

Charvil Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan

Summary of representations received by Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) as part of Regulation 16 publication and submitted to the independent Examiner pursuant to paragraph 9 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990)

Parish/Town name: Charvil Parish

Consultation period: 1 September 2025 to 5pm 13 October 2025

Please note: All the original representation documents will be included in the examination pack. The table below is a summary of the representations received so will not be verbatim. As stated in the consultation material, any anonymous comments received during the consultation have not been considered. The comments are listed by type of responder and then alphabetically within each subheading.

A total of **12** responses were received. Of these **7** were from statutory consultees; **1** was from a developer/landowner/agent; **3** were from individuals (residents or individual councillors); and **1** was from other organisations.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
Statutory Consultee comments			
1.	Historic England	General	No specific comments. Reference to online guidance provided.
2.	Natural England	General	No specific comments provided. Information, issues and opportunities standard advice provided, and recommendation that advice is sought from local ecological, landscape and soil advisors.
3.	NHS Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (BOBW ICB)	General	Notes the community aspiration for increased health provision to serve parish residents. However, provision of a satellite GP surgery in Charvil is not considered to be in line with the Primary Care Strategy and there is no identified funding for health care improvements in the locality. Confirmation of willingness for ongoing engagement to explore how health provision mitigations might be delivered / funded.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
4.	Oxfordshire County Council	Policy Charvil 10	<p>Oxfordshire CC Minerals & Waste Policy and Strategy Team continue to raise concern that Policy Charvil 10 could prevent or hinder future potential mineral working.</p> <p>Suggest the following insertion to Policy 10: '<i>Proposals for development <u>within Charvil</u> should seek to retain views from public areas within Charvil to the surrounding landscape...</i>'</p>
5.	Twyford Parish Council	General	Support expressed for the plan.
6.	Winnersh Parish Council	General	Support expressed for the plan as a whole, specifically that it accords with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024, that the community's aims are clearly stated, and that each section is appropriately justified in a manner which seeks to positively shape, rather than restrict, development while enhancing key environmental and cultural aspects of the parish.
7.	Wokingham Borough Council	Table, Figures and Policies'	Comment that the numbering has gone awry in the 'Table, Figures and Policies' of the Contents section because Table 2 is missing.
		Paragraph 2.14	Recommended modification to ensure accurate reference to the latest WBC Valued Landscape Assessment (2024).
		Figures 11 and 12	Comment that the 'policies maps' do not display the whole plan area and should therefore be re-labelled as informational maps. Recommendation that latest flood mapping is incorporated into Figure 11 and that factual updates made to reflect the grant of permission of land displayed on both Figures 11 and 12.
		Policy Charvil 1	Support the policy with modifications. Suggested modifications reflect potential unintended consequences of the wording as drafted, with recommendations intended to qualify support for community uses in designated countryside.
		Policy Charvil 2	Support the policy with modifications. Comments provided in relation to the assumptions made in supporting evidence for the policy, with support expressed for the principle of seeking to facilitate homes for lower earners / first time buyers. Suggested modifications intended to further encourage delivery of genuinely small dwellings.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
		Policy Charvil 3	Support the policy with modifications. Suggested modifications to simplify the policy and to seek to ensure full regard is had to the supporting Charvil Design Guidance and Code, rather than matters potentially being missed.
		Policy Charvil 4	Support the policy with modifications. Comments provided about potential internal inconsistencies with the policy requirement to retain existing densities, with policy Charvil 2 requiring smaller (and by definition, higher density) homes. Modifications suggested to alleviate this inconsistency.
		Policy Charvil 5	Support the policy with modifications. The council fully supports net zero development. Modifications suggested to provide greater clarity on what is meant by the energy hierarchy referred to in policy wording, as well as to strengthen the fabric first approach that is being advocated.
		Policy Charvil 6	Object to the proposed designation of Heron on the Ford Public House, The Giddy Bridge and the Ford Crossing as an Area of Special Character, on the basis of insufficient evidence to support designation. Support for the proposed building of traditional local character.
		Policy Charvil 7	Comments requesting additional clarity of Figure 27 to aid interpretation and implementation of the policy.
		Policy Charvil 8	Support the policy with modifications. Support for the proposed Local Green Spaces, with the exception of 'Land to the east and north of Park View Drive North' which is not considered to meet the relevant criteria in national policy, and Simmons Wood where it is recommended that the area of designation be increased to match proposals in the emerging Local Plan Update.
		Policy Charvil 9	Support the policy with modifications. Support expressed for the principle of the policy. Modifications suggested to aid clarity for decision makers, remove reference to requirements that are not considered evidenced / justified, and additional comments made highlighting the lack of guidance for calculating canopy cover. Comments made to supporting text for additional clarity for decision makers.
		Policy Charvil 11	Support the policy with modifications. Comments made in relation to the clarity of the policy and the range of categories it seeks to introduce, while supporting the intention in principle.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
		Policy Charvil 13	Support the policy with modifications. Minor modification recommended to clarify that engagement with the parish is sought on planning matters beyond just flooding.
Developer / landowner / agent comments			
8.	University of Reading (c/o Stantec)	Section 5 – Housing Requirements	<p>University is concerned that the NP as drafted does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and fails to comply with the Basic Conditions: (a) (having regard to national policies and advice) and (d) (contributes to the achievement of sustainable development).</p> <p>University objects to paragraph 5.2 of the NP which states: ‘<i>Charvil is not a sustainable location for significant housing development</i>’. The University attests Charvil is a sustainable location for future housing development and that Section 5 of the NP highlights there is a demonstrable need for additional housing and a need for a greater mix of housing typology within the Parish.</p> <p>University states some of the NP policies would constrain future sustainable development on the edge of Charvil, by designating Local Green Spaces which would protect such sites from development, contrary to the need for more housing presented in Section 5.</p>
		Policy Charvil 8 - Local Green Space Sites	<p>University raises objection to Policy 8 which seeks to designate several Local Green Space sites, including designation of ‘Land to the east and north of Park View Drive North’ (Site 3). They ask this site is removed from Policy 8.</p> <p>University does not consider the Local Green Space designation criteria set out in NPPF paragraph 107 have been met, meaning the LGS designations are unjustified. The evidence to support the LGS designations in Appendix A of the NP contains only a ‘brief’ assessment.</p> <p>They state the site’s LGS designation places the same restrictions upon development as designated Green Belt with development only be permitted where very special circumstances apply. Setting such a high bar would ‘<i>create great uncertainty as to how (and whether) development will be permitted to proceed</i>’ and would prevent future sustainable development in Charvil.</p> <p>The University has commissioned a Landscape Appraisal Note (by Nicholas Pearson Associates) submitted in support of their representation.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
		Policy Charvil 10 – Valued Local Views	<p>The additional supporting text in Policy 10 does not alter the University’s previous comments. Three of the ‘valued views’ pass through University land: a) ‘Bowsey Hill View’, b) ‘Thames Valley – Shiplake View’ and c) ‘Thames Valley – Sonning View’. The University objects to Policy 10, specifically the inclusion of the three views (a, b, and c).</p> <p>A ‘Valued Local View’ designation is not recognised under the current NPPF and as such there are no planning policy criteria to underpin this proposed designation.</p> <p>Table 10 of the NP does not provide indicative criteria for identifying local landscape value. It lacks detail and fails to provide adequate justification for Policy 10.</p> <p>The University’s Landscape Appraisal Note provides an assessment of the evidence and justification provided in the NP in relation Policy 10 and ‘locally important views.’ The appraisal note concludes there is insufficient evidence to support the proposed Valued Local View designations for views a, b and c. The attributes of the views do not wholly satisfy the indicators of ‘value’ as defined by GVIA 3, so are not sufficiently valued to warrant protection through planning policy.</p> <p>The University ask that Policy 10 is removed from the NP.</p>
Individual’s comments			
9.	Hartley, Jan	General	Support expressed for the whole plan, particularly the pragmatic approach taken to shaping development in a way that protects the parish’s key characteristics, supports mixed affordable housing, and encourages active and sustainable transport.
10.	Jameson, Mark	General	Non plan specific comments relating to desired road and pedestrian improvements to the existing network. General support for bus service improvements. Comments that services and amenities should be delivered before new housing and that new roads serving development should have appropriate widths.
11.	Wilton, Richard	General	Comments provided in relation to the need for expanded medical facilities in the area and, whilst this is acknowledged in the plan, it does not adequately address this issue.

Ref	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Comments
Other organisations			
12.	Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group.	Chapter 8 – Green and Blue Infrastructure	General support for the inclusion of a chapter covering green and blue infrastructure. However, considers the chapter does not align with the Planning Practice Guidance by omitting reference to supporting swifts, in particular lack of requirement for the provision of swift boxes through new development. This is important given the parish possesses key characteristics which support the presence of swifts.