Recommended Modification</b> Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in <i>italics</i> . Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
MN21	Page 74, Figure 31	<p>Change the viewpoint arrows to end at the boundary of the Plan area on Figure 31.</p> <p>Add the Valued Local View letter i.e. a), b) to each viewpoint and retain the notation on Figure 31 i.e. Bowsey Hill</p> <p>[Note that View d) is deleted]</p>
MN22	Page 73, Table 10	Remove View d) from Table 10
MN23	Page 71, Policy CHARVIL 10	<p>Amend Policy CHARVIL 10 to read:</p> <p><i>“The following four Valued Local Views are identified and shown on Figure 31 (as they pertain to the Plan area):</i></p> <p>a) From Charvil <i>towards</i> the Bowsey Hill</p> <p>b) From the north of Charvil across Thames Valley <i>towards</i> Shiplake</p> <p>c) From the north of Charvil across Thames Valley <i>towards</i> Sonning</p> <p>d) Local View of Charvil Ford.</p> <p>Proposals for <i>new development within the Charvil Plan area that would affect any of these Valued Local Views should be carefully designed to provide opportunities for the longer distance views to the surrounding landscape to be integrated within the new development.</i>”</p>
MN24	Page 86, Policy CHARVIL 11	Amend Policy CHARVIL 11 by removing the four different subheading categories of “accident locations”; “walking and cycling routes detailed in Table 11”; Charvil Safe School Routes”; and “New Public Rights of Way connections” instead inserting the phrase <i>“Important walking, cycling and school routes”</i> after the second paragraph of the policy and listing the 13 routes

Modification Number	Page number/other reference	Recommended Modification
		Changes to the wording of the supporting text or policies and any new wording are shown in italics. Please note that paragraph numbers refer to existing paragraph numbers.
MN25	Page 88, Policy CHARVIL 12	Add the words “...otherwise acceptable...” in front of “...development...” in Policy CHARVIL 12
MN26	Page 92, Policy CHARVIL 13	<p>Amend Policy CHARVIL 13 to read:</p> <p>“Development proposals will be supported where they comply with national and local planning policies relating to flood risk. Where relevant to the proposal under consideration, documentary information on local flood events provided by the local community in Charvil Parish <i>should be taken into account in determining flood risk and any necessary mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>Applicants</i> are encouraged to engage with Charvil Parish Council prior to submission of planning applications, <i>in particular</i> to review and discuss local information on flood events.”</p>
MN27	Page 94, Appendix A	Remove Appendix A from the Plan

**List Ends**